



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

Written Feedback
Waiheke Volume #1

April 2024



| Sub # | Organisation Name | Page Number |
|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1673 | Waiheke High School | 143 |
| 3120 | md design ltd | 246 |
| 4031 | Pearnold Limited | 271 |
| 5081 | Waiheke Resources Trust | 342 |



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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 | 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?

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:



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#36



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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#88



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



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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

No

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



Less wastage on unnecessary projects , eg speed bumps or round abouts put in wrong place , eg sunderlands rd @ Bucklands Bch rd

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Put high speed train tracks in and widen the motorways

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

High speed rail to pakuranga and the airport

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 doesn't seem to be currently working

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Back the airport and improve it



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:

4d. Do you have 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?



#174



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



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#174



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Build some footpaths first and widen Seaview road , it's dangerous

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do not block the development of cycleways.

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

Safe cycle transport within the city

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

Bigger road and car transport

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#236



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

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



| | |
|--|---------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Waikiki needs to manage over tourism, empty housing, the fact that non-resident can vote for the local board,

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 less |
| 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?

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.



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?

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?

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#258



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



#258

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

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

Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.

Not Important



#258



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do 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?

PUBLIC TRANSPORT, CYCLE LANES & PATHS, PEDESTRIAN PATHS - absolute priority under transport.

CITY DEVELOPMENT: council to lead, rather than private developers. We must push for densification, especially in Eastern Bays and the North Shore.

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



ROADS - this is a national government issue and not for the local government to pay for.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I do not agree with cycleways being stopped as they are increasingly being used as a means of transport in Auckland that is both affordable and keeps us healthy. On the contrary, prioritising cycleways should be at the top of this transport proposal!

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

Cycleways; creating/expanding busways to south, east and west; pedestrian crossings; reducing traffic speed.

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

Road network.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

not a priority

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

Tell us why:



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Support



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



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, 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> |
|--|---------------------|

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.</p> | <p>Very Important</p> |
| <p>Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience.</p> | <p>Very Important</p> |
| <p>Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan.</p> | <p>Very Important</p> |



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

Financing: it is very clear that our rates cannot support the well being of Aucklanders and the maintenance, let alone development, of their city. Our taxes must go towards paying a much higher share of Auckland region, which represents a third of NZ population and its most productive region by far.

Housing: what happened to the densification of Auckland? Why do we have development in Drury? This goes totally against the densification that is needed in Auckland (NPSUD). Akl Council needs to take the lead and force densification in Eastern Bays and the North Shore - where people want to live. Auckland Council must take the lead when it comes to housing development - not private developers.

Road network, development and maintenance are issues for the national government, not for local governments and must be entirely financed by our taxes.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

makes sense.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Do not give away 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:



Do not give away control of an asset

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 above

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

allow the port to concentrate on what it should focus on and public space transferred to AC

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 above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#342



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



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

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

limited

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

A better public sustainable, low-cost transport system.

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

Spend less on costly transport systems.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Need more cost-efficient, sustainable, low cost transport such as offered by Metrino-PRT.

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

Spend more on the above low-cost transport system.

Spend more on electric ferries and open more routes around Auckland.

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

Spend less on the current costly transport system.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Makes sense

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 keep rates lower.



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

Other

Tell us here:

Port of Auckland needs to be totally under Council control. The used car yard just has to go – as in ASAP. Very bad look as entranceway to the city 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:

To keep homeless people off the streets of Auckland. Need bylaws to enforce this and housing in rural areas.

4d. Do you have 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:

Need to tidy up the wharf area for public use.

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:

Not within 15 years, but within 2 years.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#608



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Services on the island are very important. It would be good to have the road sealed leading to my place, 58 Beach Parade. Have lived here and paid rates for almost 30 years and it is still a pot-holed, uneven dirt track! Very dangerous to walk on. And

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

Needs to be a focus on bringing back services the Council used to provide.



#608



8. Do you have any other comments?

There needs to be a greater focus on growing partnerships, eg with the Te Araroa walkway which passes through Auckland City – more funds allocated to maintenance, signage and publicity. This is a tourism icon.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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 funding to Local Boards

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

Less urban regeneration and city centre development



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

More cycleways

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

More cycleways

Introduce Congestion charging

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)?

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:

retain status quo

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?



#637



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



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

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

Community Services budget of \$885,000 is far too lowshould be \$2,000,000 at least

8. Do you have any other comments?

Community Services budget of \$885,000 is far too lowshould be \$2,000,000 at least



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Common sense

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:

Less investment but still keeps the fields 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:

We need a fall-back fund, as long as it is STRICTLY set up to ensure it can't be used by future mayors for "pet projects".



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

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

Tell us here:

Need money now, but by retaining the ownership it could be re-negotiated in 35 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:

We need money for services now!

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

Tell us here:

I shall leave that to the experts.

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:

Too expensive to redevelop.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



Tell us why:

Too expensive to change it.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



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

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

Raise the WQTR to cover costs.

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

Other

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I chose “other” in 7b as we need a lot more funding to do all of this. Our Waiheke Board suffered a huge drop in funding for this financial year, no reason given? The Auckland region gets huge money from tourists stopping in Ak before coming to their dest

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

Again need more funds.

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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

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

Use psychometric testing (the ideal is the MMPI2) to distinguish between those who have the desirable public-servant psychological profile and the undesirable bureaucratic one. Dismiss all the bureaucrats, and use ChatGPT4+ to aid the public



servants to make decisions that would be far more informed and made much faster. [No bureaucrat would pass this on to the Council, so they will never see this]. Use AI, which is now AGI, and about to be ASI, to get rid of stupid decisions made at snail's pace.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Take the organisation of the Waiheke bus service out of the hands of AT and give it back to the island management. AT came over before the pandemic, spent a fortune, almost all wasted, and messed up the service, because they do not understand Waiheke.

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

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

Unnecessary road works. Get rid of the public-private partnership, which is a gravy-train for private companies. One of their engineers said to me, 'We don't understand why they want half of what they ask us to do, but we do it because they ask us.' Council work used to be done by Council workers, not handed off to profiteering private companies.

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:

Selling off the family silver is never a good idea. Council-controlled organisations are controlled in name only. AT, for example, is way out of control. I spends money like water and does not do a good job.

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?

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



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#674



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

Prudent stewardship should be the top priority in all matters.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I'd say public transport is more important than cycleways because it can move more people faster. Maybe once public transport is more developed, people would accept other forms of transport like cycling, and then we could invest in that.

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

Busses

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

Roads specifically massive motorways

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?

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



#919



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



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

Support

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

None whatsoever

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

Everything



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

No

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

Everything

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:

Move it to Whangarei

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

Do not support



#934



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



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

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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



| | |
|--|----------------|
| | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Support Biodiversity Restoration

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



#1046



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

More Cycleways are important.

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

Public Transport

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

Selling Assets is stupid

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



#1046



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?



#1046



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



#1046



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#1046



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Walking and road safety improvements particularly for pedestrians. Public transport investment.

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



#1084



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?

Walking and road safety improvements particularly for pedestrians. Public transport investment.

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



#1084



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

I don't know



#1084



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



#1084



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waitematā

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. | Fairly Important |
| Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works. | Fairly Important |
| 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 |



#1084



| | |
|--|------------------|
| | |
| 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. | Fairly Important |
| Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible. | Fairly Important |

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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is not specifically mentioned in the transportation section. The current government is slashing spending on these services, but Auckland can still expand our initiatives. The city has made some important steps, but the only way to continue expanding use of existing infrastructure is to expand and maintain



#1165



infrastructure so that it is easier for every Aucklander to seeing biking and walking as healthy, cleaner, practical alternatives.

1d. Is there anything else 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:

Reducing spending on bike and pedestrian infrastructure is counter productive and undercuts the investments already made. The only way to continue expanding use of existing infrastructure is to expand, connect, and maintain infrastructure so that it is easier for every Aucklander to seeing biking and walking as healthy, cleaner, practical alternatives.

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

Pedestrian and biking infrastructure (see above).

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

It's important to maintain existing roadways. I'm not in favour of spending more money to encourage more people to drive more.

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)?



#1165



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

Tell us why:

This proposal is incredibly vague and filled with "weasel words" like "maybe" "might" "almost certain." Who could full-heartedly support this kind of language. Generally speaking, I am opposed to selling off the airport shares. They are a good investment that produces returns. Cashing in for the short term by getting rid of value long-term assets isn't the sort of thing a responsible council does.

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:

Auckland has been relatively lucky so far in terms of climate change-related impacts. But if we don't start investing more seriously in climate resilience, residents are going to be picking up huge bills over the next ten years for damage to roadways, sanitation, and other critical infrastructure. The ratio of investment in resilience to paying for damage afterwards is around 10 to 1. It's a smart investment.

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know



#1165



Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1165



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities



#1165



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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

These are important for maintaining and improving quality of life on Waiheke for all people as well the ecosystem. I just hope they can be funded given the massive proposed cuts to funding the local board.

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

I'd like to see all data collected by all Have Your Say polls made easily accessible to the public as charts showing which priorities Aucklanders supported most. This kind of



#1165



transparency is important and will make Have Your Say a much more meaningful opportunity. Many people assume that no one in a decision making level cares about these responses and do don't bother to fill them out. Making data public could help in restoring faith in this system.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Keep supporting cycle lanes especially, otherwise it's dangerous to bike around

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#1286



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1286



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



#1286



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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#1286



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 less |
| 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?

retain the airport and ports

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



all water management should be undertaken by central govt as per 3 waters.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

we need better cheaper public transport and an increase in cycleways and also pedestrian areas (ie footpaths)that are free of ALL wheeled vehicles

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

public transport in particular light rail to the airport and trains

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

additional roading for cars

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Greater community use would benefit everyone

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



#1368



It is essential the city keeps some control over the airport and ports. I do not wish either to be sold and would rather pay and increase in rates.

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

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

Tell us here:

It is essential the city keeps some control over the airport and ports. I do not wish either to be sold and would rather pay and increase in rates.

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

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 could include public spaces but may also be required to expand ferry services around the harbour which would reduce road use



#1368



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1368



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

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

no

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities



#1368



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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

we need a tourist tax and a Board that has more power

8. Do you have any other comments?

we need a tourist tax and a Board that has more power



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

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



#1410



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#1410



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1410



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



#1410



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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#1410



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Preservation of our natural environment. More investment in public transport.

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



#1471



Less reliance on consultants, even if it means establishing permanent jobs in those areas. This could be considered an investment in reducing future costs.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland's future must be in public transport.

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

Public transport

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

I support greater use by 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)?

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

Tell us why:

I don't believe in selling Auckland's remaining assets. I would prefer to get rid of the car storage areas. This would reduce congestion in the area. The harbour waterfront is



#1471



stunning but most of it is unavailable for public use. A future fund is not secure as future councils could access the money for their own perceived Auckland 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.

Tell us why:

The harbour belongs to the people of Auckland. The redevelopment around the ferry wharves has added greatly to the enjoyment of our natural heritage.

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



#1471



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

Tell us why:

It's an existing eye sore on our beautiful city other cities in other countries make the most of their gateway's.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1471



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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



#1471



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I am concerned about the proposed drastic cuts to some council funding . We pay higher rates than many Auckland areas and receive less benefits in the form of sewerage, roading and water.

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

It needs more local input and decision making.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

No

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



#1547



Less staff. There are too many doing nothing productive. (I know , I worked at council for 34 years .. it got worse and worse every year... get it under control)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Anything that makes moving from point to point Faster, at the same time costing ratepayers less, I'm all for

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

no

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

Its covered.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Anything that reduces cost to ratepayers

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 need other forms of revenue. Ratepayers, under the current system cant cover it.



#1547



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

We need to see accurate cost / benefit analysis to make a call

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:

Its councils core function, service to the ratepayers.

4d. Do you have 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 proposal would cost ratepayers and benefit only a minority of ratepayers. As a general thought, too much is spent in small areas which don't benefit all ratepayers

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#1547



Tell us why:

as above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1547



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#1547



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Only focus on CORE council necessities. We are poor. there needs to be a massive mindset change.

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

as above

8. Do you have any other comments?

The rates based funding model is unjust and unfair. Why is it ok to have a single person in house A paying more than house B with four full time workers one suburb across. Why do we on Waiheke, rates take 30 million , rates spend here less than 900k, have to subsidise to this massive degree things most never utilise.

Council needs to move to a city citizen charge, where everyone pays the same amount for core service all benefit from. Taking rates from the public to spend to the betterment of a minority of ratepayers , ie focus on the city centre is just not right or



#1547



just. We are suffering out in the real world at the moment, we are getting poorer by the day.. all this talk about raising rates just make me , well, more than depressed.. if it were a fair system , then so be it, but its simply not.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#1605



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Fullers ferry needs to come under PTOM

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#1605



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



#1605



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



#1605



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#1605



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Stop mowing all the verges and grass - it's a waste of money and bad for the environment. And definitely stop spraying verges.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Cut staffing levels. Audit all council bureaucratic spending with the aim to heavily reduce staffing and associated costs. Heavily reduce spending on Council



#1628



communications. Reduce expenditure on 'cultural' activities. Stop wasteful spending of ratepayers' money.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland Transport has demonstrated over and over again that it is NOT CAPABLE of delivering public transport. The suburban rail system and service is beyond a joke. Therefore, Auckland Transport needs to be audited to identify the reasons for and causes of their massive waste of ratepayers' money. My recommendation is that Auckland Council invite in an organisation such as Japan Rail to audit and organise Auckland's public rail system. Auckland Transport's anti-car attitude and massive expenditure on over-engineered bike lanes and 'raised pedestrian crossings' needs to be ordered to stop. The fact that so much of the Regional Fuel Tax was spent on cycle ways and other non-vehicle projects is appalling. The amateurish traffic removal and ugly traffic calming in Queen Street is an embarrassment and looks as though a group of school children were let loose with their concrete blocks. International tourists must be appalled. In addition, the pavements in Queen Street, the various side streets and Queen Elizabeth Square need a deep clean - they are filthy.

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

Road repairs. Footpath repairs. Street cleaning. Gutter and storm-water pit cleaning.

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?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#1628



Not my interest - I'm sure the people of the North Shore and especially those who were involved in creating the stadium have views on its 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)?

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?



#1628



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 the Ports don' need these wharves then they should go to Council. However, the public spaces made so far at the Ports are tacky and landscaped with the usual silly concrete blocks. There is a limit to what the public can do in these areas as it is ofte

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Auckland without a functioning port will be a back water. The working port brings money, jobs and activity to the area.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1628



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

Cut Council expenditure!



#1628



Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#1628



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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): Waiheke High School

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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 am a Trustee for the Waiheke Recreation Centre on WI. We require continuation of existing funding in order to deliver the Rec Centre at reasonable costs for users. We currently have a very high utilisation of this asset on the island. If there are cuts to our operations grant we will need time to adjust and find other funding streams or work



#1673



with user groups to move to a higher user cost. We expect any cut in funding will have a direct impact on the level of use as cost will become a barrier to participation.

1d. Is there anything else 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?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 this will enable a good use of the strategic shareholding to effectively fund future capital investments for Auckland.

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



#1673



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 own the asset and control enables us to benefit from the profits subsidising our rates.

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 asset effectively enables subsidisation of rates. Since we have it it makes sense to keep it and obtain the funding stream.

4d. Do you have 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 think given our high rates increases this development can wait till another cycle. We have just finished major development of the waterfront and lower Queen Street area.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#1673



Tell us why:

as above. I think this should wait whilst we get on top of more pressing matters.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1673



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#1673



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

These seem sensible and reflect the core council services I use/benefit from and which strengthen our community

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

agree

8. Do you have any other comments?

My main feedback to council is as a Trustee of the Waiheke Rec Centre and we will need to be across any funding changes to the Ops Grant that is currently used to help pay for the operation of the centre. Any cuts will have a direct impact on user group charges and also impact on Waiheke High School costs.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Restoring the ecology of Aotearoa. A big part of that is biosecurity and pest removal.

Also do more with public transport and bicycle transportation.



#1738



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

no

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

You should also invest more in public cycleways and raised pedestrian walkways.

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

Faster public transport

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)?

Other

Tell us why:

Don't sell shares of the airport.



#1738



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?



#1738



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



#1738



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#1738



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Support invest in the environment and climate action plan.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Making sure that the environment and our waters are clean and healthy for the future.

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



#1781



Look more carefully at where they are spending on road works. It feels like the same roads around me are getting tar and gravel for no real improvement.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I'm not sure where the projects are actually happening so it's difficult to know how much I support.

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

Helping the homeless find a way to get shelter.

Affordable rentals for more people. Could there be a subsidy for some people?

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

Tar and gravel,

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It would give the residents of the North Shore more opportunity to guide the future of 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)?

I don't know



#1781



Tell us 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 feel like it would be the beginning of selling off an asset permanently. I worry that foreign ownership of the port would eventually take profits off shore. It is like the sale of our forestry industry. We would lose control.

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

Other

Tell us here:

I feel like there could be a way for profits to be partially invested and partially used for council services. Figure out the right percentage based on the actual dividend.

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

Tell us here:

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

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:



#1781



Downtown Auckland needs more waterfront areas that are public and possibly housing.

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 think Auckland would be a better city with less commercial containers in the harbour.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1781



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities



#1781



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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

From what I understand our budget has ben severely cut. I'm wondering how this will effect all of these plans,

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Protecting our natural environment by funding predator eradication on Hauraki Gulf islands and protecting the Hauraki Gulf by reducing fishing.

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



#1791



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Seems reasonable

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:

It is not a priority to spend more money on one stadium in Auckland when there are so many other important priorities

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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



#1791



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 wharves are prime land on the harbour and it would be good for them to be used for something that everyone in the city can enjoy.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It sounds like the Port of Auckland would operate more effectively if Bledisloe Terminal was still under their control



#1791



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1791



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

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

It is important to reinstate the Natural Environment Targeted Rate to protect our environment for future generations

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, | Very Important |



#1791



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

It is really important to protect the natural environment for future generations and to reduce our carbon footprint going forward

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

Waiheke Island needs a community indoor swimming pool, so that our children can learn to swim easily, given they are growing up on an island surrounded by water. It is really important to advocate for equitable ferry fares so that a wide spectrum of the community can afford to live on Waiheke Island long-term (rather than it only being a place that only wealthy people can afford to live)

Advocating for marine protection in the Hauraki Gulf is also a key priority given the current state of the ocean.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

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

Waiheke should have separate rates - we have No water supply or treatment, terrible roads and No Indoor Public Pool. Spend per capita on Waiheke must be much lower than mainland suburbs and should be reflected in rates.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support Public Transport - but expect little of the rest of it will have a beneficial effect on Waiheke.

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

Road improvement and maintenance on Waiheke - including secondary roads.
Improve roads where lots of building consents are being given.

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:

Negligible impact on anyone living on Waiheke

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



#1809



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

Tell us here:

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

Other

Tell us here:

Split 50/50 - 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:

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:



#1809



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1809



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#1809



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Supportive of Community Pool - would like to see more focus on poor condition of secondary roads. Budget for Waiheke seems very low compared to other boards considering land area and population.

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

Pool, Ferry fares reduction(PTN) and improved secondary roads (eg Trig Hill) should be priorities. Waihekes Pest control projects are unique and world leading, and should be maintained for the benefit of all Auckland

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fund allocation for Waiheke Local Board does not seem like a fair allocation considering we are paying the same rates and have no water 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Gondola to the airport and to the north shore

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



#1886



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to get people on bikes and in gondolas

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

Gondolas

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

Speed humps

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Build the mean as stadium in the city,

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

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

Tell us why:

Why sell income



#1886



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:

Don't sell your income

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?



#1886



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



#1886



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#1886



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Sports are key to a healthy community, council are responsible for the health of the reserves and its councils responsibility not Māori nor anyone else

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

There's nothing about transport or tourism

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke needs help with transport, it need a new community board as this one is only has two people that actually do anything, there should be a bed tax on all airbnbs like \$5 per person per night, something reasonable that goes back into the community



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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 | 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?



#1922



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 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?



#1922



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1922



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

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



#1922



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

fix the flipping roads. how hard is it?

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



#1980



stop spending money on stupid decisions regarding homes and improvements to the homes. the time and money spent by a home owner to get a garage for example, is just silly.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I don't use public transport because it's rubbish.

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

make stuff work better

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

Tell us why:

why do we need another half empty 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:



#1980



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:

then you can stop ripping off home owners with stupid fees for planning etc

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 above

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

just look at Sydney and how they use the water front. it's not rocket science is it?

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

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



#1980



Tell us why:

as above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#1980



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#1980



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

it's okay

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Other

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

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

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

The present people in charge needs to look at history. There were 1 and 1 half million of us when I was young, but we had long tunnels, dams, viaducts, etc. They must have all been financed without the necessary money being held. Why is the present generation so afraid of lonesome?



#2034



1d. Is there anything else 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:



#2034



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2034



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke



#2034



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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



#2034



I think waiheke has been badly treated by the huge cut to our funding considering what a large income the Council gets from the residents, who are inundated by tourists and holiday owners all year round.

8. Do you have any other comments?

My general comment on the whole report is why are the present generation so afraid of borrowing money for big capital items which happened in our history. There were only one and a half million of us in my youth, and we had large hydro dams, Otira tunnel, railways with viaducts, etc etc.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Focus on key services. Infrastructure. Support projects that make a real economic and social difference, eg Te Korowai o Waiheke. Spend less on bureaucracy and focus on outcomes



#2174



1d. Is there anything else 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:

Compared with many overseas cities, we are too reliant on buses and trains . Build transport that meets the needs. Light rail , second bridge crossing

2a. Is there anything you 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 few enough sports facilities. It's a disgrace we don't have a cricket ground, where all other cities 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?



#2174



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 Council has proven to be a shocking owner. Compare with Tauranga

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:

Port needs land as city grows. There are no other options

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?



#2174



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



#2174



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

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

Local board priorities

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

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 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. | |
| Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide. | |



#2174



Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Focus on economic outcomes first, then environmental and social and cultural

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

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



#2254



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Too much wasteful spending on things that do not make a difference to every day citizens. They put new footpaths down Williamson Ave for example which would have cost a fortune when there was nothing wrong with the old ones, then they moved the road crossing 10m again no doubt at an absorbent cost. It seems common sense is not very common these days.

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

Streamlining roading which already exists to improve traffic flows e.g. remove parking on Newton Road to allow 4 lanes at all times. e.g. 2 remove turning only lanes on Ponsonby road that choke up traffic (incidentally this change was only done a year or so ago and its really slowed traffic flow considerably). Essentially spend money on common sense things that make peoples lives better and easier to get around.

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

Less spending on footpaths, road crossings, cycle ways or anything that doesn't directly improve people getting around and doing their business.

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

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

Tell us why:

No need to invest lots in this asset, but change operational management to reduce cost and increase utilisation.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 council assets is extremely short sighted and AIAL shares should remain council owned.

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:

Lots of this land is wasted, it should remain in council ownership but be restructured to be more efficient and portions either generate more revenue or create returns for the council.

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:



#2254



What is the point in reducing the port size and potential returns for the council?
Seems very short sighted. The management of how this space is used and what revenue comes from it needs reviewing.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2254



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Albert-Eden, Waiheke

Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities



#2254



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. | Not Important |
| Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator. | Fairly Important |
| 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. | Very Important |
| Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks. | Not 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. | Not Important |
| Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square. | Not Important |
| Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Taking away all the bins is just going to create far bigger environmental issues. Incredibly short sighted.

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

Too much spend on things that do not directly create better outcomes for rate payers.



#2254



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Too much money spent on things which do not create direct outcomes or benefits for rate payers.



#2254



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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 | 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?

Stop development everywhere! Let people moving to new Zealand live anywhere but Auckland or tauranga

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



#2568



Pedestrian crossings fewr road cones.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Get people on to public transport. Full stop.

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

Vast public transportation overhaul so we don't need to use cars all the time

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

More ***** 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:

Really! Sell assets Sotheby's can be reinvested....in assets that middle men clip the ticket on.



#2568



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:

Reduce the scale of port operations say containers only, then develop other freight port in firth of thames near thames.

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:

No middle men involved. Less fiscal drag

4d. Do you have 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



#2568



Tell us why:

An unnecessary car park

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2568



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#2568



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

All unnecessary

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

Wasteful

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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 | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

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?



#2574



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2574



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



#2574



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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |



#2574



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

I think that ‘events’ should be user pays. It isn’t the role of council to provide entertainment.



#2714



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Traffic management costs should be streamlined. More control over Auckland Transport. Fewer road cones.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Ridiculous to have all eggs in 2 baskets both of which need a lot of attention.

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



#2714



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

Tell us 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:

A pity to have access to the harbour blocked off by Port activities.

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:



#2714



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2714



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#2714



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The rates collected on Waiheke are excessive compared to what is spent on Waiheke.

All residents need to be treated fairly.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

We don't need raised pedestrian walkways and don't need more cycleways. I live on K Road and hardly ever see a bike (or scooter) on the cycleways.

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

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

Do not close Mercury Lane to vehicles by changing to a pedestrian mall.

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

Other

Tell us why:

No more stadia needed.

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

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

Tell us why:

Keep the airport shares for the future of AKL. The AFT is just a way of leaking more money into poorly thought out AT projects.

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



#2810



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:

No evidence that leasing would do any better for AKL revenue than keeping the current system.

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:

AFT is a poor idea.

4d. Do you have 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:



#2810



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2810



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#2810



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Less employees and less consultants



#2825



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Mostly a waste of money

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

No

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

Almost all of it

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:

Would rather spend less

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

Other



#2825



Tell us here:

Keen to minimize the role of council, so want to sell assets so other owners can manage better

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:

Keen to minimize waste

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

Tell us here:

It doesn't seem like there is enough appreciation of the importance of efficiency and spending money wisely

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

Other

Tell us why:

I would sell them

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

Other

Tell us why:

I would sell it



#2825



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#2825



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#2825



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Would rather spend money on road sealing at bottom end

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

Needs more focus on sealing the road to Man O War and less expenditure on wasteful mana whenua activities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

cut Marketing budgets - AT doesn't NEED to have a brand - they aren't in competition

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#3085



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#3085



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



#3085



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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |



#3085



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Not Important

Tell us why

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

fix the roads. ensure septic compliance.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): md design ltd

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Be aware rates increasing is NOT a realistic way that you will achieve all the upgrades you desire.

Good management of the assets you have & manage your expenditure around this.



#3120



Not big WHITE ELEPHANTS like the ring tunnel train - half baked idea at a massive cost for little gain.

Right now Auckland could go two ways and unfortunately good direction and leadership seems hard to find. Please remember this...

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

Don't entry into half baked ideas that cost massive amounts of money for little return

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland needs to get moving, it is about people getting to where they work or play, unfortunately no public transportation system seems robust or worthwhile. Cars are a reality and it's time Auckland Council realized this - look at Australia, a good example of city's that work (Sydney, Brisbane)

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

No

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

Get ride of the ridiculous

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

At the moment it is another White Elephant



#3120



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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Another asset no run well.....

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

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

Tell us here:

Income!!

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:

Because aucklands paying more and more rates is not the answer

4d. Do you have 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.



#3120



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:

What happened to a rugby stadium and international event center?

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#3120



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



#3120



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. | 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 |

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



#3120



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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Roads, berms, cleaning up graffiti

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

Stop the events, reduce local boards / do away with them.



#3159



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?

Beautification of roadways. Start mowing!

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

Cycle ways

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Who really uses 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:

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



#3159



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#3159



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



#3159



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#3159



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Stick to basics. Mowing, weed control, pest control. Roads. Roads. Roads. No footpaths,

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

Way too many pages. Did not read.

I would prefer the local board is done away with

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Yes improved public transport. No to raised pedestrian crossings

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Bad business to sell shares. Mayor has to be stopped they are not his to sell

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:



#3196



Once again. Stop mayors agenda to sell what Auckland ratepayers own

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:

Use this money for expenses

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

Tell us here:

I'm noticing a lot of reference to " the future fund" as if it's fete accompli

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:

What will happen there more apartments hotels. I don't trust the council will make best decisions. Wait til we get different councillors

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#3196



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



#3196



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#3196



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

Ambitious

8. Do you have any other comments?

I think the board should work to remove the parking charges at matiatia after all it is basically park and ride



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#3446



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#3446



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



#3446



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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Not Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |



#3446



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

With the reevaluation of rates that came through last year, our rates increased substantially. I note that in 2024 they are being reevaluated again as we have been asked to fill in a questionnaire. Presuming that this will result in an additional increase in rateable value plus the proposed percentage increases in rates in a cost of living crisis, it makes the rates payments very hard to meet.

When will the Council stop taking so much money off hard working tax paying citizens and start to recognise that these increases are unacceptable.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Pearnold Limited

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do 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'm a big fan of public transportation having lived in HK for 35 years but I don't believe AT is the entity to drive it. What is the population size that would be sustainable for private business to invest in mass transit.

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



Fewer cycle ways - the topography and weather of AKL makes it extremely limited - I don't get it and I don't see that many cyclists using them.

Pedestrian humps

Footpath repairs - often seem redundant and not necessary.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

As mentioned above, AT is inept and it's throwing good money after bad having them drive transportation improvements

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

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

As above and already identified: cycleways, pedestrian humps

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

I'd like to see a large covered stadium for the whole of Auckland that is not weather dependent, not noise restricted, not numbers limited and serviced by efficient and available transportation options. I know it's been beaten to death but again, private investment I would support.

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

Proceed with the proposal



Tell us why:

Strategic vision is something Auckland and the country has been lacking so totally support strategic long term thinking like this.

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

I would support leasing the operation but would depending on the terms of the lease and whether it's going to achieve the objectives.

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:

There's no option for distributing between the A) and B) - can't it fund both.

4d. Do you have 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:



#4031



We are so woefully short of ferry and cruise terminal space. Cruises ships are a fact of life and while there are environmental impacts, they are becoming more sustainable as newer ships are produced and they bring \$millions to the economy.

Auckland cou

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:

If that's appropriate for Cruise Ship terminal, then I support it but it would be a missed opportunity if the period is 15 years.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4031



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

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

Waiheke pays very high rates but invests a huge amount in having own own sewerage and water. It seems to me our rates should be lower and particularly with the radical reduction in budget this year.

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke



#4031



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Investment needs in caulerpa removal. Have concerns about the 70% of thereabouts reduction in budget. Believe our rates should not be as high given we don't have water and sewerage infrastructure.



#4031



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

I agree. Squash Courts would be nice :-)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

I am particularly interested in decarbonising the city and making it more walk and cycle friendly. A Kong term plans to remove cars from the city centre, as they have done in Amsterdam.



#4181



1d. Is there anything else 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:

I support the more option.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I don't think the evidence that fund managers are effective is good enough. Too risky

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



#4181



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

Tell us 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?



#4181



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



#4181



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#4181



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | I don't know |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

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

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

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do 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 the pay of those people in politics / government, have high net worth companies or households taxed a set fee / percentage once (once they earn over a specific amount) to ensure that lower socio-economic (struggling) families are not being impacted the same as those who are at the top earning brackets.



#4209



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

I strongly believe that Waiheke Island shouldn't be grouped in with the rates increases as our council services are far more limited (& less costly) than those in Auckland.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transport in NZ is a disgrace (compared to other international countries). This not only makes getting around NZ / Auckland incredibly difficult unless you have a vehicle, but also impacts the environment as a large number of single commuters across the city & country.

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

N/A

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

I think arts, parks, sport etc are adequate at present and not a priority. Transport & traffic / road improvements are far more important.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Again, not a priority at present (especially doesn't warrant such vast rate increases over).



#4209



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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 area of Auckland could be so much more appealing & enjoyable for locals (instead of taking up prime real estate with cruise ships). Represent our coastal city much more impactfully like Sydney etc. We could also look to revenue generate in this space with increased F&B, retail and event spaces.

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:

Just ensure that the future of that space is protected and we're not just thinking of short-term gain.

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



#4209



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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4209



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke



#4209



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Road quality, transport & keeping foliage maintained around narrow roads are the KEY priorities on Waiheke. Roads are dreadful / dangerous and causing damage to our homes & vehicles.



#4209



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

As above

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fuel on Waiheke Island MUST COME DOWN! It's daylight robbery.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Environmental protection and restoration

1d. Is there anything else 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:

Cycle ways are an important part of the transport infrastructure programme and stopping our reducing the rollout is short sighted

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

Cycleways

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?



#4228



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?



#4228



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



#4228



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#4228



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Environment, Auckland has an amazing biodiversity but it is also arguably the weediest city in the world.

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



#4250



Less Road restrictions and speed humps, traffic is slow enough with out the added cost

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cost & Common sense by the looks

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

no

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

Speed Humps

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It is a white Elephant

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Cost savings and income generation



#4250



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

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

Tell us here:

Income increases

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



#4250



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4250



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#4250



| | |
|--|------------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The environment of Waiheke is not just an asset of Aucklands citizens but a makor tourism drawcard in income earner for the region

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

Agree

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Increase Cycle lane network

1d. Is there anything else 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?

Cycle lanes

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:

To use resources more efficiently

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#4329



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



#4329



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



#4329



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

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

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. | Very Important |
| Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide. | Very 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?



#4329



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

No

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

Halve AT budget



#4342



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?

No

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

No

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

Other

Tell us why:

Sell 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:

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

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



#4342



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#4342



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



#4342



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#4342



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Reinstating and increasing the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)

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



#4422



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I would like to see the previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways, continued.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Potentially free up funds later for climate impact mitigation work. Climate impacts which may very well lead directly to negative impacts on recreational travel, and therefore on Auckland Airport share value.

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

I don't know



#4422



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#4422



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



#4422



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#4422



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Fast, reliable and frequent bus services. Train timetables are good but some express buses to Onehunga for example on dedicated bus lanes would be good.

More money into improving urban areas in South Auckland.



#4433



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

Only spend money on core services such as water and transport, swimming pools and libraries. Do not spend money on nice to haves such as new stadiums.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cheaper raised crossings if the crossings are necessary. Free public transport for people 21 and under.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Need to look at all Auckland sports centres as a whole.

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



#4433



I'd rather keep receiving the dividend from the port and airport than risk investing in a fund. Money would not necessarily be invested or invested wisely.

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 figures from option 2 don't pan out when compared to other ports. I'm sure there are lots of improvements to be made to Auckland Port with the right people running 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:

4d. Do you have 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:

Those two wharves are needed for increased ferry traffic and ocean liners

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



#4433



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4433



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

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

The charge for food scrap bin is too high. The bins are hopeless as they blow all over the road

Local board priorities

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

Ōrākei, Waiheke

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants. | |
|--|--|



#4433



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.</p> | |
| <p>Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.</p> | |
| <p>Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.</p> | |
| <p>Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).</p> | |
| <p>Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.</p> | |

Tell us why

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

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



#4433



Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

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

Tell us why

I support most priorities

Ōrākei Local Board Priorities

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

Very Important

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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Complete the seismic strengthening of the Remuera Library | Very Important |
| Progress the Meadowbank Community Centre development. | Very Important |
| Assess the reactivation of facilities at Tagalad Reserve and work towards providing access for the community. | Very Important |
| Continue to work with our many community volunteers to eradicate plant and animal pests in our natural environment, including at Pourewa Valley and in our many beautiful parks and urban forests, and support other environmental activities, for example, the Environmental Forum. | Fairly Important |
| Continue local initiatives to enhance neighbourhood connections and increase safety. | Not Important |
| Fund and support local events to showcase our spaces and benefit local residents and businesses. | Not Important |



#4433



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to engage and better support our diverse communities and organisations, such as Auckland East Community Network and Youth of Ōrākei. | Very Important |
| Maintain efforts to monitor and improve water quality in our local waterways. | Not Important |
| Develop options and projects for a community facilities targeted rate for the financial year 2025/2026. | Fairly Important |
| Investigate ways to enhance council facilities in Ellerslie to better meet the needs of the local community. | |

Tell us why

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

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#4433



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Facilities for kids activities are most important and supporting the library

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

Most important is a safe off road cycle/walkway from Onetangi beach to Ostend. It should be easy to improve the existing unsafe and unused track from Waiata Road to Historical village to get bikes and pedestrians off this part of the road.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Support Westhaven as a marina and NOT an area for increasing number of apartments.

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



#4543



Less raised zebra crossings and cycle paths, which only 1% (if that) of the population use. Auckland is never going to be a bicycle city with its hilly streets and dangerous drivers!

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We should ideally only get more population in Auckland as the infrastructure is there to support it. this would of course include education and health.

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

The arts and sports; they are very important to the population's wellbeing. No more stadiums required though. we already have Mt Smart and North Harbour, that don't get fully used.

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

spend less on bureaucrats in Council.

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

a large and important investment as North Harbour stadium should be used frequently for all kinds of 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?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 lease and/or the profits of the lessee must stay within New Zealand though.

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:

If moneys used to fund council services , it only ends up in the large gravy pot.

4d. Do you have 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:

OK to use that land for the public benefit, but certainly not for building apartments.



#4543



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The city still requires a port and the Bledisloe terminal is part of that, however we don't need more cars to sit there endlessly; employ more staff to push them through quicker and simply charge the importers.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4543



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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



#4543



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I don't understand why we need to / should work more with one group of the population than another. We're one people!

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

work with the local communities and cut out all the regulations

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

look to bread and butter issues i.e. look after local sport and forget about big stadia



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

these will not get the trains,buses and ferries running on time

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

No

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

everything

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

current management has got us into this mess

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 just another bad idea to provide work for bureaucrats and consultants



#4717



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:

there is nothing wrong with the present system

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 port thing should be a good little earner

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

Tell us here:

get rid of the staff that dreamed it up

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 money for any development

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4717



Tell us why:

no money to do this

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#4717



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#4717



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

too much money has been wasted on these plans and management plans, after many years have not been finalised. the Tawaipareira playground does not need any more development when we have waited so long for a swimming pool

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

we can not afford these proposed priorities but need better cooperation from the council for existing activities

8. Do you have any other comments?

seeing as the sum allocated has been greatly decreased there is no money to fund this policy



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Waiheke Resources Trust

Local Board: Waiheke

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



#5081



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

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

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

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

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.



#5081



- Lowering emissions by becoming a leader in localised renewable energy generation by enabling local integrated energy solutions to support community owned energy groups.

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

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



#5081



economy, the environment, and public health. Cycling is a low-cost, low-carbon and low-impact mode of transport that can reduce congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. Cycling also promotes daily, incidental physical activity, mental wellbeing and social inclusion. By improving the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of walking and cycling, more people will be encouraged to choose it as a regular means of travel, creating a virtuous cycle of benefits. This approach also creates better use of existing roading assets by making space for those who cannot choose cycling, walking or public transport.

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

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

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

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

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



#5081



Tell us 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?

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

Tell us why:



#5081



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#5081



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

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

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

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

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

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke



#5081



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

Other

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

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



#5081



boards invest a significant amount into support for local community conservation to protect taonga species or landscapes. Efforts like these are important for both nature and communities, enabling and empowering residents to take action for themselves, increasing ownership of our environmental challenges across the community, resulting in more long-term sustainability for conservation activity.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Subsidies on transport

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

Freeze pay increases for admin acc staff



#5137



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:



#5137



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#5137



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



#5137



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

Standard rates in a tier system based on GV.

Local board priorities

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

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#5137



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

University being paid for

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

no



#5366



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?

Tell us here:



#5366



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#5366



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Fixing all the shoddy roads,sealing of any and all unsealed roads especially on Waiheke. Get on with a second harbour crossing,stop taking away public bins,remember if it aint broke dont fix it,e.g.street/road signs why change them just for a different colour?Get onto ferries and make all ferries come under PTOM especially Fullers,make them more affordable with reliability,make them accountable.



#5368



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Lol what a joke its already doing less and less all the time while wasting money on pet projects e.g. the crl! Do less cycleways,do less fixing roads into pedestrian friendly spaces.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport is important if AT wants people out of cars. Dont stop whats half way finished but dont start what you cant finish.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Build a new harbour crossing. Parking spaces need attention. Public community pool for Waiheke.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways,pedestrainising good roads,tearing down parking spaces.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Dont care dont live there but 33 million would be better spent on another harbour crossing.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#5368



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Dont keep all your eggs in one basket,diversy or die,get rid of non profit making waste of time investments. Put money to better use.

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:

More profit less rates is always a winner.

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:

Better investments better returns.

4d. Do you have 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:



#5368



Keep the wharves solely for the purpose of cruise ships,ungrade them to facilitate this for cruise ship parking only.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Dont change what works,Auckland needs a working viable port like this for import/export.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Other |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. | Support |



#5368



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Stop throwing money around willy nilly! Make it more transparent on what its for and make sure none is wasted on overpriced useless consultancy etc. The customer needs value for their rates dollar,stop double and tripling up on fees and charges for nothing,get rid of bureanocratic redtape and mumbo jumbo,keep it clear and simple.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#5368



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Again dont waste money where its not needed,put it to good and reasonable use,spend it where it needs spending. Dont double up on mistakes as has happened in the past and recently,dont always pick the cheapest tender as this leads to shoddy work being don



#5368



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Priorities should include more focus on a subsidised public reliable ferry service that must come under PTOM! Make this happen! Seal all unsealed roads especially the eastern end loop road.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Funded very poorly I might add.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Do whats proposed



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

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Include promotional management

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

No confidence council can Prevent future raiding of a fund.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#5474



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:

Nothing wrong with having a working port in situ just get rid of second hand car imports. Shift them out and tidy the place up.

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:

Regular Income needed

4d. Do you have 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:



#5474



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#5474



| | |
|---|--|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke, Waitematā

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#5474



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Harbour crossing for transportation, not cycles

Delete all bus and cycle lanes

Stop building high-raise pedestrian crossings



#5498



And demolition of all existing ones, starting with Sandringham Road by Eden Park, the simply bring Auckland traffic to a grid lock standstill which in turn lowers productivity and emergency services response times, wait to people start losing lives and people families and insurance companies start seeing the ACQ including the AT, CEO and Mayor

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cut the bureaucrat waste, and red tape, and Just do your jobs, bring back accountability in the this dysfunctional council administration

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Demolish all the current raised pedestrian crossings

Slow down Akld traffic to a gridlock standstill

And emergency services response time

Fewer bus lanes delete AI in the city and suburban bus and cycle lanes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fixing the CBD once and for all, hardened up on the homeless and beggars working our streets (mode are organized crime criminals)

Our CBD I'd a filthy disgrace run by 591 deported crime rings that need to be moved out of our once vibrant cbd

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Bureaucratic non-profit nonsense

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management, Other

Tell us why:

Either fix it,

Privatise it

Or demolish it and sell it to be developed for high-rise apartment dwellings like Dubai has

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Sell all Auckland airport shares

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell it on the provider that there are substantial open to-public walkways and green spaces that include direct access to the Kings Chain waterway (meaning development can't build up to the water table)

Then restore Quay Street back to traffic lanes with oversize pedestrian pathway, no bus or cycle lanes

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 just so get unwisely spent on more nonsense by stupid dull minded bureaucrats with not accountability for their actions

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Build a water front stadium 60-80,000 seater

Demolish Eden park, redevelop Eden park to highrise apartment and green space residential living space (high-rise to be no fewer than 30 story)

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:

Makes sense, however needs to be free-bolded for developers so apartment can be free bolded to make bank finance more user friendly

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 big cruise ships bloke to numerous views

Contest the area move forward to Parnell end or get rid of the defence force In Devonport and



#5498



Make that space into cruise ship births, with medium high rise retail residential and parks

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#5498



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Ban a schoolchildren from using or driving private motor vehicle to and from all school and make it policy that they take public transportation ride cycle or walk!

Ban Hervey vehicle tucks use from all CBD during peak hour traffic periods

Including all CBD motorway areas

Trucks should also be made compulsory to use the left-hand motorway lanes, as our lanes are so narrow and few it's basically just madness when using the motorway that heavy vechel are covering all the lanes including many time auckl buses even though they already have a designated bus lane!!!

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?



#5498



I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

There is no climate change its a worldwide scam

One people one land one rule for all not just Maori

Make the Ferry fee affordable and reliable Fullurs management are out of control

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not enough



#5498



8. Do you have any other comments?

Fix the main road it's a slow uneven 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

Do not reduce library and Citizen Advice services.

Do not reduce money for Community Board spending. Reducing Waiheke Island Community Board funding by 70% is not acceptable. This is reducing it more than to any other Auckland Community Board. We have more expenses.



#5533



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do not need all these Waiheke helicopter landing permits. Keep helicopters for emergency and medical use.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make Waiheke to Auckland Fuller's ferry controlled under Auckland Transport with same funding as rest of Auckland gets. Locals penalised, tourists are prioritised for profit. Waiheke pays same rates as Aucklanders and far more for petrol.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Give grants to make ferry transport Waiheke to Auckland less expensive trips and bigger or more boats. Return it to half hour timetable. Give rival ferry Gold Card status for over 65 free trips.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Need less cycle ways and pedestrian crossings.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Spend less on the stadium. Make it more self funding by charging public more when they use it.



#5533



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 management and ownership of airport and Waterfront as it is . Do not get rid of "the family jewels".

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:

Keep control of the cities assets.

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:

Don't have any faith in proposed Auckland Future Fund.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Do not reduce Auckland Council's shareholding in Port of Auckland or the Airport.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#5533



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Do not trust Auckland Council.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Do not Trust Auckland Council.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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> |



#5533



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#5533



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Listen to decisions from our Community Board as we know what we need. Most officials sitting in an Auckland office do not understand, know , or care that Waiheke Island is very different from Central City Auckland.



#5533



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The 70% reduction in funds to Waiheke Community Board is atrocious and much higher than to any other community board.

8. Do you have any other comments?

We have well informed, qualified, sensible and knowledgeable locals and board members. Questionnaires are sent out but local knowledge is ignored and



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Reduce staff at Auckland Transport. It is ridiculous to have 2-5 "Ambassadors" all grouped together at the same place as happens in CBD all the time. No more raised ped crossings or cycleways



#5602



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I have no trust in Auckland Transport to operate a financially sound business model or one that delivers an ROI. Privatize it

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Include Waiheke under the transport plan. We are either part of Auckland or we are not. Ferry prices are having severe effects on Waiheke residents

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Sell some of the valuable land and invest it into a trust for future maintenance of the property

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#5602



I dont want our major international connection to the world to be owned by overseas investors. If it was to be sold to a NZ entity like the NZ Superannuation Fund though I would support

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Keep the asset in Auckland ownership but let a company that knows what it is doing to run it efficiently

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:

Auckland has a lot of deferred expenditure. A total lack of financial planning has left a council that should be asset rich a pauper - dont stuff it up again

4d. Do you have 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:



#5602



Open up our waterfront.

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:

Open up our waterfront. We dont need a used car yard on our harbour

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#5602



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#5602



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

On Waiheke we pay way more in rates than we receive back in services. Stop doing stupidly over-priced constructions such as the pedestrian path along the inlet. AND BAN DOUBLE DECKER BUSES which destroy our roads and vegetation!

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Mostly irrelevant. Islanders know what the islanders need but all we get is bureaucrats writing endless proposals. It will be too expensive for all but the mega rich to live on Waiheke in 10 years at the rate our rates are charged anyway



#5602



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

De-carbonization of the ferry fleet. It is the single highest contributor to GHG emissions in the Waiheke local board area, and making these ferries electric will have the greatest impact on achieving the local climate action plan

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#5717



less new roading projects, instead focussing on development near existing assets

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?

making the ferries electric

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:

sell it and the use the money more effectively elsewhere. as long as community playing fields are kept north harbour rugby can find somewhere else to live

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

tentatively proceed. it appears that the council would benefit overall, but its not a great a payoff as I would have expected

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#5717



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#5717



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#5717



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#5717



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?



#5769



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I object to the proposal to charge for Park and Ride carparks on the presumption that people should be catching a feeder bus to the bus station. Currently there are no or very limited bus services north of the Albany Bus station for commuters living in the semi rural areas such as Albany Heights, Coatesville and Dairy Flat.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Maintaining the roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways

Speedbumps

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

North Harbour residents should have the control back. Before it was integrated into the Greater Auckland control it was making a profit. It was also an entertainment venue with many major acts such as Cher, The Who, Fleetwood Mac and even an opera. With the Northern Busway there are great transport links to the city. It is a disgrace that management have let it get to the state it is in. All the money seems to have been spent on venues south of the Harbour Bridge at the expense of Northern rate payers

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#5769



Tell us why:

We have already sold most of our airport shares. Auckland needs to have some presence on the board to make sure things are done in the best interest of Aucklanders not for overseas owners

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:

Ports of Auckland must stay in local control. Large international companies that own ports will not put our city first. We only need to look at how NZ is treated by the shipping companies as a warning.

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 council needs money today

4d. Do you have 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.



#5769



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#5769



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Other |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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



#5769



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. | 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 was unable to find P110 on your long term plan document. Maintaining library services in Albany is important as it is extremely well used.

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Couldnt find P128 but North Harbour stadium should be a priority.

Maintaining parks and green spaces.

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



#5769



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?

I put I dont know because there are no details about the land that could be for sale.

Also I do not know enough about the targeted rate option. Are other areas in Auckland paying targeted rates for their Library services?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I could comment if I could find P110.I have downloaded the Long Term Plan and it only goes to P77



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| 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?



#5925



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

the raised pedestrian crossings in general dont work, they slow up emergency response vehicles, damage vehicle running gear, case drivers to speed up between humps, increases fuel consumption.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

east west link road is a must to smooth up commuting to and from most work places in auckland

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

speed bumps, bus lanes were there is next to no buses, for example great south road bus lane is hardly ever used by buses but 50% of the roading for general use has been removed.

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:

once it is sold it is gone forever, the council should keep revenue streams for future generations



#5925



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:

as long as this land stays in auckland rate payers ownership and does not get transferred to lwi or other interest groups

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



#5925



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#5925



| | |
|---|--------------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Ōrākei, Waiheke

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants. | |
| Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme. | |



#5925



| | |
|---|--|
| Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models. | |
| Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum. | |
| Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative). | |
| Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?



#5925



Tell us why

I support most priorities

Ōrākei Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōrākei in 2024/2025?

Not Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Complete the seismic strengthening of the Remuera Library | Fairly Important |
| Progress the Meadowbank Community Centre development. | Not Important |
| Assess the reactivation of facilities at Tagalad Reserve and work towards providing access for the community. | Very Important |
| Continue to work with our many community volunteers to eradicate plant and animal pests in our natural environment, including at Pourewa Valley and in our many beautiful parks and urban forests, and support other environmental activities, for example, the Environmental Forum. | Very Important |
| Continue local initiatives to enhance neighbourhood connections and increase safety. | Not Important |
| Fund and support local events to showcase our spaces and benefit local residents and businesses. | Not Important |
| Continue to engage and better support our diverse communities and organisations, such as Auckland East Community Network and Youth of Ōrākei. | Fairly Important |



#5925



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Maintain efforts to monitor and improve water quality in our local waterways. | Not Important |
| Develop options and projects for a community facilities targeted rate for the financial year 2025/2026. | Fairly Important |
| Investigate ways to enhance council facilities in Ellerslie to better meet the needs of the local community. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Ōrākei proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#5925



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 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?

BECOME MORE EFFECIENT

GET STAFF BACK INTO THE OFFICE, AS ANYONE i KNOW wft (FOR cOUNCIL) IS AT BEST DOING 50% OF A JOB



#6011



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

GET BACK TO BEING A COUNCIL AND PROVIDING ESSENTIAL COUNCIL SERVICES, I.E. YOU ARE NOT A PROVIDER OF HOUSING, OR A SPONSOR TO COMMERCIAL EVENTS, I.E. CONCERTS I UNDERSTAND THAT THEY BRING MONEY INTO THE CITY BUT THEY ALSO MAKE THE PROMOTER A LOT OF MONEY, AND ITS NOT LIKE AC IS GETTING A CUT.

IF YOU WANT TO MAKE MORE MONEY FOR COUNCIL CHANGE THE LAW TO ALLOW 50 WEEKENDS OF EVENTS AT EDEN PARK JOB DONE

COUNCILS JOB IS TO PROVIDE ROADS, STORMWATER, LIBRARIES, ART GALLERIES MUSEUMS, PARKS AND POOLS, COLLECT RUBBISH ETC GET BACK TO YOU KNITTING BECAUSE AT PRESENT THE PLACE IS FALLING APART. AT PRESENT COUNCIL IS NOT DOING A GOOD JOB OF ANYTHING, AND THE MAYOR IS DEFLECTING HIS LACK OF PERFORMANCE ON TO OTHERS

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO BE USED IT NEEDS TO BE CHEAP, RELIABLE, AND FREQUENT. SADLEY AUCKLAND TRANSPORTS EFFORTS ARE AN ABJECT FAILURE, AS IT IS NONE OF THOSE. IF AT BELIEVE THAT THE CRL WILL SOLVE THE ISSUE, THEN THEY ARE MISTAKEN

BUS LANES ARE A JOKE, BUSES DONT USE THEM

DYNAMIC LANES ARE A WONDERFUL IDEA

TM (AND NZTA) IS A JOKE A.T. HAVE LANES CLOSED OFF FOR MONTHS WITH NO ONE WORKING IN THEM, I.E. QUAY ST

RAISED PED CROSSING DO NOTHING TO SLOW TRAFFIC, THEY ONLY DAMAGE BUSES, TRUCKS, AND FIRE ENGINES

CYCLEWAYS (IM A CYCLIST) DONT USE THEM IN THE MOST PART AS THEY ARE UNSAFE, ROUGH, FULL OF TRAFFIC SIGNS AND UNMAINTAINED (I.E. THEY GET LEFT WITH ALL OF THE DEBRIS FROM THE ROADS AND REMAIN UNSWEPT, AND THEN YOU GET SAM AND SUE WALKING HAND IN HAND OR AUNTY BARBARA ON A SUNDAY DORDLE WHEN ITS TUESDAY



#6011



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

DYNAMIC LANES

ENFORCEMENT OF CLEARWAYS

STRATEGIC CYCLEWAYS

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

PED CROSSINGS PARTICULARLY THE RAISED ONES ON WHICH I WOULD SPEND NOTHING

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)?

Other

Tell us why:

NO ISSUE WITH THE FUND, BUT WHY THE OBSESSION WITH SELLING THE AIAL SHARES OR THE POAL

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



#6011



Tell us here:

THE POAL JUST NEEDS GOOD MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNENCE, AND THE LAST GM WAS A DISASTER, AND THE BOARD DID NOT HOLD HIM OR THEM SELVES TO ACCOUNT.

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 POAL IS AN INCOME STREAM USE IT FOR WHAT IT IS

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

PORT LAND SHOULD STAY WITH POAL. TRANSFERING TO AC WOULD JUST SEE IT EITHER BE DIVESTED TO IWI OR SOLD IN A POORLY STRUCTURED DEAL AKA THE OLD COUNCIL BUILDINGS

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

TRANSFERING TO AC SO THEY CAN BE SOLD WILL BE A DISASTER LOOK BEHIND THE PORT TO SEE WHAT YOU WILL GET, AUCKLAND DEVELOPERS ARE NOT LIKE THOSE IN SYDNEY OR MELBORNE. ALTERNATIVELY LOOK AT PRINCESS WHALF A NICE BUILDING QUICKLY ROTTING AWAY

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other



#6011



Tell us why:

NEED TO UNDERSTAND WHAT AC WOULD DO WITH IT IN 15 YEARS, BUT POAL CAN NOT BE CONSTRAINED BY LACK OF SPACE, EFFECTIVELY DEVOLVING THE PORT TO MARSDEN THAT HAS NEITHER THE RAIL OR ROAD CAPICITY TO TAKE THE TRANSPORT OF GOODS FROM THE PORT.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#6011



| | |
|---|---------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#6011



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

THE LOCAL BOARD IS ***** BENT ON BUILDING MORE ASSETS BUT FAILING TO MAINTAIN THE EXISTING. THEY HAVE JUST COMPLETED A CYCLEWAY TO THE SOUTH OF THE CAUSEWAY, AND THE ONE ON THE NORTH BUILT 5 YEARS AGO IS FALLING APART. GO FIGURE YOU CANT USE THE C

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

SUPPORT

local organisations to develop a community swimming pool

implement effective flood control, proactive stormwater maintenance and necessary capital investment



#6011



receive funding for fairer public transport ferry fares

8. Do you have any other comments?

BECOME MORE EFFICIENT

CUT WASTE

GET BACK TO CORE SERVICES AND STOP COMPLETING WITH CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE THESE 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else 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?

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 oppose the proposal to lease the operation of the port for 35 years for the following reasons:

Disregards Expert Advice: The proposal ignores expert advice on the port's unsustainable location, as evidenced by the conclusions of the last three port studies.

Hidden costs: Locking the port into its current location until at least 2060 will impose billions of dollars of road and rail costs on future generations as freight flows increasingly strain our already congested transport network.



#6174



Long-term Impact: Prolonging the status quo until at least 2060 will prevent Auckland from realising the significant social, economic, and environmental potential we could achieve by transforming the industrial port zone into a thriving urban environment, as we've done with Viaduct Harbour and Wynyard Quarter.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that



#6174



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |



#6174



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#6289



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#6289



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#6289



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |



#6289



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do 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?

Core Services, like rubbish and recycling, roads, core infrastructure

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#6334



anything not listed previously - arts, sports, recreation services should be user pays, likewise major events.

Council support is too vague for me to support. What is the return on investment and benefits?

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?

Fixing potholes and slips - we have had a main road in our neighbourhood down to a single lane for over a year, and potholes are damaging our cars.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways! they are a total waste of money as cyclists typically use the road anyway!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Sell it, or put it to some other use. Auckland doesn't need another stadium - especially not 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)?

Proceed with the proposal



#6334



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

If this would result in rate cuts I am in favour; if it results in more pet project that result in no net benefit to ratpayers then I am against

4d. Do you have 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:

Depends what you would do with the land, but it does seem that shifting this area to something other than Port Operations would improve the city centre

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#6334



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing | I don't know |



#6334



| | |
|---|--------------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#6334



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | I don't know |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?

Roads and stormwater on Waiheke Island

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#6340



Look at efficiencies in the system, e.g. building a house has become such a complex and costly process. Strip out unnecessary things that only serve bureaucracy.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The public transport is not user friendly, where do I find the right bus stops? What route is the bus taking, where exactly are they stopping? The AT app is clunky. Try going from the ferry terminal to Ponsonby, there's nothing fast or convenient. Stop adding and fix the basics first

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The payment is easy, that's not the core issue

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

A council doesn't need to manage nor own a stadium. Look at Europe, the clubs all own the 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)?

Other

Tell us why:



#6340



Sell non core assets, such as the 11%. The shareholding doesn't give Council a say anyway, rather free the assets to not increase rates.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Move the port, sell the land and use this money for a proper City development. There is no other city in the world that has a port that close to the CBD and Council owns the most expensive piece of real estate. What a waste of money.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

See above

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Again, Council should not become an Asset Management Company

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:



#6340



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | I don't know |



#6340



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

In general I was shocked to read that Waiheke contributes about \$30m in rates and In return it was proposed to cut our local budget from \$2.1m to 900k. What does Waiheke get, we have severe stormwater issues, roads with a million potholes and get millions of tourist. But Council manages to ignore the issues we have here year after year. You can't continue to milk the population here and use funds only for the City. Rate increases lead to long-term residents no longer being able to afford to live in their homes as incomes are significantly

Lower. Think of a new tax system that doesn't harm these people, tax businesses.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#6340



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As stated earlier, let's keep our rates for projects on the island and we would solve a lot of problems.



#6340



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

No.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

1. Pay fewer bureaucrats. In fact fire MOST of the bureacracy.



#6445



2. Stop contracting out to private contractors. Contracting out public works is a recipe for corruption and inefficiency. Hire your own and tell them exactly what to do and by when. Prioritise efficiency and low cost.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't use public transport. I therefore object to paying for it.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Control the Fullers ferry company. Institute a council owned ferry service to and from Waiheke Island, which operates once an hour, with relatively large boats and govt paid seniors prices.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Stop sending huge buses which nobody uses and which wreck the roads to Rocky Bay (Omiha) every half hour. Go back to the old system of smaller buses that specifically operate to meet a council run hourly ferry service. If Fullers want to operate ferries half hourly, that's their problem. Don't waste public money on servicing this timetable with buses paid for by Auckland Council.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I have never used this stadium. Therefore I object to paying for 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)?



#6445



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

1. WE OWN THE AIRPORT SHARES. How dare you force their sale.
2. The "climate crisis" is a scam. Investigate the geoengineering of recent rainfall events.
3. Don't issue permits for building in flood prone areas.

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 don't know what the "Auckland Future Fund" is and therefore don't trust it. In fact I don't trust anything unnamed bureaucrats decide for the "future" of Auckland. TOURISM IS NOT OUR FUTURE. Waiheke in particular should not be treated solely as a "tourist destination". Personally I would like Waiheke to secede from Auckland Council. How dare unnamed bureaucrats based in downtown Auckland decide what should be done on Waiheke.

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 THINK THE "AUCKLAND FUTURE FUND" SHOULD BE SCRAPPED. Stick to your knitting. Provide basic services to the current population. Don't import more people to NZ and then cram them into high rise buildings in the downtown area. Look at what is happening to New York and San Francisco. WAKE UP and ditch the globalist agenda.



#6445



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Scrap all globalist-oriented changes, including the Future Fund. Local Auckland councils should never have been amalgamated into a SuperCity. The SuperCity has been and will continue to be a disaster. Auckland is NOT a super city. It's a series of local communities.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

I DON'T want "new public spaces and/or new waterfront residential or commercial developments." This is just a recipe for the enrichment of "the elite".

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

As above. Stop grabbing our public assets and transferring them to private use.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#6445



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Do not support |



#6445



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Water Quality Targeted Rate is too vague for me to comment on. Since I live on Waiheke I catch my own water on the roof, which is fine by me. I haven't drunk Auckland water in years and am happy not to have to because as I recall it was terrible. I support in general the monitoring of Hauraki Gulf water quality, but there's not enough information here for me to comment on specifics

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | I don't know |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#6445



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | I don't know |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

1. Re Council core services, the transfer of these from the Ostend Service Centre to the Library has been a disaster. Librarians are well trained to be librarians -- they should not have been forcibly "retrained" to provide totally inferior service on co

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Sorry, I don't have time to read about the ten year budget. In the perhaps unlikely event that you do ANYTHING AT ALL about my comments on the priorities for the next year, I will reconsider that at the next available opportunity.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am not aware that Council Controlled Organisations HAVE any accountability. I wish they did.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

expand regional and/or local park and open space facilities

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#6687



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

effective transport, especially public transport, essential for a livable city. Completion of a properly joined-up cycling network will provide options for users that will potentially take pressure off roads. Continue with prioritizing pedestrians over cars in high areas with lots of people/areas where adding more and more cars not sensible.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

infrastructure to provide options for reduced car use

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:

just got to figure a way 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?



#6687



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#6687



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |



#6687



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#6687



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

seems very wishy-washy

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Programs to install renewable energy sources for home and transport. Programs to stop the degradation of our harbour and gulf, and the oceans around us.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#6807



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Some of the proposals would help the current problems, but the nugget is getting more people out of their cars and onto public.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Getting more electric public transport, and supporting smaller electric vehicle use in the CBD. Incentivise public transport, lower cost initiatives. Removing the fuel tax effectively did the opposit.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:

Shorter term to profitability for council and good purpose for public benefit

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Too much cost to set up elsewhere.



#6807



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#6807



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#6807



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | I don't know |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good, with a focus on reducing pollution, carbon emissions, handling tourism and housing... and most of all protecting our oceans, creating the Hakaimango marine reserve.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The best idea for bringing in funding into Auckland council in my opinion, and I don't see any downside to it... is to license and register all recreational boats. The fees would not be insignificant, and the resulting identification on the bow and stern of every craft would enhance safety and bring in more funding when regulation results in fines. It's high time for this. We have to register our cars, and pass a test to learn the rules of the road. Why are the rules of the sea not just as important, especially in this time of degrading ocean environment. In a country with one of the largest populations of recreation boating, it is amazing that this hasn't been enforced, not only as a safety precaution, but also as a funding source. Please take a look at 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: Waiheke

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?

I would like AC to continue to progressively and consistently invest in soft transport options - walking, cycling and public transport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#6834



Yes be less finicky about 'AC' approved contractors for local work - this is a very expensive and frustrating procedure on Waiheke Island.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Too much emphasis on private care ownership.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Libraries, community facilities, soft transport, public transport, green ways, environmental education, wetland restoration, climate change infrastructure

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

expensive wages/salaries of top AC employees.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't live in that area or no anything about that facility

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't know enough about this comment



#6834



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?

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

Support



#6834



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#6834



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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 support the Central Proposal for “Fairer Funding” in the LTP, which will reinstate Waiheke’s budgets to current levels from July 2025.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#6834



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

My understanding is that there is a significant proposed cut to the WLB budget which will hugely impact on our communities ability to maintain and improve our public facilities. This includes our arts hub - Artworks which includes but does not exclusively cover the library. I disagree with such severe budget cuts.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop building cycle ways and bus lanes



#6855



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

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:



#6855



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



#6855



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#6855



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#6855



| | |
|--|---------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Most are not a priority

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Some could be cut as not a priority

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

More understanding of how to run the city for less money

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Charge a single person only once in your rates for all rubbish collections.



#6939



Explain why people with 1 rubbish bin pay 2x for collection.

Council already doing less so why people have to pay more?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make public transport reliable

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rail connection from Pununui to the airport. Will need only a few km of extension

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle way

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?



#6939



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:

Reduce rates

4d. Do you have 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:

If the council start operations there it will be yet another disaster, most likely will transfer it for cycleway



#6939



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#6939



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#6939



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Not spending \$450,000.00 for bumps will help with the council's budget



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Train to Auckland Airport. Bring Fullers under AT so cheaper ferry for Waiheke Islanders.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Rubbish collection. Bins should have a barcode ie. Use less, pay less. User pays.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

National Government should not be taking Auckland fuel tax income.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Rubbish collection.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It would be good to keep 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:

Keep the airport, sell the port!



#7055



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

It is money for nothing ie. The port will still be there.

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 will leave that to the experts.

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:

Auckland waterfront is crappy compared to others like Wellington. Put a port up north so they can benefit.



#7055



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 above.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#7055



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#7055



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Most of these are good enough now.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Getting Fullers under AT. Capping tourists.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

dont know

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



less endless roadworks

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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:



#7123



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#7123



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Support |



#7123



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#7123



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#7180



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways are good to stop people being, ya know, killed.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

maybe not more, but SOME: cycle ways.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Not a venue I even remember exists, let alone use.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

sell down and lose income seams... silly.

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:

would be nice if cruise ships can use it, mostly to stop the delays to the ferries

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?



#7180



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7180



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#7180



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Given how much Waiheke contributes to rates, why do we get a massive cut in funding???



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Don't do it if you don't have money

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Gardens, parks, road construction, free meals in schools,



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Waste of time and money

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Don't do anything, just keep the status quo. If you don't have money, don't waste time and money.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Selling it to a private person won't waste your time.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#7250



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

City council is a waste of 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:

4d. Do you have 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:

Stop messing around

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?



#7250



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7250



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Why should the money for public services be taken from people who own property?
Don't people who don't own property also enjoy public services?! It's so unfair!

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waitematā

Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road. | |
| Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works. | |



#7250



| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| 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. | |
| Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans. | |
| Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitemātā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitemātā 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 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?

Health system

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

It seems like we pay more and more and we get less and less.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Health system

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public sector salaries.

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:



#7313



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:

It seems like we pay more and more and we get less and less.

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



#7313



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#7313



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Not Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#7313



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

It seems like we pay more and more and we get less and less.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

More cutbacks of unnessesary staff like communications and "cultural" BS

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7383



Stop wasting money on trying to Maorise New Zealand. This is just a racist agenda driven by a desire to gain advantage on the basis of race - it has no place in a modern society.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stop using preferred suppliers that have grown fat on guaranteed work without competition - Downers just subcontract anyway and make huge profits from ratepayers. Stop putting in traffic lights, they make junctions less safe and hold up traffic.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

A review of council salaries for people working in a safe government job with no competition of commercial risk. Council staff should be paid much less for this security.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Staff - with little effort, it would be possible to reduce council staff by 50% and in some areas much more. Nobody wanted Maori signs everywhere and Maori announcements, this is a racist political agenda and has nothing to do with providing better service for lower cost. This just ponders to radicals.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It is very underutilized. If it were private they would make it PAY.



#7383



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Is this yet another way for Iwi to get more public money ? It looks like it.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Please make sure this is not just another iwi takeover plan as is happening all over Auckland.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

"Auckland Futures" is likely to be gobbled up by vested interests, not those who represent ratepayers.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance makes sense because insurers are currently charging Aucklanders to fund riskier places in New Zealand. Auckland Council do not need to do that.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#7383



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. | Do not support |



#7383



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

How about cutting back on non essential staff in council like removing a couple of layers of middle management and drastically removing the number if managers earning over 200,000 per annum.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#7383



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

The local board are entirely unnessesary and could be replaced with a phone app. We waste millions on just funding personal agendas and their mates projects like "pest free waiheke" that has spent years NOT killing rats but instead driving around in signwr



#7383



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Get rid of the local board

8. Do you have any other comments?

Get rid of local boards



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

I strongly OPPOSE the 70% cut to the Waiheke Local Board’s budget for capital spend from 1 July this year for three years. Capital is the money we invest in our long-term permanent assets like our tracks, facilities, and playgrounds. The board’s capital budget fixed in the last long-term plan was to be \$8.42 million for the next three years. It is proposed to cut that to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years (a 70% cut).



#7420



Waiheke has the biggest % cut of all 21 local boards. Some have no cuts next year. Spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch up maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks will be seriously impacted. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up enormously. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, or repair and replace. Ratepayers of the Waiheke Local Board area paid approx. \$27 million (excl. GST) this financial year.

1d. Is there anything else 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:

As a Waiheke resident, I OPPOSE any proposed cut to GOLD AT HOP hours of use. We have no other transport option available if we need to go into the 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?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#7420



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#7420



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |



#7420



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |



#7420



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Fairly Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

A proposed cut to GOLD AT HOP hours of use would severely impact Waiheke seniors.

A 70% cut to the Waiheke Local Board’s budget for capital spend from 1 July this year for three years. Capital is the money we invest in our long-term permanent assets like our tracks, facilities, and playgrounds. The board’s capital budget fixed in the last long-term plan was to be \$8.42 million for the next three years. It is proposed to cut that to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years (a 70% cut). Waiheke has the biggest % cut of all 21 local boards. Some have no cuts next year. Spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch up maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks will be seriously impacted. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up enormously. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, or repair and replace. Ratepayers of the Waiheke Local Board area paid approx. \$27 million (excl. GST) this financial year. That’s just for one year.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke is unfairly impacted by "mainland" practices and policies.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Housing!!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Big sports events

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?

Electric ferries, free buses for workers and school kids

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

not important

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#7471



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

I don't know



#7471



| | |
|---|---------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |



#7471



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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 bike paths continuous and follow the example of how they get preferred Right of Way at intersections like in Paris now or have been in The Netherlands which makes biking safe for all ages. Today's bike paths are too scary for most people as they end periodically so you have to suddenly depend on the goodwill of motorists to not be killed. Connecting up existing bikeways should take priority over new ones.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#7471



| | |
|--|----------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke's most pressing problem is housing for workers. We can't even staff our medical centre because doctors and nurses can't find anywhere to live and the ferry is costly and unreliable.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As above. Add Housing.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Use of consultants and external contractors. Grand ideas, based on international comparisons, that are over-ambitious for the size of our population.



#7542



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The only future for the city is to be largely car-free. The sooner we embrace that idea the better.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

This is a feeble attempt to divert money from capital investments to paying for gross inefficiencies and over-ambition in the Council. It is not a solution, it is the problem. I strongly disagree.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#7542



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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#7542



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7542



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7542



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

The LTP fails to address the core problem which is that the Supercity is a failure. It hasn't delivered as promised and, as many of us argued at the time, has led to huge problems of a centralised bureaucracy out of touch with local communities. We are not given a vote on it and we don't want it. The only Long Term Plan I am interested in is one that reviews the Supercity and devolves power to local communities, which can come up with cheaper and more integrated solutions. Your LTP fails to address this core issue.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Find a solution to the Caulerpa invasion

1d. Is there anything else 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?

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:

AIAL should continue to be owned as once sold, returns will be to the new owner.

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



#7547



Tell us here:

Once the Port operation is leased, revenue goes to the lessee. Secondly, there is/was a long term plan to move port operations from downtown. This would not be possible once the operation was leased. Future decisions would be prevented by short term thinking.

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:

See above.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Not used much in the container age.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I think the idea of a sunken sports arena is really dumb in a sea level rise era.



#7547



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7547



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7547



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think the 70% reduction in allocation of Waiheke board funding is unfair and ridiculous.

8. Do you have any other comments?

See above.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

No more raised pedestrian crossings and no more bus ways. Long term rail is imperative as per Melbourne. Buses are not a long term solution with increasing population.



#7571



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Temporary traffic management makes moving around the city impossible, it has become a joke, so many cones and stop start functions. We have become the nana city of the world with all this so called protection.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Footpaths on Waiheke Island is a priority

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Traffic Management big time

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Have no idea about this

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#7571



The fund will be confused and it will become a huge fund of money administered by people who may have other ideas on it's future. Keep it as it is.

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:

Any lease will take away any council initiatives for the wharf areas. Long term many current wharf operations could / should be moved to northland.

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:

Forget the future fund

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Unsure why the development of the commuter ferries has happened next to a cruise ship berthage, when ever a ship comes to port it severely disrupts the commuter ferries.

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.



#7571



Tell us why:

Having imported cars / trucks etc on the these wharves is crazy, they should go into northland ports. These existing ports should be freed up for general public and move the cruise ship berth away from Princess wharf.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Bledisloe is a critical wharf for Auckland with much existing infrastructure that would be impossible to relocate. Keep it as it is.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |



#7571



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#7571



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

With budget cuts the LB needs to concentrate on priorities not "nice to have" Ideals. Core council services are critical plus more footpaths.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#7571



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Spending on efficient public transport to make it a viable option for most. I am in favour of a congestion charge for the city centre.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7576



Less short term cosmetic repairs and focus on long term efficient changes to infrastructure.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support the use of dynamic traffic flow and increased use of bus lanes to encourage more public transport patronage.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Busways and investing in congestion charge infrastructure.

I am concerned that in the pay less option that the use of the gold card would be restricted during afternoon peak periods of 3pm - 6.30pm. Firstly, this is a long window of exclusion and a period of 4pm-6pm would be more appropriate. The other concern directly relates to the Waiheke ferry. For all other areas if the city, people have the option to use rail/bus where the cost of having to pay during peak periods is affordable for most. However, for the Waiheke residents no option exists so having to pay is very expensive for many and impacts peoples ability to attend medical and other critical appts. If these elderly people cannot afford the ferry fare there is a chance they would have to wait up to 4 hours on an inhospitable wharf to return home which is too long for our elderly residents.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No. Transport is vital for a thriving city.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:



#7576



I am not directly affected by the stadium, but although I would support community groups keeping access to use it there is probably better more economic usage plans for 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I have very mixed feelings about selling all the airport shares as I feel we still need to have some involvement and as the airport grow it would be a good long term investment. I am supportive of an investment fund to help generate substantial funds both for ongoing projects and to build a buffer for emergency funding.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 this is a good balance of retaining ownership of the valuable land, but divesting the running of the port to the private sector.

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?



#7576



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 wharves are right in the heart of the city centre and using them for public benefit would enhance the whole feeling of the area to ensure we are creating a great public face similar the the waterfront in Sydney CBD.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Although in theory I like the idea of transferring it to be used for something else, I do not like the fact that this would increase heavy good vehicles. Of course, if we could ensure the good were transported by rail rather than road I would be more supportive.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount | Do not support |



#7576



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#7576



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |



#7576



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Very Important

Tell us why

Waiheke is a unique environment within Auckland city, and unlike Aotea it is close enough to be considered a suburb. Often referred to as the Jewel in the Gulf, it is vital we protect the environment that make it special whilst ensuring it is a welcoming

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I broadly support them.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Investment into a surface light rail rapid transit network starting with a route from the City Centre to Mt Roskill, and then further expansion to Onehunga, Māngere and other transport corridors such as the North-Western and Northern corridor. Any busway development along the North-Western corridor should be future-proofed for surface



#7586



light rail upgrades. Consistent work over the last decade, reflected in Auckland Transports Auckland Rapid Transit Pathway 2023 report, has shown that to effectively address Auckland's congestion issues we cannot rely solely on a bus network. The busiest bus corridors in our city are already reaching capacity, and the long-term plan should reflect that reality. A surface light rail network would provide opportunities for growth, development, and productivity in the city. I believe this should be included in the "Auckland Deal" with central government. I urge Auckland Council and the Mayor to make the development of a surface light rail network, starting with the City Centre to Mt Roskill line, a priority in such a deal.

1d. Is there anything else 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:

This plan it does not include investment and commitment to a surface light rail rapid transit network. Any work on a busway in the North-Western corridor should be future proofed for surface light rail and there should be commitment to surface light rail along the City Centre to Mangere corridor, starting with a City Centre to Mt Roskill line. I worry without this we will not be able to address Auckland's congestion issues as projected growth in these corridors would require higher capacity transport modes such as surface light rail.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I want to see Auckland Council spending more to develop a surface light rail network, with a City Centre to Mt Roskill line constructed as a priority. From this stage I would support expansion of surface light rail, such as what is proposed in Auckland Transports Auckland Rapid Transit Pathway 2023 report. The line should be expanded to Onehunga and Mangere, and eventually to other transport corridors such as the North-Western or Northern corridors, upgrading any busway infrastructure. Staging the development of the network in this way ensures it remains affordable for Aucklanders and is practical to build.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



#7586



The 3pm-6:30pm travel concession for super gold card holders should be financed by the government, not the City Council. Gold card holders nationwide have access to this subsidy, so a nationwide agency should pay for it instead of just Auckland ratepayers. No other region has this exemption implemented as the gold card system was intended to keep peak hour services for those who need it most.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us 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:



#7586



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |



#7586



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#7586



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#7586



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The proposal to have a \$50 a week AT public transport fare cap should be extended to the Waiheke ferry service, not only the inner harbour ferries.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Waiheke Island roads are in need of repair and we need more footpaths.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7587



Building wildly expensive speed mitigation structures on the roads on Waiheke Island. Donald Brice roundabout could have been handled far cheaper with asphalt speed bumps as are throughout Surfdale. Also what is with all the expensive concrete crossings up by Waiheke College?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Wwe use public transport all the time - any improvements are welcome.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

If Auckland Council has an unlimited ability to borrow and the return on owning AIAL is always more than the cost of borrowing - retain the investment.

Rates must be kept as low as possible!!



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

If Auckland Council has an unlimited ability to borrow and the return on owning POAI is always more than the cost of borrowing - retain the investment.

Rates must be kept as low 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:

Rates must be kept 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.

Tell us why:

Better returns - Lease to Hotels or Apartment high rises (rates income also).

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#7587



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Better returns - Lease to Hotels or Apartment high rises (rates income also).

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | Do not support |



#7587



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#7587



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

cycle ways



#7592



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

stop putting money into facilities that are making no difference to the overall plans

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

only cycle ways

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:



#7592



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#7592



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Support |



#7592



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#7592



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

do not the recognise the whole community
 whole community

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 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 question about transport (do more do less) is badly formulated: Council should do less for roads and a lot more for bikes, pedestrians and public transport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Spend less money on consultants and on an overblown administration

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Emphasis has to be on getting away from individual cars as transport. Every decision has to be judged against the climate change crisis.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public Transport and getting people out of cars.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Don't sell public land

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

No indication that Council is looking after money well. If Council would have the ability to think and act longterm, we wouldn't be in this mess now.

4d. Do you have 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?



#7607



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7607



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7607



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Why are those priorities not shown here in this questionnaire

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke Local Board has done a wonderful job



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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 funding for Local Boards.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Funding rock concerts.



#7613



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 and Ports of Auckland shares should be kept in public ownership.

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



#7613



Tell us 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:

WE need the cash now.

4d. Do you have 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:

There is presently nowhere to berth for small craft from the Gulf islands and visiting yachts that is close to downtown Auckland.

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



#7613



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#7613



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#7613



| | |
|--|------------------|
| | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?



#7619



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#7619



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#7619



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#7619



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#7619



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else 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?

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:



#7638



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#7638



| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of | Support |



#7638



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#7638



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



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:



#7641



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#7641



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#7641



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#7641



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Marine conservation of our big blue backyard. Making the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park a true protected area - just like national parks on the land

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Less of Drongo Brown

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Please do more to make public transport better safe more reliable. Make the Waiheke Ferry part of the public transport network - this for commuter who do not clog the roads

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Electric buses

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Drongo Brown

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Sport is an important part of any city's culture

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#7656



It just commons sense to hold onto valuable 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:

It's important for us to control our own 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:

Makes sense

4d. Do you have 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 more waterside public space

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#7656



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#7656



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.</p> | <p>Very Important</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#7656



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

All good an necessary work

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Major priorities: Marine conservation and ridding the island of cats

8. Do you have any other comments?

Keep up the good work. But let's be much bolder with environmental campaigns. Let's get serious about predator free. Let's get that NW Waiheke Marine Reserve done



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Arts, libraries, public swimming pool on Waiheke

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Sports grounds golf courses more roads

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

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:

Little idea of what the shore needs

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I don't believe in selling a good returning investment to pay ongoing costs

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#7682



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 should be more open to the public and less of a parking lot for cargo. Cruise ships make ferry travel awkward... get real the harbour is our front yard, not the back shed

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 believe in the Auckland future fund, a political catch phrase

4d. Do you have 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:

You try to use the ferries when there are cruise ships in port and you won't need to ask

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



#7682



Tell us why:

Look at wellingtons waterfront , why can't we have that ?

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#7682



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#7682



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not enough said about other islands ie Rakino and others that should be covered. I pay rates on both of these islands

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Don't 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:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#7700



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#7700



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Support |



#7700



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#7700



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

Fewer rubbish collections, don't need weekly. Pay more if you need more rubbish picked up.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Put speed levels in most areas back to what they were, except keep them low through shopping areas, near schools etc.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less on cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Make it better and that will increase the use. Seating inadequate.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Develop the city waterfront area further, keep port in city. A port is often the centre of many great cities.



#7715



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Sounds like the best financial 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:

Use the money to keep rates lower

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

I think the public transport around Auckland is really good. The people who moan are often those who don't use it.

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:

A thriving port is so good for the city.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#7715



Tell us why:

Cruise ships are great for the city.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#7715



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#7715



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

The island needs to continue improving roads and footpaths and recreational areas. The visitors to the island as well as residents need to be safe walking and riding.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Roading, parks, improving weed control.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Marine parks i.e. no fishing areas

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Fewer new roads



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support public transport initiatives, road improvements not so much

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Bringing the Waiheke ferry under the PTOM

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Any new 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:

Keep all assets

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#7716



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:

Keep all assets

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?



#7716



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7716



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7716



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Community cohesion and environmental safeguarding are most important to me.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Affordable housing is another issue - we are relying on teenagers and visitors to look after the tourism industry and they are competing with local families for very scare accommodation. Ferries to be under the PTOM. Stormwater and roading works consider local vegetation and effects of runoff. Plan looks fairly good if a bit non-specific. Dark sky only realistic eastern end, Auckland lights affect the rest. Would prefer more emphasis on extending footpaths than cycle lanes which don't get used because of their unsafe gravel surfaces. Marine reserve should be priority.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Council should either refuse to accept the devolution of responsibilities from Central Government and actively oppose this unless the Government makes rates tax free (including GST)

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7733



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Extend bus lanes and widen their use to allow taxis and other public service vehicle to use them. Allow car use in unrestricted lanes to find its own balance.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Council administration costs.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management,Other

Tell us why:

Put ownership and operation in private or charitable trust hands.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

A good idea.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#7733



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Use this area for Cruise ship operations and free the Queens Wharf basin for ferry operations alone. Better public transport

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 need to open up more sea facing space,

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



#7733



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Other |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#7733



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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 live on Waiheke and currently manage my own environmental situation and do not support targetted rates that duplicate what I am doing for my own block.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#7733



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Decisions should not be race based. We have 600 Argentinians on the island, do they fit into mana whenua or mataawaka?

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

don't give enough flexibility

8. Do you have any other comments?

Reduce AT and other CCO's operational funding by 10% per year and let them determine priorities within 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#7746



I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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?



#7746



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#7746



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |



#7746



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#7746



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Concern at the proposed restriction on the hours of use of Gold Card for Waiheke residents. There is no alternative cheap transport for such things as hospital/ medical appointments which mostly occur out with the proposed restricted hours

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#7753



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | I don't know |



#7753



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#7753



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#7753



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do 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?

Put on more fun events that people want, rather than the Council think people should have

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Constantly assessing and changing speed limits.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#7759



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:

Tourism - the place is currently revolting

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#7759



| | |
|---|--------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#7759



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#7759



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?

Introduce a city peak time congestion charge

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7827



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?

Include the Auckland Fullers Waiheke ferry service into the LTMA

City wide infrastructure - sewerage, water, gas, electricity, fibre networks

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle ways that aren't used and nanny state Council projects

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



#7827



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#7827



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#7827



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#7827



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I do not support the proposal to cut the Gold Card hours of use .I is already unavailable before 9am and this is a further unnecessary and discriminatory reduction which will yield very little increased profits

2a. Is there anything you 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:

land is needed for more important 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:

AIAL is an important strategic asset which should be in public ownership

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#7844



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 keep public control of this asset

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?



#7844



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7844



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7844



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

the most pressing need on Waiheke is developing safe roads namely improving the surface and widening many roads

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

The proposed reduction of \$2.5million to the Waiheke Local Board budget is egregious .It amounts to 70% cut which s far greater than in sustainable and far greater than other local boards.It is unjustifiable



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#7871



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I would like to see us investing more in cycle ways, not reducing the amount

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

See above

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 have views on this

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#7871



Tell us 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:

I think the public should have access to these wharves. At the moment they are fenced off from us and are used to park vehicle imports.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I believe we should have a properly functioning port in Auckland

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#7871



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#7871



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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 am a big supporter of the NETR.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7871



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke's environment, being close to the coast is very fragile. We should do everything we can to protect and enhance it.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Generally in favour

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Fix the fast declining state of the Hauraki Gulf and stand up to the parties wishing to continue to exploit it at the cost of the natural resources there that are under serious threat.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Perhaps less cultural events and let those groups that wish to provide such events look at how they are funded and seek more private investment.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Maybe reduce gold card travel between 4.30 & 7. 3pm is really before commuter rush time and would limit the ability for Waihekeans to get into town and back for appointments.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#7873



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

To open up the Auckland waterfront as has been happening at the Viaduct and beyond

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Concerned about keeping the viability of the port and the costs involved being far greater.

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



#7873



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#7873



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#7873



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke Island is unique and its environment needs to be protected and not just destroyed by over development wanted by outside influence. We are not just another suburb of Auckland and wish to keep our character which is why visitors want to come here (

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think the funding for the environmental issues is grossly underfunded. Not sure what Governance Funding covers (is that wages etc?) or outside consultants to advise? Not convinced a flying fox at Tawaipareira is that needed and funds possible best spent elsewhere. Having had a daughter go through pony club and the experiences and life skills it taught her and many others preserving equestrian facilities on the island is important. Are there savings to be made by combining the Pony Club and adult riding. Dont believe the Golf club should be allowed to take over the adult riding land.

How can Auckland Council help in sorting the Ngati Paoa settlement as the perceived ongoing battle between the Tust Board and Iwi Trust continues to delay the effectiveness on consultations of third parties with Ngati Paoa and leads to many frustrations in getting things done.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Strongly support giving the Local Board more input into decisions affecting the Island, autonomy on decision making and funding and involving less Auckand bureaucracy/cost. On the planning front Waiheke is not just a suburb of Auckland and blanket policies conceived in Auckland are not appropriate eg number of helipads, (Waiheke now has 63 consented and a ridiculous number of non essential helicopters



#7873



buzzing overhead!)allowance of subdivision of rural sections eg on Te Whau. Enable local input in planning decisions more.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

More funding for eradication of caulerpa than the \$200000 proposed

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7874



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?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#7874



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#7874



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#7874



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#7874



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Cutting Council capital funding to Waiheke by 70% to \$2.5m when the Island ratepayers contribute around \$27m per annum is manifestly unfair. Such a cut will result in a downgrading in important amenities on the Island such as parks and tracks.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

The eradication of caulerpa from Waiheke, Great Barrier and our inner harbour.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less unnecessary speed bumps.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support your synopsis points above. I haven't read the full transport plan.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised pedestrian crossings.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't live on the north shore so won't comment on this.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 makes sense.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#7875



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

I think the port should ultimately be moved out of the city.

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:



#7875



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#7875



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7875



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think it is an absolute disgrace. We receive very little services on Waiheke and you are cutting our funding 70%. The island pays 27million in rates annually and you are proposing to spend 2.5million over 3 years. 833k a year i.e. 3% of what we pay you! Waiheke generates taxes through the many international visitors who come daily, yet the infrastructure to support this is zero. The new Island Direct ferry should be allowed to take Gold Card passengers so this will reduce traffic on the over crowded Fullers ferry. But the single most important thing for the future of Waiheke and our harbour is the invasive caulapa weed which needs to be dealt with URGENTLY. This will destroy all our fish stocks and have knock on effects on the environment and economy. We also need to maintain our walkways, roads (with increased tourism traffic) and beaches. Onetangi beach at the eastern end also requires urgent attention. The gambion rock wall needs repairing and fresh sand needs to be moved in to support this wall. Then the planting of sand dune plants to preserve this end of the beach will be more successful as you can see from the western end of the beach. Planting there has been occurring for many years with good results.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

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?



#7887



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#7887



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#7887



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |



#7887



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Networked cycleways

1d. Is there anything else 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:

Cycleways should also remain a priority

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Networked 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

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#7895



Tell us 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 | |
|---|--|



#7895



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,</p> | |



#7895



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Tear it down and build some affordable housing - put the money saved towards an increase in investment in the Waiheke Local Board's funding so that it more fairly reflects the rates paid by Waiheke 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)?

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:



#7901



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



#7901



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#7901



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#7901



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke Local Board funding should be increased to more fairly reflect the level of rates paid by Waiheke residents, as well as its 'Jewel in the AKL Tourism Crown' status...



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#7912



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I would like to see better network utilization of busses on Waiheke as it is incredible how many "Not in service" busses I see. I am disappointed that some planned cycle lanes may not proceed

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I have never been to the North Harbour Stadium and not likely to ever visit so I am not really qualified to comment

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

This is a very complex question which I am not really qualified to answer

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



#7912



Tell us 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:

Keep Bledisloe Wharf as is until, or if a better use for this area arises.

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



#7912



| | |
|---|--------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#7912



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#7912



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I agree with most of the proposals

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

Devolve more to local boards who are proven to use the funding better the central Council . In particular give a fairer share to Waiheke Local Board to reflect the size of Waiheke’s rates take.

Not reduce the Gold Card travelling times.



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Employ less people pushing paper in the Council Office

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

All the objectives bed sound pretty good to me

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Nothing

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Nothing

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It's a white elephant at the moment

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#7959



The creation of a fund to create an income stream to reduce rates seems an excellent idea.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 sale of the lease would generate a better return from the Auckland Future Fund keeping rates down

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:

Anything to keep rates down to the rate of inflation

4d. Do you have 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?



#7959



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#7959



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#7959



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think that the reduction in funding is far greater than other local boards and does not reflect the large amount that the Council receives from Waiheke rates and the large amount of Council expenditure that has no benefit to people living on Waiheke

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

improvements aligned with the Central Rail Link like the Karanga-a-hape station improvements project, which includes a protected cycleway along part of Pitt street, a pedestrian mall in Mercury Lane, and could include improvements for Canada Street



#7963



The Making Space for Water programme's inclusion of "blue-green corridors". These are walking and cycling paths through greenspaces and alongside streams, adding to our walking, cycling network while also creating a natural drainage area.

recreational cycling facilities where people can safely grow their confidence on a bike

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Wider roads, and speed increases

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I definitively do not support stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways. All the opposite.

Wanting increased investment in cycling infrastructure and maintenance. Investing in cycling has benefit-cost ratios of anywhere from 10:1 up to 25:1

Support for more raised pedestrian crossings and increased maintenance of our footpaths

Support for "Dig Once": aligning delivery of transport projects with delivery of other infrastructure such as water improvements, to reduce costs and disruption overall.

That Auckland Transport could leverage road renewals and maintenance for quick fixes that make streets safer for walking and cycling every time a road is repaired, repaired or repainted.

Support for multi-modal trips: such as the proposed \$50 weekly cap for public transport, bikes on buses, more investment in train services, and whether or not you support light rail

Let Auckland Council know you want them to advocate to Central Government and Waka Kotahi for a lane on the existing Harbour Bridge to be reallocated for walking, cycling, and wheeling.

The UN for Environment recommends 20% of our transport budgets are towards walking and cycling but Auckland Transport typically allocates under 1% of our transport budget on cycling – note how we are massively underinvesting!



#7963



Auckland Council's commitment to the Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways! Safe cycle infrastructure, accessible for all kinds of bikes, that get people where they want to go. More end-of-ride facilities for all kinds of bikes, more repair stations along key routes, and better, more regular maintenance of pathways throughout the city. The sooner this stuff is in the ground, the better off our city will be.

A safe, connected cycle network can be delivered fast and affordably by reallocating road space and using pop up protection like concrete or rubber separators

More safer speeds (30km/hr) for residential areas, around schools, and through town centres, with traffic calming and raised pedestrian crossings so that everyone can get to where they are going safely

Low traffic neighbourhoods or using modal filters (stuff like planter boxes and bollards which prevent cars coming through into a neighbourhood from a main road, but allow for bikes and pedestrians) as a fast and affordable way to make safer streets and empower people to walk, cycle and wheel for their trips

A 24/7 lane on the harbour bridge gives people the freedom to make their own reliable journeys, free of traffic, and independent of public transport constraints.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Spend less on road widening for projects, and instead reallocate road space for delivery of walking, cycling, and public transport networks, creating an overall more efficient, affordable, and climate conscious transport network

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

if it used, then keep it as it is... oithewise do houses



#7963



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

is future proof investment

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Invest in Housing and charge rent

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:

Otherwise, money will have to come from rates

4d. Do you have 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.



#7963



Tell us why:

Invest in Housing and charge rent. now is only used to park cars

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:

Do it soon not in 15 years... is only used to park cars

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#7963



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke



#7963



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Charging tourists to come to Waiheke



#7963



and use part of entry fee, for more funding for cycling infrastructure... around 200
tourist a day come to cycle the island every day from november to march

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7985



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 and safe cycleways.

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:

I disagree with selling off public assets or reducing stakes in these especially when pressures and use of these is going to increase significantly.

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



#7985



Tell us here:

As above I disagree with selling public assets when pressures and use of these is going to increase significantly. The port is a critical asset for Auckland as a maritime city.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 believe keeping Auckland's ports as functional assets, is essential for the long term resilience of the city. Reliance on land transport alone and removing functional land has potential to make the city very vulnerable especially in times of natural di

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#7985



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#7985



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7985



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Fund more local halls on Waiheke. Also a walkable pathway around Te Whau Wharetana Bay. Put the rubbish bins back.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7986



Stop translating everything into Maori. You changed all the bins to PARA

Rubbish then you took the bins away what a waist of money. Signage leave in English stop translating it all into Maori would save a heap on signage.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

stop some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Keeping the gold card holders for all travel to and from Waiheke. Regulate the fares to and from Waiheke they are too expensive at present. A direct and decent bus service to the airport would be great

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:



#7986



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?

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?



#7986



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#7986



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#7986



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

we need better roads, better drainage, less trees cutting our power off all the time.
better accessible tracks around Te Whau to public spaces. Please put our rubbish bins back.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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 is poor in Auckland compared with overseas cities of our size. This should be a priority.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#7988



Council should stop being a cash cow for highly-paid consultants and a bloated city bureaucracy. Lots of saving to be had here if anyone had the guts for it.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transport policy should tilt away from catering for car traffic. With few exceptions the so-called road improvements have only served to displace the problems from one point to another. Alternatives to private cars must be prioritised.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Finish the City Rail Link -- that's exactly the wrong project to cut. Also, instead of chopping back the Gold Card free travel times, this programme should be expanded to include young people and those on a benefit.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Transport consultants. In general the city has been pretty good at hiring private companies to get projects done. We should specify what we want done and let the companies get on with it for an agreed price. No consultants needed.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Sports in general have become less and less about sport and more and more about making money. Stadiums should therefore pay their own way and not be a leech on Council expenditures. If you're hot to sell public assets, sell that one. Then the best you can do for North Shore Stadium is to stay out of their way -- i.e. no contributions and no bureaucratic hurdles either.



#7988



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Council's holdings in the airport and port are themselves good investments with very long term prospects. Sacrificing excellent long-term investments for short-term gain is always a bad investment policy, and calling that a "Future Fund" is just plain dishonest.

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:

Switching from a dividend to a lease is short-term thinking in that it provides an immediate cash fillip while reducing Council income from the ports for the remaining 34 years of the lease. It's just kicking the can down the road.

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 I say, I don't trust the whole notion of a "Future Fund". The best investment for the future that we could make would be to retain our port and airport shares and the dividends thereof. Both are fast-growing businesses; don't sell them short.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?



#7988



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | Support |



#7988



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#7988



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

In general the local boards around Auckland are more efficient than the central bureaucracy at ensuring that projects are actually beneficial to the community they serve. For that reason funding for local boards is the last thing you should chop. Also,



#7988



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support them all because local boards are where Auckland's governance is best (or should I say least bad).

8. Do you have any other comments?

What I worry about most with the proposed new budget is the gutting of the most effective and worthy services that Council provides at a local level, such as rodent control (part of the Natural Environment Targeted Rate) and inorganic waste collection. These should be supported directly from rates because their benefits are immediate, whereas infrastructure investments (like public transport) should be funded from debt as their benefits are long-term. That, and not the slashing of Council services, should be the way to keep rates under control.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Yes, protecting the environment. More ecological reserves in the Hauraki gulf

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#8019



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No mention is made of electric bus implementation or of an electric light rail network both of which would be of benefit.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Both of the initiatives mentioned above

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 do not live on the north shore so the stadium means nothing to me. Please ask the local residents what they want

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 council does not need to own shares in the airport in order to manage it. It can regulate it through legislation & regulations.



#8019



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Move the port to Whangarei & lease the land along the waterfront to developers so the business risk is diversified and still own the 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:

With climate change down the track we are going to need those set aside funds.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance makes sense as the city has a broad risk profile. Should consult some experts on this.

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 the land is leased to developers, there should be no loss of income and maybe even an increase



#8019



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | Support |



#8019



| | |
|---|---------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#8019



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

We desperately require a world class all weather multipurpose Stadium (that is not Eden Park) to attract great events to our city and encourage activation of central downtown.



#8030



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less urban sprawl - the city needs to intensify up as opposed to spreading out.

Create boundaries & city limits.

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?

Development of a world class integrated public transport system.

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:

Focus on a world class central city multipurpose stadium opposed to more city fringe development which is killing downtown.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#8030



Auckland Council needs to continue to own shares in the airport to have a considerable "say" in the future development of one of our cities biggest assets.

Its no different to saying lets sell off all of our cities property assets and invest the money into a fund - where does it stop.

Auckland's ratepayers need to "own" our cities assets to retain control.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Retain owner ship of the port land and wharfs & lease back to the port but also lease the land to a developer to build an International stadium on the waterfront - in return for leasing development rights to building residential & commercial on part of the 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:

Proceed with the transfer of ownership of the land as I would love to see our waterfront developed to benefit the people of the city including an international multipurpose stadium, plus residential or commercial development



#8030



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 above - Proceed with the transfer of ownership of the land as I would love to see our waterfront developed to benefit the people of the city including an international multipurpose stadium, plus residential or commercial development

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8030



| | |
|---|--------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I dont have a problem with increasing rates as long as I can see beneficial improvements to the environment.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#8030



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Restoring our native fauna and flora are incredibly important.

Pest & weed eradication should be very high on the agenda.



#8030



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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 all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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?

Tell us here:



#8037



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need 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 |



#8037



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#8037



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

I understand that you are proposing to cut the budget to the Waiheke Local Board. I do not understand how you can carry out your proposals with a reduced budget. Waiheke is a major tourist destination and it is important that the tracks and public are



#8037



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

PLEASE do not cut Waiheke funding by 70% as proposed. It would change from becoming the jewel of Auckland to a backwater.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Support affordable housing with fast track building permits. Safer cycle ways and footpaths are urgently needed in many areas, especially Waiheke Island, where I live.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8058



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I totally oppose cuts to planned cycle ways and safer pedestrian crossings. Its really important to enable children to cycle to school safely and this should be a transport priority

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle ways, pedestrian crossings (even basic footpaths are required on Waiheke).

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:

Better value for money

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I think Auckland needs to retain its interest in this important and lucrative transport hub. The AFF isn't going to solve Auckland's finance woes. The government needs to accept its role.



#8058



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Leaving the port where it is and not fixing its transport issues is impossible.

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:

Bledisloe Wharf is valuable for vehicle imports, extra space for cruise ships and cargo. Cruise ships currently often block commuter ferries.



#8058



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#8058



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#8058



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

These are all important - although you have missed out 'progressing affordable housing' - by a supportive approach to building permits by charities, and other attempts to deal with an urgent crisis.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It is proposed to cut Waiheke Local Board's budget for capital spend to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years (a 70% cut). That is unfair, given our rates contribution.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke has the biggest % cut of all 21 local boards. Some have no cuts next year. As our board chair points out, spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch up maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks will be seriously impacted.

It is proposed to cut the local board's capital budget to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years. The ratepayers of the Waiheke Local Board area paid approx. \$27 million (excl. GST) this financial year. These cuts are grotesque.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | Do less |
| 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?

Maintain or improve major infrastructure like libraries, swimming pools, parks etc.

Do NOT reduce amenities like libraries, swimming pools, parks etc



#8095



Ensure all decisions have given thought - AND made changes - that recognize the disabled, e.g. easy access to transport and plenty of seating stops en route (these could be sponsored by local businesses). For example changes in the CBD especially Queen St itself, have made access much slower and harder unless one is a scooter user!

More opportunities for citizens to invest in Pub/Priv partnership for funding e.g. bonds.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Funding "entertainment" - whether facilities or actual activities.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Removing road access reduces disability access by making it harder and slower - e.g. different heights - slowing buses, making taxis very expensive and private cars carrying the disabled either illegal or virtually impossible to use as there are so few stopping or parking spots for people to help get their 'client' to the required venue.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:



#8095



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Instead of selling, BUY/INVEST MORE in key infrastructure such as:

Transport hubs whether land (rail, bus, parking), ports, ferries, airport.

Land-banking - especially larger tracts - for future use as recreational centers, shopping, commercial, industrial precincts.

Avoid CCOrgs - Council has insufficient control over them.

Future proofing is a fundamental core business for the city BUT doing the work NOW is more cost effective than saving per se.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

As above. Akl has a bad habit of selling for \$5 then having to buy for \$9. This is particularly true of giving or selling off near impossible to find larger areas of land etc e.g. free harbour for private marinas, rail and road depots to be broken up into small lots for private commercial or residential developments and later being forced to accumulate large areas at many times the hassle and expense for the larger projects it didn't have the vision or money to do at the time.

Surely those large areas could be leased for industrial or commercial purposes in the interim rather than merely lying idle and rotting.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other



#8095



Tell us here:

As above. I agree with future fund but not at the loss or diminishing of the present

4d. Do you have 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:

NOT for residential commercial development.

Yes if it is retained for the development of future ferry or other port/maritime infrastructure such as cruise or other shipping (sailing?)use further from the inner city transport hub.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

As above. Make money out of it while still owning it.

If PoAKI needs it for use, and can give you a return greater than any of the other previous comments, then let them keep using it. Empty and grafitted is the last choice.

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



#8095



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#8095



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#8095



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

BUT - A year-round usable swimming pool for education, rehabilitation competition and entertainment is possibly my TOP priority.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do 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?

Don't support any of the proposal



#8117



Tell us why:

Auckland is a main economic engine for the whole country, Big ticket items like transportation, and water infrastructure should be the responsibility of the central government!! Off loading these enormously expensive items onto the rate payer is both short sighted and inappropriate. Inner city renewal should be left to the private sector using ACC planning guidelines.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Transition to Gas-less vehicles on Hauraki Gulf islands. Reducing speed limits on our outer islands to 25 to support electric golf carts to safely navigate narrow roads. Support smaller electric jitney buses on island roads. Increase capacity for cycle lanes on outer islands.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Councillors per diems and consultant fees. Large events in the inner city. Marketing budgets for development projects.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

North Shore has received priority for too long. What about the western districts? Funding the Te Atatu Marae would go a long way to improve unity and cohesion among our community while especially supporting positive youth development.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#8117



Tell us why:

The suggestion of a charitable? trust sounds interesting. But more information needs to be made. Trading shares on the stock market for an airport sounds ludicrous. What would happen during a pandemic? Go bankrupt?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Seems the port could be the answer to the funding gap in the short term.

Although, I have to wonder how did Auckland get itself into such a deficit situation in the first place? Has there been an audit of where our deficit and lack of funds has occurred? I

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 goods and services that come through the port benefit the region, therefore the region should benefit from the profits.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

As a senior citizen property owner on Waiheke Island I have been subject to the outrageous APTR rating overlay for using our place for casual holiday rental. We do NOT make a profit from this activity after we pay all our property expenses. This extra bed tax rate will generate a large amount of funding for ACC marketing and development activities.



#8117



Why then is Waiheke receiving a 75% reduction in local council funding??! This is totally unfair. Local councils are close to the needs of residents and these funds are greatly needed for local project not funded by Auckland.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

We do NOT need a huge fancy waterfront arena for these sites. Why do you continue to try and draw large crowds into central Auckland when the bad traffic planning of the past has created extreme bottlenecks? These think big projects do not help the avera

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Until we find another location for cargo ships, this is the only viable terminal for cruise ships.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8117



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Other |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8117



Recycling, drainage and sewerage projects require Central Government funding. 50-year Finance bonds from Central Government where revenue from user fees are dedicated to the bonds repayments should be floated on the financial market. Generational neglect in our infrastructure improvements has led us to this regional crisis.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#8117



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We have a very diligent local board who listens to its residents. These priorities reflect the residents needs, and are not dreamed up in an isolated backroom.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

What are you budget people smoking? Why a 75% budget reduction for Waiheke local board? Waiheke is Auckland's tourism cash cow. Give us some respect.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fairer funding for Waiheke Island!

Auckland amalgamation was sold as an idea that economies of scale could greatly reduce the cost of doing business and get local projects funded more quickly. From my humble perch, it appears the faceless bureaucrats have aligned with big business to plan vanity projects like big expensive football stadiums while our less glamorous but vital infrastructure decays and fails. Lack of investment in community building like youth development activities has led to spikes in crime by disaffected youth. Small businesses which contribute greatly to the economy could benefit from more investment.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#8126



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Pedestrians and Cyclists are an important part of transport. ??? who else is moving around the city? cars don't drive by themselves. People need to get from point a to point b -SAFELY by incorporating walkways, cycle ways, crossings etc. Please put people back into transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

People. Safety. Public transport - make it affordable for people. Do like other international cities, make one ride one fare ie \$2 to get on. Don't penalize people because they live far away from work.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cars.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Once the land is gone, its gone. Keep the precinct for future use and the future generations.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#8126



Auckland should have influence over its own international travel hub. There is more at stake than just money.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 must control its own assets for the benefit of the future generations. a lease would provide necessary income or cash injection. It could also provide savings by eliminating operational costs, providing auckland council to focus on delivering core services. Just make sure the lease benefits auckland and not the lease holders. (as we have experienced with Fullers Ferry Service and Port Fees). Please have good people involved in the negotiations and no corruption please. Or backhanders or whatever mess we were left with Fullers....

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

I think a combination of funding services and investment into the auckland future fund would help provide for the 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?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#8126



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#8126



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities



#8126



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Core infrastructure is important to waiheke as a major tourist destination. ie roads, water management, etc. Waiheke is not like any other suburb. we have a large transient population, non-resident owners of property, huge influx of visitors, poor public

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It appears that Auckland Council forgot to provide funding to Waiheke Island. How will council deliver on its promises with \$889,000 while other local boards receive \$5 million etc.????? Nice plan but Waiheke is being left out in the cold. WHY? we must



#8126



be making money off the marina and the ferry terminal, etc where has our money gone??? Is there corruption at Auckland Council? or unfair bias?

8. Do you have any other comments?

the local board funding policy is not right. Waiheke has been placed at a disadvantage. We are not a 'normal' suburb of Auckland. Our population of residents of 9,000, fluctuates to over 50,000 to 60,000. Please take this into consideration. Services and Infrastructure are used not only by residents but by international visitors. ie rubbish, public toilets, walking tracks etc. double deckers, electric buses too heavy for the road and causing the road to break up. etc etc.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 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?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8131



cut the bureaucracy and get rid of this mayor and connect with the people and local communities

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

all of this is paperwork and little action

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

council offices

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

they were doing well before council took over the management

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#8131



let the experts get on with the job of running the port and airport and get rid of those who came up with this ridiculous idea

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:

nothing wrong with the existing system

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 operation is working well so what are you trying to fix?

4d. Do you have 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 money to make these changes

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#8131



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

no need to make any change

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Other |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing | Support |



#8131



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

the council fails to work with the local communities and should look to all local community needs

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#8131



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

council should concentrate on core services and let the community deal with the Climate Action plan. It is disgraceful that these management plans have not yet been sorted and enough has already been spent on the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. The mana

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

these are unacheivable as there are no funds available



#8131



8. Do you have any other comments?

council should be getting on with its "bread and butter" jobs and show more care for the people who will be unable to pay rates increases in the present financial climate. It would be interesting to see how much of the present rates have not been paid because any increase will see this number rise



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

To really keep making Auckland 'beautiful, thriving and safe' and not slide backward.

Fairer allocation of money to areas like Waiheke and Aotea which bring money into the Council coffers and gets far too little in return in comparison to other areas.



#8158



The proposed cut of 70% to the Waiheke local board budget is just outrageous and will see the deterioration of amenities and dangerous degradation of walking tracks etc. This will also mean a lot more needing to be spent in future years - a false economy.

I want wiser spending of our money - too much is wasted on projects not done properly and having to be redone etc.

Tighter restrictions on building quality and responsibility on developers to avoid the huge costs of eg leaky homes - later flooding problems

More emphasis on dealing with climate change and forward thinking - bouncing in the same sport will just cost us much more later.

Developers to be responsible for contributing to usable green spaces around multiunit buildings. Kids need grassed areas to play in - not just concrete parking and a few flower beds. Important for their health.

Transport - definitely a greater emphasis on public transport (How about a free Just try it week to get car users to give public transport a go).

I think debt is a necessary evil at this point in time.

The Pay more option would need to recognise the increased hardship for many from higher rates and offer rate relief to those who need it.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

avoid wasting money. Make the whole institution more efficient.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Car users need to be really encouraged to give public transport a go - We can't be continuing the crazy nose-to-tail one person occupant we see every weekday on our motorways. The Northern bus lane is fabulous. A bus only lane over the harbour bridge in peak times would help and surely could be organised quickly- this could also take bike shuttles.

Waiheke Island needs urgent attention re ferry services and costs.



#8158



There should be no changes to the hours the concessions can be used (only the retirees have this). We are dependent on city hospital facilities. - a close-out period for concessions would see ill people (cancer patients etc) having to wait for long periods in poor facilities on the wharf if they cannot get back to the wharf by eg 3pm and cannot afford to pay the high fares.

The ferry charges to Waiheke need to be brought under AT as per the rest of the city (we are part of the city!) and be equitable.

We need transport to be much more environment focused with more bikeways and emphasis on safety for bikers and pedestrians.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Yes increasing public transport and safety measures for all of the people of the city

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads

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 northern areas need a stadium but it does need to be used more. None of the green areas should be sold - it is increasingly important that we maintain and increase the green areas we have as our population increases - and the North is surely one of the areas which will see increased population growth and need for amenities. A different management model would seem to be the way to go. Public transport works well for this stadium at the present time.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#8158



Tell us why:

I have little confidence in the ability of such a fund to deliver the benefits outlined. There is no security in such an arrangement as we have seen and are seeing in the present time. We need to retain our assets - selling them is a one off benefit and they are gone. The rest of Auckland Airport should not be sold - it's a critical asset for the city and we need to maintain influence over it.

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:

It's a critical asset for Auckland. The idea of leasing the operation for 35 years with possibly the ability to renew the lease could be problematic, eg with the impact of environmental change (just one aspect). The council need to keep control of how the ports are handled. There does need to be change - using so much for car parking is ridiculous - Aucklanders need to be able to use much more of that waterfront - as Wellingtonians can. I don't want to see the establishment of an 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?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

see above

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#8158



Forget about the Future Fund

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 space should be used for public benefit - not commercial or residential - think future environmental problems

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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> |



#8158



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | 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?

Refuse collection should be user-pays - or there is no incentive for people to take more care with recycling thus more pressure on our environment.

We need to be spending more on recycling.



#8158



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |



#8158



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Very Important

Tell us why

I would really like to know how these priorities will fare with the enormous cuts to budgets the Council is proposing to deliver to Waiheke. We need fairer funding allocations now or the facilities we do have will deteriorate. Not maintaining tracks, play

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Many of the priorities need urgent attention - ie housing, equitable transport costs , flood control. Most of all a much fairer allocation of funding for Waiheke and Aotea both of which stand to loose a huge chunk of their present funding. That needs adjustment now.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8161



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I'm in favour of increasing cycle paths

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle paths

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



#8161



Tell us here:

I'm happy with how the port. Is now

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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

Support



#8161



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#8161



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Please do not change the gold card ferry subsidy

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#8161



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Please do not change the gold card subsidies



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?



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:

Broader use across more community groups

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#8173



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:

Greater good to regenerate urban use of auckland cbd

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |
|---|----------------|



#8173



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8173



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#8173



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Climate is a priority. Community use and development of shared spaces is key.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We need to ensure that the local events can continue to deliver to foster the community spirit on Waiheke - so many are now lost to red tape. The Onetangi Beach races, the Wharf to Wharf run, the Food and Wine Festival - all are key parts of a great community that no longer run due to heavy overheads and tight central council compliance expectations.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Strongly object to the reduction in local council fees - by 70% - given the amount of rates paid by the community (\$27m), with a budget of \$2.5m that severely restricts what the local community can do to make Waiheke a great place for the locals who pay the rates, and for the tourism that we rely on so heavily. This is a significant drop, and far greater than all other boards - this is a very poor and unbalanced outcome.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#8177



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The general principle of maintaining the rate of developing and maintainance of transport is good, particularly increasing the fleet of electric buses and improving public transport. Moving to electric ferries is also important for climate action as is devlopment of cycle friendly networks which should not be cut. Hence I lean towards a 'o more' scenario rather than the central proposal. Keeeing the evening peaktime AT Gold card use free is important to make it meaningful for older people who often have appointments (eg medical) in the city which mean they cannot leave before 3.00pm

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Electric or hydrogen powered ferries, cycling and pedestrian facilities.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is,Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It is a valuable facility, demolishing it would be short sighted but it needs better management and finding new revenue generating 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#8177



The past performance of Auckland Airport may not be indicative of its future performance and value. Whilst air travel is not solely what AIAL is about it is a fundamental element and the negative climate impacts of air travel and freight are likely to detract from the business in the future. It is therefore preferable that Council has more flexibility in investing the funds currently tied up in AIAL 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:

The port is too important in the long term to the city to lose control of its operation, albeit that its profitability needs to be sharpened up.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Funding council services will moderate rates increases so is a good general direction but a fund should also be initiated from the profits and dividends to enable future reconfiguration of the port operation..

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Plans to reduce the use of some of the wharves to free up land for other uses are premature and would require unnecessary expenditure eg for upgrading Bledisloe Wharf as a requirement, unless these can be funded from income derived from the port.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#8177



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

As above expenditure in transferring the two wharves to Council is not justified at present.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The efficient functioning of the port and flexibility is the primary consideration now and into the future, funding for alternative public uses is unlikely to be available, justified, or a priority.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | Support |



#8177



| | |
|---|----------------|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke



#8177



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Core services environmental initiatives and climate action are critical to the island's future. The latter two also leverage community voluntary work so achieve benefits not only physically but also socially as they make for a more cohesive community.



#8177



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Support

8. Do you have any other comments?

The proposed future funding policy is a sound idea with Waiheke receiving 2% of the funds available. That is because whilst our population is relatively small we have a high proportion of assets to maintain which are used by our part time residents and visitors, the majority of which are Auckland residents. Waiheke also has a high rates contribution relative to its population.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#8180



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

do not support any action adversely affecting cycleways

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Do not trust the alternatives

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

For god's sake leave the council's airport shareholding (ie the public's stake) ALONE!

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



#8180



Tell us here:

It's the least undesirable 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:

as above

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

long-term, it is inevitable:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#8180



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#8180



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#8180



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

because I live here

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | |
| 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?

Fairer funding for local boards

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8200



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I agree with key points of the plan. Getting around Auckland is key to both good living conditions and commerce. There have been sustainable gains in public transport over the past decade, we need to keep improving PT while also maintaining roads & other infrastructure.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making level crossings safer.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The proposed budget of \$33m over 10 years should be redirected to Local Board's for capital expenditure to protect and repair assets, and for climate change resilience. This is a ridiculous budget for an under utilised 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)?

Other

Tell us why:



#8200



The concept of a future fund has merit, but I'm not convinced the proposal will deliver what is expected/hoped.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

I am astounded that the Waiheke Local Board funding is to be cut by 70%.

1. Waiheke Island is a "jewel in the crown" for tourism to/in Auckland, including cruise ship visitors; visitors for SOTG & Walking Festivals; visiting celebrities & sports stars;
2. Waiheke ratepayers have paid c. \$27m to Auckland Council in the past financial year but the proposal is to cut Waiheke Local Board's funding by the biggest % of all Local Boards. Assuming no change (!) to rates Council would receive c \$81m over the next 3 years, but only "invest" 2.5m back into the community.
3. Waiheke infrastructure (ie: public toilets, walking tracks, roads, parks) will be under maintained, degraded and probably lost under the current proposal. The current funding proposal is unconscionable.

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



#8200



Tell us why:

Auckland is NZ's biggest city and should have a full working port to support the growing city without relying on the road network to get goods/supplies/emergency support to the supercity.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by | Do not support |



#8200



| | |
|---|----------------|
| businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Waiheke Local Board funding is to be cut because of the "smaller population size" but without regard to the contribution Waiheke ratepayers make through rates payments or to the significant impact of visitors/tourists/day trippers to Auckland's "Jewel in the crown". Waiheke ratepayers have paid c. \$27m to Auckland Council in the past financial year but the proposal is to fund Waiheke with a budget of \$2.5m over three years. Assuming no change (!) to rates Council would receive c \$81m over the next 3 years, but only "invest" 2.5m back into the community. 3. Waiheke infrastructure isn't just used by the c9,000 residents, but by more than 50,000 visitors each year. The current funding proposal is unconscionable.



#8200



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#8200



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke Local Board funding is to be cut because of the "smaller population size" but without regard to the contribution Waiheke ratepayers make through rates payments or to the significant impact of visitors/tourists/day trippers to Auckland's "Jewel in the crown". Waiheke ratepayers have paid c. \$27m to Auckland Council in the past financial year but the proposal is to fund Waiheke with a budget of \$2.5m over three years. Assuming no change (!) to rates Council would receive c \$81m over the next 3 years, but only "invest" 2.5m back into the community. 3. Waiheke infrastructure isn't just used by the c9,000 residents, but by more than 50,000 visitors each year. The current funding proposal is unconscionable.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transport has to be a priority for a city the size of Auckland. However there often seems to be wastage for instance repairs to potholes that fail after only a couple of years.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Sometimes doing things on the cheap is false economy. We need to be sure the money is well spent and that whatever is built/done will last a reasonable time.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Not specifically. The current Gold Card funding for the afternoon should be retained as with hourly ferries it is hard to get back to Waiheke when going to appointments that are not in the CBD eg at Green Lane.

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 an existing facility and the local community should be able to get greater use out of 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)?

Other



#8236



Tell us why:

Proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund but not at the expense of divesting the airport shares. These are part of Auckland's future and should be retained in public ownership. If this proceeds the new fund should not be too bureaucratic with a CEO and staff who earn big salaries.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Retain council ownership but lease the operation for a shorter period (It is not clear why 35 years is chosen though perhaps it is to maximise the lease price. It is easy to envisage a situation where the Council wants to cancel the lease so they could sell the ports and reduce future rates.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

The use should be bot with part of the profits being used to fund council services and another part being for investment (but needs to be clear what it would be used for and in what circumstances.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Partial self insurance with a focus on key assets would be the least risky approach as some cover is provided.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#8236



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 wharf area is an eyesore and waste of prime waterfront land. It would be better to start a transfer process so it can be transformed but not sold off. The community should benefit from more waterfront access.

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 above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8236



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I do not support the proposed removal of the SuperGold subsidy programme for afternoon peak services (e.g. 3pm-6.30pm). Many SuperGold cardholders on Waiheke have to travel to the city for medical appointments which in the case of appointments at Greenlane clinical centre involves a 25 minute bus ride as well as the ferry. Often



#8236



the appointments do not finish until the afternoon and it is often not possible to get back to the ferry before 3pm. This would make medical appointments expensive.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#8236



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

These are the minimum that are required.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

These are the minimum that are required.

8. Do you have any other comments?

It is outrageous that the Waiheke Local Board budget is proposed to be cut by 70% - this is the biggest percentage cut of all boards. Waiheke ratepayers pay around \$27M in rates so the proposed \$855,000 is just a pittance. Spending at this level will mean most assets will deteriorate and just get patch up maintenance. This will have a big impact on the local walking tracks which draws many tourists to the Island. The proposal fails to take into account that the Island draws many tourists to Auckland but its facilities and charm has to be actively maintained in order to continue to do so. Funding should return to previous levels.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Accelerate pest/predator control to promote native birds, insects and flora.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8302



While libraries and certain arts initiatives are very important, money is also squandered on high maintenance/low uptake pastimes such as bridal trails (horse riding) and similar fringe activities. Apply a better cost-benefit analysis to funding. Partner stakeholders rather than allocating arbitrary funding..

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport and transit corridors are suboptimal for a city of Auckland's size

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Not a fiscal priority

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

AFF smells like a shell for transitioning public assets into private hands. Those assets have high social value that should be preserved. Selling them off may appeal as a



#8302



short term solution but when the cupboard is bare, what then? If an investor can make the airport profitable, AC should focus on that and maintain the asset for those who paid for it. Selling it is a form of stealth tax. Dishonesty is not a good feature of governance.

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 know why

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:

Ferry access to downtown is crucial for Gulf Islanders. Not publishing your intended "something else" is intentional, one presumes. Why not say what you want these wharves for and what will change rather than asking for blanket approval?



#8302



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

"Something else" lacks value if it is not specified.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#8302



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#8302



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 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?

Less employees



#8326



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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It should pay its way or be sold

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell the land, shift the port



#8326



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Pay down debt

4d. Do you have 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:

Best use

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



#8326



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |



#8326



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#8326



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Support

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | |
| 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?



#8405



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

More public transport less congestion.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#8405



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:

Enhanced waterfront will benefit whole community

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



#8405



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#8405



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#8405



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Improving the quality and maintenance of roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less involvement in entertainment and festival type events



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Our road infrastructure is falling way behind, yet the population of the city is increasing

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Routine maintenance

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:

The council needs to return to core services

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

The city requires funds now, to be able to continue offering a reasonable level of service, without raising rates drastically



#8463



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 will free up capital the council can use on core services, with the port controlled by a specialized company that will likely be more focused on running it better

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:

If the AIA shares are sold and the port leased, the fund will have a reasonable base to grow and produce returns

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:

To keep the port viable to operation as is, and future growth, along with making the proposition as attractive as possible for a company to lease, all of the land and wharves currently set aside should be included



#8463



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

To keep the port viable to operation as is, and future growth, along with making the proposition as attractive as possible for a company to lease, all of the land and wharfs currently set aside should be included

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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> |



#8463



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#8463



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Core services and protecting environmental aspects of Waiheke are the most important function the council needs to focus on. At a point in time, where additional funds might be available, nice to haves can be included again

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I like the long term strategies proposed, especially when it come to those pertaining to the ferry services, and the Matiatia wharf development; along with adocating on the communities behalf to central Govt and governing bodies



#8463



8. Do you have any other comments?

Allocation of funds to the Waiheke board needs to reflect more the rates paid by Waiheke residence and businesses



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | Do more |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would like the council itself to review it’s own inefficiencies and look at saving there please. I would be prepared to pay more rates if I saw more value on how they were managed.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8516



Stop mowing verges with fossil fuelled tools.

Stop wasting time with moving rubbish bins around and wasting million when you have to put them back.

Make AT more accountable for the Public Transport money and get people off private cars and spend less on roads.

Remove all the red tape around AT/TMP plans etc which make community impossible to put on and require huge staffing levels.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stop spending money on roads and put it into a free public transport system (including Waiheke) - THAT I would pay more for!

More trains, better network. THAT I would pay more for.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

A free/low cost public transport system (including Waiheke) - THAT I would pay more for!

More trains, better network. THAT I would pay more for.

More decarbonisation of harbour ferries and utilise them as major transport option.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads, cars, changing speed limits, endless signage, TMP plans. Bike ferries, just include them on bigger harbour ferries.

Communications department which allows council public servants to water down information and create 'narratives' rather than an upfront and clear communication with ratepayer and business that the council serves.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It might as well be on Mars if you live on Waiheke and can't even get to the city affordably, let alone North Shore 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:

Because this money has historically always had a habit of being misused and misplaced by officials.

We should not be selling public assets that belong to the people. It is not financially smart and will be something that robs future generations 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:

We should not be selling council assets, including the operation of the biggest port 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



#8516



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:

Not enough info on what it would be used for.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Not enough info on what it would be used for.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | Support |



#8516



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |



#8516



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#8516



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke has had a 69% CUT to its local board capital works budget. Why on earth would anyone here be happy with that. Waiheke nets Auckland Council \$31,000,000.00 in rates alone yet our capital works budget has been slashed to well under \$1 million. There

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Strongly support affordable (per km) public ferry service for island.

Strongly support future provision for equestrian facilities.

Support most initiatives.

Please stop mowing our grass verges. Bees and insects need the habitat and it is wasteful to have someone using a fossil fuelled trimmer to cut something that doe not need to be.

Have no idea what Matiatia landslide issue is.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The 'fiscal hole' of nearly \$300,000.00 is inexcusable. When you take rubbish bins away with one hand and then have to reinstate them at huge cost to the ratepayer shortly after, it shows the council is not fit for purpose and it too big to be in touch with the communities it is supposed to be serving. Id we were witnessing a highly effective governance of the region, we would not be complaining but ratepayers see the wastage on a daily basis. The council is just to big to be effective.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know



#8566



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#8566



| | |
|---|--------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#8566



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#8566



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Support more protection in Hauraki Gulf (in terrible health decline) by lobbying central govt. and supporting local projects and the HPA legislation in the house. Recognise the regional and national risk of the caulerpa invasive seaweed incursions and support mitigation, eradication and management initiative



#8584



1d. Is there anything else 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:

Still support more cycleways and other options for non-vehicle transport

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways and options to keep pedestrians safe. Greater protection for the regions biodiversity

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:

Once a strategic asset leaves public ownership - it is near impossible to regain it - especially something that Aucklanders have paid for over decades. The airport is in my opinion a strategic public asset



#8584



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 for 35 years is a thin wedge that could easily lead to the loss of a strategic public asset and control over the operation of the port. We want to retain control over the operation of the port for not just strategic reasons but for environmental reasons - given the threats that exist for our marine environment - some of these threats are already affecting us - and what is affecting the Hauraki Gulf can easily affect the inner Gulf and the wider Waitemata Harbour and Port waters.

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 Future Fund as I understand its operation/structure from my reading may not be able to be protected from loss such as an investment crisis - national or global. Council services and infrastructure is/has been underfunded. I presume Council services will, also, refer to infrastructure 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?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#8584



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#8584



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#8584



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

This fits with the Vision contained within the consensus document/research 'Essentially Waiheke' - that the island is a treasure island, a sustainability focused island; a conservation purpose island and a holiday destination which has a character very di

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support the proposed priorities



#8584



8. Do you have any other comments?

I cannot understand why the Waiheke LB has lost funding - it appears that our budget has been cut and its a mystery to me why this has happened. I want AC to relook at the formula and be transparent with the LB and community regarding this matter. I believe a LB funding policy needs to be fair and not disadvantage one particular LB over another.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Weeds and bad Plants removal service

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8590



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Not everything effects me in my Geo-location

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Repair of major damages to roads that are half closed, proper resizing or road use changes to single lane roads that are not marked as 1 way

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



#8590



Tell us 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?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#8590



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Other |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | Support |



#8590



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#8590



| | |
|--|--------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Fix the roads

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Protecting the gulf and particularly the elimination of wastewater overflows closing beaches after even modest rainfall events.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8642



Less redtape and bureaucracy, more efficient provision of services - eg around consenting, approval of traffic management plans for 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I believe the Auckland Airport is a strategic asset and while Auckland Council retain a little more than 10% it cannot be taken over, delisted, etc. (One could argue it is a national interest so it should be central Govt which should retain the 10% but good luck in achieving that.)

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#8642



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 needs to be relocated within a shorter time span than a leasee is likely to be happy with. While gaining use of waterfront land is nice, I believe the main benefit is getting that heavy traffic volume out of the central city area

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 see the logic in Auckland Council sitting on significant capital reserves while borrowing.

4d. Do you have 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



#8642



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#8642



| | |
|---|---------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#8642



| | |
|--|------------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Cannot see that necessary capital developments can be achieved with the pathetic sum being proposed.

Don't agree with provision of equine facilities being a specific priority separated from all the other sport/recreational activities.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Local Board has been prudent in capital spend with no extravagance (unlike Auckland Transport on the island) so I cannot see how they can provide similar capital developments with a 70% reduction of an already modest capital expenditure budget.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Retain the capital funding programme for Waiheke Island.....the savage cut proposed will have a significant impact on the Island.

Why not 'smooth' the rate increases to 7.5% (as proposed) in year 1, 6% in years 2 and 3. That would give a little more in the coffers in year 2 to cover for year 3.



#8652



1d. Is there anything else 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?

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



#8652



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#8652



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#8652



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#8652



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The question you have not asked is 'how do you feel about the proposed funding cut to the capital works programme for Waiheke'. It is beyond belief that a Council led questionnaire, which purports to ask residents and ratepayers for input, would not inclu

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As noted above.....

8. Do you have any other comments?

Council has a rate 'take' of close to \$30 million from Waiheke Island.

Yet the proposed 'spend' on the Island is nothing like that.

That is unfair and unacceptable.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal



#8677



Tell us why:

pAY LESS GET LESS Waiheke our rates are extortionately high for the services we get. No sewerage no water no footpaths and the dearest ferry charges in the world .The Waiheke rate payers paid 27 million dollars for one year .We pay enough give us a full ferry service not less .

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle paths for the safety of all concerned .

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Double decker tourist buses making the roads UNSAFE AND TOTALLY UNNECESSARY

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#8677



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#8677



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

lower THE RATES AND GIVE US 21ST CENTURY INFRASTRUCTURE

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



#8677



Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

Provide Public Toilet in Ostend and Oneroa

rT



#8677



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Give us a decent budget not stripped back to the bones

8. Do you have any other comments?

Stop making Waiheke a tourist hub for Auckland winedrinkers



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Protection of Hauraki Gulf.

1d. Is there anything else 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#8685



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:

Make Waiheke Ferry part of AT.

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 reinvigorate central city.

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 |
|---|---------|



#8685



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#8685



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#8685



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Protect the marine environment too.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#8693



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Common sense

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:



#8693



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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
|---|--|



#8693



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | |



#8693



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#8693



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke needs a bigger share of the taxes that are collected from waiheke than what is proposed.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

plan for climate change

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8705

road improvements

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland is a growing city and public transport is the key to future development

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

environmentally friendly buses and ferries

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:

I don;t think this is a priority art the present time

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 think it is short term thinking to sell off Auckland's shares in the airport



#8705



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 is the short term gain option and I think we should be looking at the long term

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 will need money to spend on the three waters problems

4d. Do you have 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 increased need for truck and rail transport is not good for the environment. There is enough public space along the wharves.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#8705



Tell us why:

"public benefit" is not sufficient reason for the change

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing | Support |



#8705



| | |
|---|---------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#8705



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

We need to protect the unique features of our island

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I agree with them

8. Do you have any other comments?

I cannot understand why Waiheke Local Board budget is cut more than any other board



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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:

One thing must be retained is the free gold card trips from 9am. To stop it from 3-7pm
Would make trips to Greenlane hospital especially extremely long and tiring for elderly sick people on Waiheke.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Putt signs in the reo. A waste of time and money

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Never been 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:

Do not believe in council tampering with these and council would no doubt waste the money.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#8719



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:

Believe best 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:

Best

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Best

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:

Best

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



#8719



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#8719



| | |
|---|---------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#8719



| | |
|--|------------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Sew responses above

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 a bed tax and use that to fund events and improvements to the environment

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8779



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Introduce a road pricing scheme to reduce congestion and to help fund better transport solutions. The main problem is that 90 % of cars have only one person - this is not sustainable.

2a. Is there anything you 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



#8779



Tell us here:

Council does a poor job of operating the Port. The port of Tauranga looks much more efficient.

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

Support



#8779



| | |
|---|--------------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |



#8779



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#8779



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

Waiheke is one of the jewels in the crown of Auckland - very important that we protect and enhance the environment here for future generations. Protect and regenerate the native bush, eliminate the introduced predators and take the same care of our surrou

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 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?

Under 'transport' I have ticked 'do more' but I don't want more roads but I do want more public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



I don't want them to do less of anything

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to increase spending on pedestrian crossings and cycleways. WE also need to regulate the use of electric scooters on footpaths.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

New roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

We have enough stadium space and there is no need for another,

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Once public assets are privatised there is no going back. Assets developed out of the public purse should remain in public ownership. Flogging them off for a quick buck and



#8782



transferring their revenue generating capacity to private hands is wrong and only serves to exacerbate the gulf between rich and poor in our city.

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 never serves the public interest. Look at water and rail in the UK. what a disaster. When has it ever worked? Why should we repeat the poor strategies of others? Who will benefit - private investors in perpetuity.

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 own it, we operate it and the profits should be ours.

4d. Do you have 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:

If the land is used for 'other purposes' what might those be? I suspect more apartments, shops and restaurants and a fast buck for the council. We don't need



#8782



more of this kind of development which only serves to impoverish the existing commercial areas.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I don't trust the current right wing dominated council to really consider the long term needs of the port. Leave it alone!

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. | Support |



#8782



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#8782



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke is a unique place with different requirements to the rest of the city. Waiheke has a diverse population and it's easy to conclude that wealthy retirees and weekenders dominate the requirements of the island. This is not the case and there are man

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I approve of most of the proposals.



#8782



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Support the functioning of local boards;

Assist with the cost of services in areas where ratepayers are a minority of users (eg Waiheke Island)



#8830



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less support for expensive sporting events(boat races etc)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Making public transport more efficient is fine but removing funding for cycling and pedestrian safety initiatives is not

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More well-lit walkways and cycleways

Banning e-scooters from footpaths

Facilitating the new Island Direct ferry service to be able to take AT Hop cards for payment

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Initiatives to facilitate the use of private motor vehicles . Auckland has car-induced congestive heart failure.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Underused



#8830



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Retaining ownership offers a better chance of moving the port operations and letting the beautiful waitemata harbour edge be enjoyed by people not occupied by port activities

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.



#8830



Tell us why:

WE need more public space at the waterfront and be a city for people not industry

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 above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8830



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#8830



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I do not wish to see reduced funding of services in teh Waiheke Board area



#8830



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8847



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Get rid of the port cargo facility and turn into a public amenity



#8847



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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



#8847



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8847



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#8847



| | |
|--|---------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rubbish

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Fix infrastructure, pot holes and review speed bumps and rules and help the people who have lost homes in cyclone Gabrielle

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#8883



Sell ports of auckland

Sell airport shares

Get rid of at

Get rid of entertainment organisations

Stop doing commercial things that private companies can do eg like composting on Waiheke and the huge team at te Koro wai te waiheke when roads need fixing and sealing

Get back to basics with fixing infrastructure for the long term

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads and electricity

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Make it usable or Move it to the land where the old railway station is



#8883



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Need to provide for future infrastructure

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell it all - aucklandcouncil shouldnt be holding these shares

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:

Just sell it

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.



#8883



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8883



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Only do what's necessary to keep the city safe and healthy and prosperous

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities



#8883



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Too much emphasis on non core activities and environment

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fix the pot holes



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Shift the Port completely within 10 years

Reduce poverty and improve equity by sharply increasing funding for Local Boards in poorer areas and invest in urban regeneration in those areas.



#8887



Accelerate climate mitigation

Climate resilience and recovery, including making space for water

Nature restoration, including that targeted Rate for the Natural Environment

Annual increases in funding for Parks and Community

Accelerate the clean up of wastewater and management of future flooding events

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Bureaucracy and red tape

Roads

PR and Communications

Privatisations of public assets

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I do not support the cutbacks in cycleways

I do not support cutting ferry services or raising prices - they are already too high

I do not support reductions or a lack of improvement in bus services and transit lanes

I do not support removal of subsidy extension for SuperGold users

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I support the 'Do more' option. In addition:

The Council should bring all ferry services, including Waiheke, under proper regulation

Accelerate plans to provide a fast and affordable link to the airport



#8887



Put rail rather than road under the harbour to improve reliability of lining the city to the North Shore

Move ahead with pedestrian/cycling access to much of the CBD and other urban centres

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

I want less spending on more roading in Auckland.

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:

The creation of a Future Fund should not be a smokescreen to privatise more of Auckland's current assets

AIAL is a strategic asset and the Council should retain its shareholding.

If there is to be a Future Fund, it should have strong ethical criteria for its investments.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#8887



Do not lease out port operations or continue them beyond a short transition period.
Follow through on the Mayor's promise to move the port and free up the land to benefit the environment and people of Auckland.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

The Council does not need a Future Fund in order to self-insure. If it is worthwhile doing it, the Council should go ahead without the Future Fund. Trying to sell the fund on the basis of self insurance is spurious and makes no sense.

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:

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to Council ownership sooner than 15 years, within 5 years.



#8887



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#8887



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#8887



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

They should include Local Board support for additional Marine Protected Areas

Priorities should include supporting local community actions for nature regeneration, climate resilience and supporting vulnerable people.

Transport priorities should include investment for safe cycling.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Local Board Funding Policy should give a far stronger weighting to deprivation in the funding formula - to at least 40%. This would start to redress the deep inequalities within Auckland's communities.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

maintain art gallery and libraries funding

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no more cycle lanes!!!



#8952



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

please don't put more money into unused cycle lanes, it is lovely rhetoric that more cycle lanes = more people out of cars and onto bikes but the majority of people don't cycle, they just talk about it

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

keeping public transport affordable, on time and at the right time so people do use it.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

cycle lanes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

it needs to be utilised better in current configuration or the impact on climate change is exacerbated by re-building an perfectly ok structure. But to continue subsidising it is not acceptable, there must be a way of getting more paid use through concerts, festivals 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#8952



Tell us why:

just don't think the port has been through properly yet

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:

4d. Do you have 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



#8952



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#8952



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#8952



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It is totally irrational and unfair regarding the proposed cut to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years (a 70% cut). Waiheke has the biggest % cut of all 21 local boards.

8. Do you have any other comments?

It is totally irrational and unfair regarding the proposed cut to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years (a 70% cut). Waiheke has the biggest % cut of all 21 local boards.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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. Let's just increase the productivity of contractors awash with Council funds and stunningly generous Council Contracts. This is not a \$\$ shift, a mere attitudinal shift to give us more results for our rates. How many times do we see stop/go people with no workers in between these stop/go people?



#9048



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Make current Council entities need to be less inefficient. The huge entities such as Downers and Tree Scape (to name just 2) with contracts to print their own money despite their obvious inefficiencies need to improve their effectiveness and service to their ratepayer clients.. Speed humps costed at \$300K!!! AT that shuts the rail network every weekend for ongoing maintenance! The only major city globally which shuts down on weekends, perhaps?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Giving AT or Council more money for such total rank inefficiency they shown over the last 10 years does not warrant an increase in budget.

A rail system shutdown 2 days a week, already charging higher public transport fares than most global cities, proposing even greater price increases is counterproductive.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Spend some money of redundancy payments for those who currently run public transport but have no concept of serving the public that pays their wages.

AT and Council needs an attitudinal shift: to service and insist on value for money for ratepayers

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce the number of people who think shutting the rail network 2 days a week is a profitable use of ratepayer investment.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is



#9048



Tell us why:

It is a good facility despite its inaccessibility by public transport. Creating another similar facility would cost even more. If the operational management needed to be changed, there has been nothing to stop this occurring already. If the management of the facility is a concern, why has it not already been addressed? Charging more to use a Council facility does NOT guarantee a greater income. It often creates resentment and further reduction in facility 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Auckland Council's track record of managing assets is appalling. (e.g The sale of the old council headquarters behind the townhall for a ridiculously small amount.)The Airport shareholding provides income. Don't sell any more money- earning assets which have already been paid for by earlier generations of ratepayers. What a joke! To think that Council believes it can create a financial fund by selling off current assets! In a sea of financial mismanagement it believes it can generate funds by creating a new council entity. Surely a bad joke.

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 financially viable for some entity to lease the port for 35 years, why is it not financially viable to retain it as an immediate source of Council income. Why should current Council incompetence be a reason for leasing out an income stream for private investor gain. If private individuals who own or lease the port are capable of financial



#9048



return, why not Auckland Council. Lack of competence among high-earner Council staff?

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:

No faith in the organization of the proposed entity. Another entity that has no apparent fiscal benefits (just like AT/Watercare.) we can all do without!

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Council's own asset management department (recently rebranded to conceal some of its incompetence in the past) has NOT provided any enhancement or development of assets. It has ultimately been an asset-stripping department with no financial gain for ratepayers. Why would a new Future Fund be any better?

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

There is no need to spend more money on the waterfront. There is no need to continue to develop Downtown Auckland for the sole benefit of the cruise ship industry.. Haven't we already spent millions of dollars to create a bland inner-city environment ind

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#9048



Tell us why:

Aucklanders like me don't want Council (with its history of financial cost blow-outs) having licence to waste more public money.

If you don't have the money, don't do it. Don't borrow more.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#9048



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Schools can educate their students to reduce their waste , Councils just remove bins, don't educate and succeed in creating environmental costs elsewhere. If the regional petrol tax was so beneficial where are the beneficial outcomes? Council proves that increasing costs of services does NOT guarantee improved services. Council mantra must be "serve the communities that pay your wages."

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#9048



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke deserves better financial support from Auckland Council. Minimum water costs, minimum sewage costs from Waiheke to Council YET despite its substantial "rates gathering" catchment it is proposed to get very little in return.

Even worse, Council is

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I agree with all priorities but I am surprised that consultation with mana whenua should be a major budget item. Tawaipareira Reserve has already had a major revamp and should perhaps not be a major financial focus over the next few years.



#9048



8. Do you have any other comments?

The proposed budget reduction of 70% to our Waiheke Local Board is unimaginably unjust. We have a competent Local Board which understands the needs of our community. Any reduction of funding to our local board will have an intense response from our local community, already tired of the incompetence of Auckland City-based advisors. They are tired of Council admin costs (\$273 to issue a certificate.) Just give our Local Board the previously planned budget (before the 70% reduction) and Waiheke residents can trust that a degree of competence will be delivered. It is the incompetence associated with the Super-City model (especially CCO's) have ensured that the model has never been adopted elsewhere in NZ.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 and facilities for the whole of society, moving away from car dependence. We need to learn to live with the wonders of this place, supporting prospects for future Aucklanders ... a more diverse population, while respecting what's gone before



#9164



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Waste within council is woeful. Coherent and coordinated planning and action is vital. Siloed operations that work at cross purposes are truly sad. We deserve better.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Please embrace the future. Look at globally progressive cities with public spaces and ready access, by bike, foot and public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public facilities with ready access, in ways other than cars

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:

Whole of society perspective is critical. We have an excess of stadiums 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



Tell us why:

Don't sell off our children's future. Have we learnt nothing in this neoliberal age?

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:

Working port is the heart of the city of sails. It's for all of us

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 find ways to support collective futures

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No additional comments

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:



#9164



Collective benefit works well. Silo Park area has been wonderful

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

No additional comment

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |



#9164



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

May not be the right place here, but concerns for waiheke at the heart of the gulf are growing and council doesn't seem to respect values of this place and assets it gives to the city as a whole

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?



#9164



I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Facilities for everyone are critical... locals and visitors

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Gravely concerned at budget prospects for the island. Folk on the island itself are working effectively and very hard. External council relations are a sad reflection on what is possible



#9164



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: Waiheke

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?

I will be very happy to see my road (Scotts Terrace Onetangi) sealed under the do more plan! Grow public transport services / Investment in growing productive employment, ie manufacturing, weightless economy / MORE hi value jobs (not tourism



#9189



or ag)/ more support for seniors (how might we make use of their knowledge) Provide greater care of the fascitiis council is responsible for eg roads, berms, parks etc.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do less of anything that doesn't add to economic growth. Less bureaucratic oversight. Establish guidelines and trust people to do the right thing / smack them when they fail.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Huh? I like some of the ideas, I dont like others! For example, I dont like the introduction of charges on busway car parks that are highly used. Clearly they are working well, so build more car parks! FFS, we need a half decent car park building at Matiatia; council charges us for parking and provides a bog for a parking surface.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Matiatia! What a dog's breakfast, and embarrassment it is.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Bureaucracy.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Just make it meet the needs of the people, dammit!



#9189



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Any investment in the productive economy is a good investment. The focus for the fund must be focussed on enabling the growth.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Lease it yes. But not for continuation of the port operations. And not for 35 years. To get the right investment for Auckland and that area needs longer term investment, now.

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.



#9189



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#9189



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#9189



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I am OK with supporting mana whenua, and believe that the needs of all people on Waiheke MUST be listened to and attended to. My needs and aspirations are important also!

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

There is nothing there covering the appalling nature of our roads. Dammit!



#9189



8. Do you have any other comments?

The doc is way to long.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Capital gains and wealth taxes. More bike and pedestrian lanes and safety measures. Creating more robust Hauraki Gulf marine reserves. Addressing our climate crisis. Restore the RFT.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9195



Protect wealthy private interests. Enable fossil-fueled transport.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Climate crisis requires change. Specifically, lessening dependence on fossil-fuel-powered transport. Enhancing public transport is essential, however I am uncertain about your ability to implement any such change given your budget realities.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Ensuring Gold Card concessions for Waiheke residents remain intact. We have no way to get to family and medical appointments without using the ferry. That often requires travel in afternoon peak hours.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The mayor's salary. Anything related to fossil fuels.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Abandon this. Given urgent climate and infrastructure needs, this is frivolous.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 will cripple the region's financial independence and put us at the mercy and whim of predatory foreign investors. NO!

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Do not lease the Port. Move it north as previously envisioned, Enhance the shoreline and public image of the harbour.

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 needs all the funds it can get!

4d. Do you have 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:

As above.



#9195



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 current industrial use is an eyesore.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Other |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#9195



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Waiheke residents do not rely on public water and should not be subject to rates for water use.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#9195



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

There are more urgent needs: limiting heliports, enhancing protection for the Gulf, road maintenance and safety, housing for our vulnerable and elderly on fixed incomes and redressing the mess that Fuller's monopoly creates for residents.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Especially believe the council has little knowledge of factors that make Waiheke unique. We are largely rural, needing less urban services and more protection for our land, roads, people, animals and surrounding marine areas.



#9195



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| 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?

- Safeguarding the natural environment
- More open meetings(Democracy)
- More public transport (including Airport link)
- Upgrading historic buildings
- Managing stormwater



#9263



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| Reduce Mayor and councillor remuneration | Signage |
| Less farming out contracts to private sector | Staff reduction |
| Over-regulation, re consents, licences etc. | Stop funding Marinas |

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Move from supporting private motorists to improving public transport links and rail services.

Cycleways on major short journey e.g. Think Tamaki Drive cycleway

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

See 1c

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

See 1d

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell this off to the Private Sector (not the Port!)



#9263



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 Mayor Wayne Brown's scam, selling off Council's strategic 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:

It is an asset sale and any funds from it will disappear down a debt plughole without any advantage for future Auckland

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

For the future, not paying off past debt

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Don't lease or sell it

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#9263



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:

Self-explanatory: We are selling other carparks and land for freight holding, and obviously the land is valuable for suitable commercial development

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 5a

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#9263



| | |
|---|--------------|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke



#9263



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Not Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#9263



You receive over \$31 million in rates from us, and have reduced our budget by 73%, the highest in Auckland. I think your priorities stink. You treat us like a cash cow and repay us with more private helipad consents than anywhere else in NZ

8. Do you have any other comments?

From Day 1(Cyclone Gabrielle) Mayor Brown has shown he is totally unqualified and inadequate in the role – a businessman completely out of his depth. His only idea is to sell off as much as he can. He has no vision and should resign immediately.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Do not want the Future Fund. The Council should carry debt if necessary and ensure that Council officers reduce wasteful spending.



#9280



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Capped weekly public transport concessions cannot be guaranteed.

Need more info on "Rapid Transit" network. Am concerned at the suggestion that Council would reduce pensioners ability to use concessions from 3.30. This would impact ability to get free transport home from Hospital to Waiheke Island.

2a. Is there anything you 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 is a great facility for North Shore residents and needs improved maintenance and management.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The Council has already diluted its ability to get dividends from the Airport by selling part of its shareholding. We need to maintain these assets for the future, not sell them



#9280



and find out later that the Future Fund has been further depleted because Council needed more money for wasteful spending.

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:

Same as for AIA. Retain the asset and work on improving its profitability.

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:

Need for more astute management in order to generate better dividend.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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 greater public access to these wharfs. Look at how much access Wellingtonians have to their wharves.



#9280



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#9280



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Don't reduce transport concessions for older and younger passengers.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#9280



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The problem for Waiheke is that the new budget substantially reduces the Local Board's ability to fund their usual operations.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Lack of budget restricts Local Board's ability to meet its objectives.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | 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

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

road cones



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

yes regional food tax

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

public transott

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

men

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

don't 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

cause

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9325



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

we need money and the port is bad

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:

auckland needs a future

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

nope

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

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#9325



idk

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#9325



| | |
|---|---------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

nope

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#9325



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

waiheke board needs a stronger connection with the people and community

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

yes

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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9392



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making cycling and walking safer, especially around schools

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?



#9392



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the 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> | |



#9392



| | |
|---|--------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9392



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#9392



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

A 70% cut to the Waiheke Local Board's budget for capital spend from 1 July this year for three years seems far too much to expect the local board to work effectively.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

More cycleways and trains, and better protections for the environment, including planting lots more trees.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9427



Building less roads, and put the burden of outer city developments onto the developer, not the rate payer.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I'm not sure if you know, but we're in a climate emergency, and your idea of canning all public transport and cycleway initiatives is a retrograde step for Auckland city. At a time when more cycleways than ever should be built, you're suggesting the opposite. All of the data and research worldwide, if you can get your noses out of the petrol pump, will tell you that we need to reduce car dependency, not increase it as suggested in this long term plan.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More new rail corridors, cycleways, and static bike share scheme. Open the bridge to pedestrians and cyclists.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads, and supporting private housing developers.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Without trains and safe cycling and bike parking, it's simply in the wrong place.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#9427



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Setting up a climate change mitigation fund whilst advocating for more road users and less public transport options and cyclists is laughable. Spend the money on full public transport infrastructure and cycle lanes and then you can start with climate change mitigation.

Also, you're allowing the city to sprawl further, further exacerbating the climate change issue.

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 council and government assets never benefits the rate/taxpayer, only the rich. We should be gathering dividends and spending them on improving the cities 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:

Selling assets only benefits the rich, never the tax/ratepayer.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#9427



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:

Unless Auckland has fast and reliable rail infrastructure, a smaller port will see more trucks on the road, both increasing pollution and wear on Auckland's roads.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Unless we heavily invest in rail, the plan will result in far more trucks being on Auckland's roads.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | Support |



#9427



| | |
|---|----------------|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Auckland needs massive increases in spending on the environment, water, and drainage. These infrastructure projects should have been carried out years ago.

Auckland Council needs to take ownership of water care and auckland transport.



#9427



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#9427



Tell us why

Waiheke is the Hauraki Gulf's natural gem. We need a pristine island for tourism, and locals alike. any reduction in services would be catastrophic for the island. More money needs to be spent on environmental initiatives, not less. More cycleways, more p

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It needs a more comprehensive budget for the environment, and more onus placed on property developers for the infrastructure require for their development. The environment budget needs to include pest plants and predators. the economic benefits of the island being predator free is incredible. The ferry to Matiatia needs to be council run, and fares for locals reduced.

8. Do you have any other comments?

More public transport and cycleways, with green streets and less parking would make this city liveable.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | Do more |
| 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?

Keep the trees branches cut properly

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9438



Less road works

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?

Keeping trees cut properly and surveillance to reduce crime

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Road works

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#9438



Tell us 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?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#9438



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#9438



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#9438



| | |
|--|---------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#9484



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support the development of public transport and don't support any cuts to the gold card benefits

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

public transport systems

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

cosmetic road changes

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



#9484



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#9484



| | |
|---|----------------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |



#9484



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#9484



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Strongly oppose the massive reduction of the capital spend budget for the Waiheke Local Board



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 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?



#9517



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

it can make it easier for a lot of people to get around places and areas

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

promoting maori culture because it is an important part of nz history

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:

why not

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us 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:



#9517



it seems like the port in auckland is good enough for now at least so i dont think we need major improvements

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:

because they need money they are in debt

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 dont know what that is or i just dont remember

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?



#9517



| | |
|--|---------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#9517



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#9599



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support significant spent in public transport and development of cycleways

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#9599



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#9599



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Support |



#9599



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#9599



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

Yes stop replacing macrocarpa bollards on Onetangi beach and stop road side spraying.



#9607



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?

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:



#9607



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#9607



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |



#9607



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#9607



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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:

Auckland airport will not produce much income for some time so need flexibility to sell council shares.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#9628



Retaining port land is essential but leasing out the operation will probably be more productive.

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:

To help keep rates increases 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?

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

Support



#9628



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#9628



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#9628



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#9647



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Roading needs to be fixed

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Money can be used to help funding for places like waiheke where the funding is cut drastically

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#9647



We get more money to invest now

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:

Public benefit from this

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:

Public benefit from this

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



#9647



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |



#9647



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |



#9647



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke budgets should not be cut

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke should not have a 70%cut in funding

8. Do you have any other comments?

Do not stop the gold card use for the older population



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#9699



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:

Spend less money on 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:

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?



#9699



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:

Only proceed if it doesn't add costs

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#9699



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Support |



#9699



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#9699



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Spend less money on nice to haves

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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 | 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?

This question really annoys me. I live on Waiheke. I get very little for my rates and the council is proposing to cut it by 70%.

When the council gets about 27 million from us every year.

Why should we get less?



#9703



1d. Is there anything else 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:

Have a high density tax for people who live in Auckland City and

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I wouldn't mind living on a sealed road.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell 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:



#9703



Don't sell these 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:

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:

For my rates I live on an unsealed road where I and my neighbours keep the council trench clear.

We have our own water and discharge system that we pay a consent for and also for maintenance.

We pay the most expensive public transport link to Auckland City and the fares have just gone up. Now AC is proposing Gold Card users will have less access to Auckland which means less access to medical treatment.

We have had many of our public rubbish bins removed so we are cleaning up after visitors.

And now, this council is proposing to cut our budget by 70% and asking what we can go without. We were going to get 8.42 million for the next three years. Now it is only 2.5 in total. We pay over 27 million per year into Auckland's coffers. Our assets will deteriorate.



#9703



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#9703



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#9703



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The cuts to our budget will destroy Waiheke's fragile infrastructure while the rest of Auckland gets the benefit of our rates contribution..



#9703



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| 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?

No more cycleways.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland has to get it's whole CBD organized before starting on anything else.

Too many expensive mistakes have been made in the past. To

o many businesses on Queen Street are shut.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Community Boards.

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:

I along with many others worked extremely hard with fund raising for this project it would be a total insult if it was removed.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#9722



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:

Keep our 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:

4d. Do you have 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 another grandiose idea to make an even bigger mess of Auckland than we are in now.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#9722



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |



#9722



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.</p> | <p>Very Important</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#9722



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | I don't know |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

There is far too much money being cut to the Waiheke Local Board. AC has a huge intake of rates from Waiheke and to cut what we get to \$600.00 in return is criminal. Who ever decided on this should be made to resign.

Also to stop the Gold Card users being able to use the peak hour ferry services is the worst thing that AC could do. I believe that the council have no legal right to do this as it is a government thing. You could kill people with this by people not

going to get to hospital appointments on time. It's bad enough with the ferry being unreliable without making it harder for people to get to hospital. I will be strongly objecting to this if it goes ahead.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Reestablish direct bus service from downtown Britomart to the airport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9736



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?

Direct bus service to the airport

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:

Auckland airport is a critical infrastructure to Auckland as well as NZ and we need have control through share ownership.

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



#9736



Tell us here:

It is important to keep ownership and control for future use.

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:

This would provide more inner city public space for an increasing population

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

To maintain shipping port capacity in Auckland to minimise goods transport on the roads in and out of Auckland

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#9736



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#9736



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Auckland as the main economic centre and transport hub in nz should qualify for more central government funding.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, | Very Important |



#9736



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Continue work on getting the Waiheke ferry services under the public transport act to improve affordable fares.

Important to maintain the current Gold Card benefit rule for the affordability of living on the island .



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

To allow Gold Card holders on Waiheke Island to use these cards as we can today, after 9 am .This is to allow us sufficient time to return home after a medical appointment without paying for a return fare costing us \$27.50 to get home.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9757



Reduce the number of Orange cones that you are paying rent for while waiting for road repairs . instead of using so many cones place them at the beginning and end of the area and use an orange ribbon joining to just a few cones in the middle.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycle ways separated from the roads are the way to go if we are going to reduce traffic and air pollution .Ferry users reduce the number of cars on the road so Auckland City Council should ensure that ferry travel is frequent and cheap.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Yes, on providing facilities for Island Direct ferries, to be comparable to the facilities Fullers has at the ferry terminal.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Orange Cones.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It has too little uses as it stands today .

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#9757



Tell us why:

We owe this to future generations so the family silver is not held by foreign companies who could dictate to our citizens what they might want to do with their 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:

We can't wait 35 years to move the port. AS long as we have control of it , we can work on moving the port so that we can develop our waterfront for accommodation, recreation facilities , similar to the development in Vancouver city .

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#9757



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#9757



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#9757



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke provides Recreational Areas for all Aucklanders . Tourists visit us all year round to our beaches , our vineyards , our parks. it is ridiculous to reduce the number of rubbish bins for example , our rubbish bins are overflowing and rubbish starts

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I understand you have reduced your financial support to Waiheke Board much more than any other board. As already stated we provide facilities for Auckland,NZ , and



#9757



overseas visitors and need help to maintain our island . Especially our roads need a lot more funding.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | 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?

Addressing homelessness not for businesses more about the humanity

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less talk of selling valuable assets



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

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#9766



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#9766



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#9766



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#9766



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We are a diverse community

Environment manu whenua and community sports are paramount

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Totally agree on environmental issues and protection

Love to see any extra helicopter pad ban in there

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Good public transport. Light rail. Remove cars from queen street

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9793



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycle ways are good

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Light rail overland. More money for the rail network

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, 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:

The port should be moved

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9793



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?



#9793



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |



#9793



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#9793



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Weekly recycling pick up

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9819



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cutting cycling lanes and initiatives is short-sighted.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#9819



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#9819



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#9819



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#9819



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke is a unique place and is both a home to many residents as well as attracting domestic and international tourists. It needs to be properly funded and I am alarmed at the proposed cuts.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I am against the proposed cuts to the budget and think they should be kept at the same level or increased.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?



#9829



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways very important!!!

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Privatization ultimately gives less control to the city. Very against this.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#9829



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#9829



| | |
|---|--------------|
| we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |



#9829



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#9829



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Keep libraries. Keep local staff. Keep noise control local, it is ridiculous that you ring council fir noise control and they ring Auckland firm who then rings waiheke firm.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9859



And Less roadworkscones. And fewer raised crossings. Just paint white line crossings.
Cut council fees for resource consents. Crazy money spent on consultants.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make public transport affordable. Make at cards only tag on, no need to tag off.
Subsidise waiheke ferries.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#9859



The inner city underground rail has ruined Auckland. We didn't need it. We do need suburban rail and city rail link to airport

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Move port out of central Auckland. Revitalise inner city. Allie free competition for new ferry companies

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:

Keep costs down. So much money is wasted

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?



#9859



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#9859



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

So much money wasted. Learn to budget

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Albert-Eden, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Waiheke

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 | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#9859



| | |
|---|------------------|
| engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community. | |
| Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator. | Not Important |
| 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. | Fairly 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. | Not Important |
| Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square. | Not Important |
| Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes. | Not Important |

Tell us why

You need rubbish bins

7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Manurewa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Manurewa in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#9859



| | |
|---|--|
| Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development. | |
| Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention. | |
| Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants. | |
| Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action. | |
| Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities. | |
| Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active. | |
| Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park. | |
| Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Manurewa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I do not support most priorities



#9859



Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

Not Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants. | Fairly Important |
| Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme. | Fairly Important |
| Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models. | Not Important |
| Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum. | Not Important |
| Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative). | Not Important |
| Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing | |



#9859



growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Other

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Fairly Important |



#9859



| | |
|--|------------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Don't cut the budget, return our rates money to our island

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Too many cuts

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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 First priority has to be to eliminate wasted spending through improved efficiencies.

There is no room for luxuries

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9867



Yes. Cut the budget to reflect the income available. increasing Rates is not the answer.
Responsible management is required so cut our cloth to cope.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Fanciful dreams of mimicing overseas examples on a convoluted city like Auckland need to be scrapped

Improve the efficiency of what we already have without imposing century old regulations to match idealist zealots

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No we have to cut luxury items until we can manage a budget successfully

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes, multi-layered contracts that simply increase the costs as each entity adds their margin

Undue imposition of PC regulations that do no more than increase costs

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell the stadium. Any asset that is not utilised fully is a liability. Save the operating costs and use the capital to pay down debt

Everyone knows that interest on debt is wasyeful



#9867



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Sell the assets and pay down debt just as your constituents are doing now

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell the business investments of the Port and paydown debt.

Council have no business to be in this business

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

See above - sell

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Get out of business that council have no expertise or capability

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#9867



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:

Utilise the area for private investors to develop

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#9867



| | |
|---|---------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Other |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

User pays would be more equitable if it was determined equally across all areas of the city

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#9867



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | I don't know |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

keep to the basics



#9867



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

unimpressed

8. Do you have any other comments?

the cut to board funding is an insult when compared to the rate paid



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Need to be a complete focus on public transport & cycleways. Put taxes on people using roads to drive petrol vehicles.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Turn the stadium into a green zone with a walking & bike friendly park.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 don't want Auckland Airport shares to be sold over time. This is an investment for the future in their current state. Also continue with Ports of Ak as currently in place & review when comes up for renewal.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9872



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?



#9872



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#9872



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#9872



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#9881



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland needs to continue its network of cycleways - we cannot simply rely on roads and public transport when a connected cycleway network makes cycling a workable option. The issue is we have cycle tracks but they are not connected as the project was halted. Cycling remains a real transport option and should be encouraged so finish the network and do it cheaper.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Once these assets are sold they are gone - I'm just not convinced it is the best option at this time.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#9881



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 don't trust that there can be adequate control over a lease arrangement - 35 years is a long time. That is prime land and needs to stay in council hands. There has to be protection of environment around the port.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

A Future Fund is a good idea and channeling profits and dividends from the Port and other assets into it makes sense

4d. Do you have 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:

It's prime land and public access makes sense and it's a natural extension to the other waterfront areas that have been developed for public use and enjoyment.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#9881



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing | Support |



#9881



| | |
|---|--------------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#9881



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am puzzled and concerned that the Waiheke Local Board proposed budget for capital spend from July 2024 for 3 years is to be cut by 70%. Is this an error? This budget is money to invest in permanent assets - walking tracks, facilities, and playgrounds. In the last Long Term Plan the local board's capital budget was to be \$8.4 million for the next 3 years. Now it's cut to \$2.5 million. Why does Waiheke have the biggest budget cut of all 21 local boards: (especially when some have no cuts?) How can it be when the ratepayers in the Waiheke Local Board area paid \$27 million in rates this past year? Our island's permanent assets will deteriorate as there just won't be the funds to maintain our network of walking tracks, facilities etc. The previous funding model level is needed to be able to cover costs. Waiheke Island is a destination for more



#9881



than 1 million visitors a year - there needs to be recognition for this by council. It's not good enough to promote Waiheke as the jewel in the crown and have people pouring into the community and using assets then slash funding which will make it very difficult to maintain standards of the island's tracks and playgrounds etc. I am very concerned that this is an unfair cut and there has to be more information to explain this rationale.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

More buses and ferries

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9905



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 lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#9905



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



#9905



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | |



#9905



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Not Important |



#9905



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Subsidise ferry travel for commuters and residents. As with the rest of Auckland

8. Do you have any other comments?

Subsidise ferry travel for commuters and residents



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Public Transport and Climate Change resilience

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9923



Investment in the CBD and major events funding - such saving should go towards more essential services

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't support capped weekly public transport passes proposal

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Invest in bringing Waiheke (Fullers) ferries under the new Sustainable Public Transport Framework and in not cutting back on the Gold Card peak travel allowance.

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:

While this issue has some region - wide implications, it is a matter that North Shore communities should have the dominant say on

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#9923



Tell us why:

AIAL shares are a strategic asset with a positive revenue flow. The shares did not cost the Council anything to acquire. To argue that the dividends do not meet the cost of capital borrowing for other council assets and activities is specious.

The sale and transfer of the proceeds to the proposed AFF will not guarantee that these converted assets will endure over time. The disbandment and expenditure of the last regional investment fund is a prime example of this when the Council chose to expend the total invested funds rather than simply use interest the earned.

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 a strategic asset. A 35 year lease provides the Council will little flexibility to solve the Port's long-term future e.g relocation The asset is effectively privatized for 35 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:

The Port company should be instructed through a firmly monitored Statement of Intent to focus on ensuring a strong profit and dividend stream to assist fund the Councils funding needs.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#9923



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:

This piecemeal thinking - any land ownership change must be considered within a framework of proposals (a) what specific uses and subsequent public benefits the land will be used for? (b) the longer term context of the Port's future location and value

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

As above - plus the decrease in the Port's asset value and profit and dividend yield potential will adversely impact on ability to contribute towards funding Councils services.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#9923



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#9923



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#9923



Tell us why

These priorities relate to activities that are essential to not only for the Local Bd to plan and provide services and a positive environment for its residents but also cater for the tens of thousands of domestic and international visitors the Island attr

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As mentioned, support them.

However, I understand that the capital budget for the next 3 years will only be \$2.5M - a 70% decrease on the previous 3 years!!! Other Local boards are not experiencing such decreases

How does Auckland Council expect the Local Board to manage and maintain the Islands public assets on this low level of funding?

Does Auckland Council think that the tens of thousands of domestic and international visitors will have no impact on the Islands infrastructure over the next 3 years?

Therefore, in accordance with my support for Option - Pay more and get more I would want to see Waiheke's Capital funding increased to a realistic and equitable level. After all, Waiheke is frequently cited as the "jewel" of Auckland and promoted as a must visit regional tourist destination.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Please see my comments under the previous question re the total inadequacy of the \$2.5M in capital funding intended for the Waiheke Local Board for the next 3 years



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else 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?

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:



#9936



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



#9936



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#9936



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#9936



| | |
|--|---------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Yes fund Waiheke Local Board appropriately

1d. Is there anything else 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:

There should be a petrol tax

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

EV charging

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



#9941



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#9941



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#9941



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#9941



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke is a taonga and should be invested in

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#9945



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport should be prioritised.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#9945



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



#9945



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of | Support |



#9945



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#9945



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Climate adaptation, at domestic and city level

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#9964



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I want to see a long term commitment and investment in public transport infrastructure that seeks to be more sustainable, moving away from roading and fossil fuels

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport infrastructure

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:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 believe AIAL as a major public asset should stay in NZ hands, it belongs to the people of Auckland.



#9964



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:



#9964



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#9964



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#9964



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

These projects and priorities have been agreed with the local community and reflect our needs and priorities

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#9978



less hiring of contractors and employing locals instead. These contractors do not have their work checked eg. Treescape signed off council work which has not been done in my area, Sick of trying to get accountability. These and others such as Downer are big businesses with all the associated bureaucracy to be paid for.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

RETAIN the Gold Card pass from 9am to end of service . Waiheke Islanders who need to travel to hospital or other medical appointments would be unable to return by the 2pm ferry necessary under your suggestion. What sick person wants to wait in the cold for several hours, unable to afford the return fare? The waiting room is a joke.

Traffic management and associated cost has become onerous and is preventing local traditional activities from happening.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings are costed at ridiculous amounts. Stick with simple markings and an island.

Stop AT tinkering with timetables and replacing perfectly good bus shelters. This would save money and locals frustration..

Stop unnecessary advertising of planned objectives and just do it!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:



#9978



This comes under the not essential category. Just maintain 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:

The airport is a vital boundary. It was bought with public money and needs to be retained by the public. It is an asset which will grow in value. Why pay others to take their share of monies earned by a managed fund? KEEP ALL OUR SHARES IN THE AIRPORT.

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:

A community asset. If another organisation can run the ports profitably what does it say about the council that it cannot.? DO NOT DISPOSE 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?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Investing is for the future. Costs increase all the time so USE the money NOW TO FUND COUNCIL SERVICES. Managed funds are as risky as any investment.



#9978



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

DO NOT LEASE, KEEP 100 PER CENT OWNERSHIP.

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?

Other

Tell us why:

no confidence in the council planning for other uses of our waterfront.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#9978



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

impossible to comment without any knowledge of areas outside our own, hence "don't know"



#9978



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |



#9978



Tell us why

Money needs to be prioritised by our Board.

Our board has had a cut of 70 percent. Why is this? Waiheke are a most involved community and have needs beyond those of locals to cater for the many tourists which are directed here by Auckland Council CCO. IN

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

council will need to supplement the Boards income to just maintain our assets

Why are you penalising the Jewel of the Gulf.???

8. Do you have any other comments?

there is a need for greater accountability across all areas of Auckland Council and especially their contracted workers. Also give workers the freedom to do what needs doing not what is just directed = more efficient use of men and machinery



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

We pay too much on rates as it is. Spend less on consulting fees! Spend more on roads and fix them up properly! Bring back our rubbish bins. Get off your overpriced *****'s!!!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10003



Get rid of AC consultants!

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Your proposal is just *****! You spend all this money on speed bumps, crossings, bike lanes, electric buses etc and it is no value to us. The electric buses are too heavy for our waiheke roads, the bike lanes are hardly used (tourists ride all over the ***** road!), crossings have been installed in unsafe locations etc.

look at the dire situation of our ferry services too!

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fixing all the ***** potholes!!!

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Consultants!! Electric transport- Buses!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I do not use this facility

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other



#10003



Tell us why:

Maintain our assets. Don't let them fall into such a poor state of repair. Do not sell off our assets!

Stop with the climate *****.

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:

Because the government will only lease the property to their cronies who will be the only ones who will benefit from the 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:

Use the revenue to put back into the asset it was generated from. If the asset makes more money the. It needs more investment.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:



#10003



We don't need any more ***** down there.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#10003



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Fix the wastewater system in the cbd as it is stuffing up the entire hauraki gulf. This is not climate change. It is poor maintenance management!

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities



#10003



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

Stop with the climate change *****! Bring back the services we had and are paying rates for!

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As above



#10003



8. Do you have any other comments?

Fix our roads! Get rid of the electric busses that have been causing damage to our roads!

Clear out the ***** drains to prevent properties flooding!

That's a start!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Yes - fund the maintenance of community assets on Waiheke

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10006



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I don't care about North Shore 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:

I don't think we need to own the airport

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#10006



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:

It makes very little sense to have so much great waterfront land tied up in moving cars from overseas

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:

It's in the wrong place

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



#10006



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#10006



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#10006



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Cutting capital funding to Waiheke where residents pay \$27m per annum in rates is appalling and should be rethought

8. Do you have any other comments?

Do not cut Waiheke funding- a 70% cut to capital funding is absolutely appalling.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Remove gold card subsidy to all bit those on low incomes on Waiheke ferries



#10010



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?

Safer Cycleways to get people pff cars safely

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Building more roads

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:

Stop selling our assets!!!!!! You have sold enough already . I do not trust your sense of what is the right thing to do.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#10010



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Stop trying to sell our profitable income streams . Short term thinking.

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 trust the governance to make this find profitable. Keep your current assets.

4d. Do you have 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:

Make an alternative use a profitable and socially beneficial one that benefits people and commercial 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



#10010



Tell us why:

Same as above. Find new ways to make money instead of selling off our existing profitable ventures.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#10010



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#10010



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Library and kids playgrounds very important for community

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Do not cut out budget by 70%. We pay 24million dollars in rates and gave the largest cut of all the boards. This is unacceptable.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Keep our funding relative to the rates value we pay to council. Currently is not fair for us.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Spending money on consultants to get a second, third or fourth opinion on an issue



#10014



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycleways are critical to helping reduce the need for more cars

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Aligning the planned open loop public transit system with the rest of the country would reduce costs, rather than AT going it alone and then having to align to a national open loop system later. Seems a massive waste of resources given global examples

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?



#10014



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#10014



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#10014



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

A 70% reduction in the capex available to critical infrastructure and services on Waiheke (the largest reduction of any area) is nonsensical given the tourism opportunity and approach to using the island to market Auckland to the world.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#10014



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Priorities are mostly fine but the cut in capex over next 3 years is outrageous given the council’s tourism and visitor aspirations

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10018



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10018



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#10018



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10018



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#10018



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Pay contractors exorbitant amounts for little outcome. Downers are ripping off the council and therefore the tax payer. We need more value for money in everything.



#10023



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)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10023



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10023



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>I don't know</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?



#10023



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why



#10023



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

A 70% cut to the Waiheke Local Board's budget for capital spend from 1 July this year for three years is appalling!

Capital is the money we invest in our long-term permanent assets like our tracks, facilities, and playgrounds. This is the reason we pay our rates

The board's capital budget fixed in the last long-term plan was to be \$8.42 million for the next three years however the proposed to cut to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years (a 70% cut) is just unbelievable. OUR PROPERTIES VALUE AND THEREFORE OUR RATES HAVE PRACTICALLY DOUBLED OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS AND YET SOMEHOW THE COUNCIL HAS NO MONEY??

Waiheke has the biggest % cut of all 21 local boards. SOME OTHER BOARDS HAVE NO CUTS next year.

Spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch up maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks will be seriously impacted. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up enormously. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, or repair and replace.

Ratepayers of the Waiheke Local Board area paid approx. \$27 million (excl. GST) this financial year. Why are we being cut when others are receiving no cuts? Why are we being discriminated against?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Police in central city

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10080



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#10080



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#10080



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |



#10080



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#10080



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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 public transport, better protection of the Hauraki gulf and waterways in general

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

LESS ROADS



#10098



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I don't believe there should be a reduction in cycle lanes or on safety measures. I am also concerned that fares for Waiheke commuters will continue to increase. I am concerned about the Waiheke ferry operations in general - Waiheke residents are completely dependant on this service for work and health reasons.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Reducing public transport costs for commuters

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:

Because we have major issues that need to be addressed NOW and getting rid of assets is a short term solution that will lose money for us in the long run.



#10098



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:

We should be investing in our port and making the most of the asset that it is. Currently we are wasting it's beauty and potential.

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 believe in the creation of 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:

Cities all over the world make the most of their harbours for the general public and tourism. We need to be utilising these assets to create the best city Auckland can be.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#10098



I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10098



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#10098



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think it is appalling that our spend is being reduced so heavily, especially when we manage our own water and sewerage and our roading requires so much less maintenance. Furthermore, on Waiheke we pay rates already that are unbalanced compared to our Auckland city counterparts. I think it would be AWESOME if we could get a community swimming pool - this is something the community has been trying to make happen for over 25 years. I don't agree that Auckland central council should have increased say over Waiheke's assets, I do agree with looking after the Gulf and elimination of toxic algae

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Treat Waiheke like all other suburbs of Auckland council, take care of what they / we have there. No justification to rack the rates up and let a community down.

Look at other parts of the country - eg Wanaka. Looked after very well by the Queenstown district.



#10147



It's no ok and so unfair to take 70 % on average from rate payers who pay the same as people lining in "the main land" Auckland. Release Waiheke from your jurisdiction if you can not live up to how you treat the rest of the "Auckland" community"

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do road works on the down time (season) not as summer is coming and have a million useless cones with no one working behind them.

Also make a round about built quicker than someone building the twin towers.

Then show that there was a reason for the wait. Nope there wasn't. It was literally just a roundabout near the school did not make anything safer.

This is only the start. I actually feel sorry for the employee at AK council having to read all of what you do pay less and what we need to pay less.

Good luck on that'

Get rid of the double decker buses. No where else on the country has diesel guzzling tip top - empty busses causing our rate payers to have to pay for trees to be cut back to fit them on the tiny roads of Waiheke.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

It's pretty obvious you know why. But that is ridiculous I say that as you at council clearly clearly x a trillion have no clue.

If Auckland council had some smarts - they would take care of our beautiful Island and do all it takes to preserve it to create tourism to flourish.

The list could go on how let down a suburb of the Ak council is. It is beyond.

The beaches and tracks are not even maintained.

It's an island.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Beaches, safer walk ways - foot paths.



#10147



Think the rest of the community will give you a heads up.

The list is very long.

- getting unzipped from Auckland council.

-

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cones

Reducing needed road works

Paying for fullers - double decker busses taking away our trees, ruining our environment.

Spending less on not caring of our beautiful island. Spend more - not everyone is rich here, we all need the same stability like the rest of auckland.

No doubt key words will just be scanned on this and nothing with change.

But it has to

Don't be dumb. It let anyone above you do so.

Stand up and look after our country.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Don't 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



#10147



Tell us why:

Don't trust the Mayor or the council to do anything.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

The ports should be moved. No other major city in the world has a port that leads trucks to a main highway. The congestion would deplete if they were moved. It's also an eye sore.

Auckland is ruined by the traffic due to trucks loading onto Stanley street Motor way.

It's obvious what to do. Start the move

Turn that area into a place for businesses to thrive and our people to enjoy the beauty of our harbour

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Don't trust the council to invest in the way I believe it should be. Unless someone stands for Auckland that has the right balance of care and practice.

That's not in this term ;(

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Are we just doing your job by answering these ridiculously Long confusing questions.

If your asking the average person they don't have time to read this. Busy working to pay their rates.



#10147



Get busy and change

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Because I don't know!

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Because I don't know. But it's probably a great idea if it means the port is gone

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | Support |



#10147



| | |
|---|--------------|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Just be sensible. Look after the people, environment, and animals.

So unfair so many people won't be filling this crazy form out - you all just should know these answers.

Embarrassing.



#10147



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#10147



Tell us why

Do you want an essay. I am supporting my home. Look after it like you do with the rest of Auckland.

I will be up all night if I tell you why.

Ticked the boxes.

Work it for our people and the environment please 🙏

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fi



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Keep the Ports of Auckland

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10151



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

In the future, we will RELY on good transport infrastructure & public transport options.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

green energy transport initiatives

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:

At least the redevelopment might be useful

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#10151



Tell us here:

Keep ownership of this valuable asset

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've lost faith in the Council since the current mayor took over. I can't be confident the Council is operating in the best interested of the citizens.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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?



#10151



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#10151



| | |
|---|--|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#10151



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The local board understands the needs and identifies important capital projects for support

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am trying to provide affordable housing on Waiheke but the rates are crippling me.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?



#10185



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?



#10185



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10185



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10185



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#10185



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?



#10213



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support investment in public transport and cycleways

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Include Waiheke in PTOM, free youth public transport.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#10213



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



#10213



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#10213



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#10213



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Track and facility maintenance and improvement is a high priority but impossible with the proposed funding cuts of \$2m per year! The community facilities team currently does a great job, but without budget our assets will become run down and eventually cost more to repair. These assets were largely acquired through community fundraising efforts before Auckland Council.

Swimming pool is a higher priority than equestrian facilities as it would benefit more people.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Fairer Funding to reinstate Waiheke's budget.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#10432



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Please make it easier and more reliably (especially Waiheke Ferry) to get around Auckland by 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?

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:

Some of AIAL shares have already been sold without any apparent benefit to Auckland. Auckland Airport is a strategic asset we need to maintain control (and profit) from it. Please don't sell off the family silverware.

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:

Profits from the operation of the port will accrue to Auckland not some private (Overseas?) lessee. The port is a strategic asset. We need to retain control and benefit. They sold off the railway and look what happened - they ran it into the ground!

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:

Efficient operation of the port would use this space effectively.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Why put limits on what is a strategic asset, a revenue generating operation of real benefit to Auckland.



#10432



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#10432



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#10432



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Use the rates collected from Waiheke properties to fix the pot holes and broken curbs on the narrow winding roads and make the cycle tracks continuous.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10608



Less expenditure on the environment. Let nature regenerate itself and prohibit development in flood prone areas.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

The council should stop allowing traffic lanes to be blocked while buildings are constructed. The design should allow ALL construction and delivery services to be carried out on the site. NOT as the case on Custom street where CHINA CONstruction has blocked lanes for several years

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

STRONGLY OPPOSE PROPOSAL to CANCEL SUPERGOLD FREE TRAVEL between 3 and 7pm

THIS IS THE ONLY PLACE where this document allows this COMMENT

Less on salaries for the management unless they are competent.

The have your say site only works on goggle chrome and not on IMAC Safari. The council document We want your feed back gives site "akhaveyoursay.nz:" This does NOT work on SAGARI.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

The stadium should be suitable for NORTH SHORE residents ONLY. People will not travel from other areas such as SOUTH/WEST/ AUCKLAND and Waiheke on a regular basis



#10608



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into 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 a monopoly and poor management has continued in recent years.

This is not a, GOOD reason to lease the operational actives. Previous councils have leased out/contracted out waste management, rail, ferry etc.

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:

Future generations are generally "better off" and will be able to look after themselves. They may have to reduce their lifestyle such including overseas trips for themselves, school trips for their children, and entertainment by going to Australia for concerts and sports events.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

A future fund will have limitations due to INFLATION. NOT A GOOD INVESTMENT.



#10608



Events where the future funds would be used should be financed by borrowing. That the council has a DEBT limit is due to mismanagement and NOT a good reason to establish a future fund.

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:

PORT COMPANY Should become more efficient and there is no reason for cement from North Auckland to be transported to the CBD area. CARS need not be imported through Auckland.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount | Do not support |



#10608



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10608



GOVERNMENT FACILITIES such as IRD premises, Law enforce:

Police stations should pay rates. If Schools and Universities take in OVERSEAS Students then a .rates component should be paid by government

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Not Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#10608



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Recreation is vital for a healthy community, includes all ages and fitness levels.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Retaining and promoting fitness activities which support healthy outcomes. The walking tracks have not been restored since the last big weather event affecting tracks around church bay and Matiatia. Cycle tracts should be continuous and pot holes fixed and roads maintained.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE PROPOSAL TO REMOVE the FREE SUPERGOLD CARD TRAVEL

between 3 and 7pm week days.

The councils documentation/publications is very poor and history of its activities is non existent.

Communicating with the Council is Frustrating and highly inefficient. The AT interface is poor. If the initial statements about , for example. If services are ava have been accessed in the past MONTH then by pass this information. It wastes tiome



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?



#10611



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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?



#10611



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 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#10611



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?



#10611



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |



#10611



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I do not agree with the propose funding cuts for Waiheke local board, 70% cut over 3 years is too drastic and unfair compared to other local boards. We don't benefit from many council services that we have to pay a share for, such as public transport and pool/leisure facilities. To cut local funding also is very unfair.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Do more on transport, except for anything the encourages the use of private cars.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10647



Anything that encourages the use of private cars.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do more to reduce traffic in central city. Actively implement user congestion charges and reduce parking in the city.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport, cycling and pedestrian improvements

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other



#10647



Tell us here:

Don't support leasing port. Strongly support moving port from existing site.

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



#10647



| | |
|---|----------------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |



#10647



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#10647



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Looks OK. effort needed to improve ferry service reliability..

More work on reducing helicopter landing sites and overall helicopter use.

Enforce current requirements to keep flying over island areas to a minimum.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

There is not an option for making savings within existing budgets and the option for redistribution of equity to avoid the need for large increases in rates to be able to achieve the essential work required. Why not?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#10692



There is not an option for making savings within existing budgets and the options for the redistribution of equity to avoid the need for large increases in rates to be able to achieve the essential work required. Why not?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I live on Waiheke and get very little benefit from the proposal and will be disadvantaged with the changes to the Gold AT Hop time availability changes. Transport travel costs and reliability of ferry services are already challenging/costly for residents.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

There are two significant washed out areas at the Eastern end of the island on Orapiu Road that have been cordoned off and are unsafe since the cyclone. If there is further subsiding this winter the road could be completely impassable cutting off the eastern end community. The gravel loop road needs urgent sealing.

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:

I don't live on the North Shore or will ever benefit from any investment/change. It seems obvious that something needs to change!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#10692



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

This should offset the need for any rate increase.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Whichever will result in lower rate increase

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:

Not much point having a future fund if our roads and wastewater are not future proofed NOW.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Again - whatever is going to create the best financial outcome to be able to achieve the priority areas of transport/roads and water without the need for huge increases in rates.



#10692



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

As above comments

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10692



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

We are all on septic tanks on Waiheke and do not have any sewerage system for our rates.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#10692



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

I suspect infrastructure is not included in Local Board funding - but it is hard to focus on other aspects of funding when the roads, water and power infrastructure is a far greater priority to spend any money on.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As above comment - it seems that if there is such a need to find the money to complete fundamental infrastructure upgrades across the Auckland Council region - perhaps the funding model needs to be completely looked at "what money there is over the next 10 years" should be prioritised on infrastructure.



#10692



8. Do you have any other comments?

As above.

No point having the "nice to haves" if you don't have stable power supply, safe road access, and your house is being flooded every time it rains.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#10739



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

My concern is the 15:00- 18:30 when gold card users cannot use their card. I have a gold card but I still work. Actually I work for the council, through Auckland Live which is an important revenue for council. Most of my work is in the evenings at all the venues at Aotea and Viaduct so would be travelling in from 15:00 onwards. Mr Wayne Brown should know we play an important part in the success of Auckland City and more and more gold cardholders are now working for the Council. Open your eyes Mr Brown.

2a. Is there anything you 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?

Other

Tell us here:



#10739



Move the port and make better accommodation for cruise ships.

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



#10739

| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#10739



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#10739



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

I would like to see less outside consultants used. They cost council a fortune and Council lose in house expertise



#10742



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Raised pedestrian crossings are expensive to install. temporary traffic management is often there to protect contractors working on the roads,

removal of these would endanger lives. Capped weekly transport passes a good idea.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is a fantastic facility and the largest on the shore. There used to be concerts etc held there, and that should happen again. Also supporting baseball etc to become established at 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:

This would hand Airport over to overseas investment and lessen the say that Auckland have in any future development.



#10742



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 a good asset & investment whereas cash investments fluctuate year on year.

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 does not need more truck movements to bring goods into the city.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#10742



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#10742



| | |
|---|--------------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#10742



| | |
|--|------------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Despite collecting \$27 million from Waiheke Ratepayers Council want to reduce the CAPEX budget to \$2.5 million for 3 years. This is not right. There is a constant need to upgrade the facilities on the island due to pressure from environment and visitor numbers.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fairer funding for local boards - why has Waiheke's been reduced the most of all the local boards in Auckland?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#10770



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?



#10770



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount | Support |



#10770



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10770



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |



#10770



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

BUT, you are proposing to slash the capital spend on Waiheke Island, drastically, it seems unreasonable given the rate take on Waiheke Island is \$30,000,000 + annually.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

- 1) Include Waiheke in the public transport system with similar reduced fares, especially for residents.
- 2) Improve bicycle infrastructure, especially on Waiheke Island. Cycleways are key to reducing traffic and improving quality of life.



#10830



3) Improve funding for Waiheke Island local board.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do not sell public assets (ports and airport shares)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Improve bicycle infrastructure is key to improving our city. Safe cycleways are necessary for reducing traffic and improving quality of life.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

1) Cycle ways... reintroduce regional fuel tax and discourage gas guzzling, polluting vehicles.

2) Include Waiheke in the public transport system with similar reduced fares, especially for residents.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Anything that encourages people to drive into the city.

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)?



#10830



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

These proposals are drivers to privatise the commons that are owned by all of us.

Councillors will have less control of money coming from ports if shares are sold.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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?



#10830



I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10830



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#10830



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke Island is a special case because of the huge amounts of tourists entertained there every year. As a result, funding should be increased to Waiheke Local Board to help improve services offered and to maintain the Island and prevent it becoming an e

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It is outrageous that funding is being cut to the Waiheke local board!

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Prioritising the development of infrastructure, resilience and community support and collectivism to prepare for the challenges of climate change and environmental degradation - over building up the funds to pay for the damages resulting from crises. It is cheaper and more efficient in the long-term to prepare rather than clean up after



#10835



disasters. Acknowledging that local authorities often do not have the capacity to respond 'in the moment' as ordinary citizens do (eg. the East Coast floods in 2023), it is imperative that councils and local boards prioritise developing community resilience.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Building more roads. Focus on fixing what's there and much better public transport options.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support all the initiatives that improve public transport which will ultimately reduce congestion and enhance people's lives by reducing their transport costs, improving accessibility to services for low- and middle-income people and making the city more pleasant and livable.

I do not support further restrictions to use of the AT GOLD card between 3.00 PM – 6.30 PM weekdays. I am an older Waiheke resident on a very restricted income and undertaking PhD research at Auckland University. I travel in for my work and sometimes have to pay if I need to travel for an early meeting. I stay overnight at least once a week with a friend in town to minimise travel costs. My research is into strengthening community preparedness for climate change which is the greatest and existential challenge of our time. I could not afford to do what I believe is important work to benefit the community (hopefully with insights for many other NZ communities) if I had to pay for more of my ferry travel. I took on this work knowing that I could use public transport at limited costs to make it viable. I know others in a similar situation who use their opportunity to travel into the city to make important contributions to civic life.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Electrification of the ferries and all public transport to reduce pollution and carbon emissions and reduction in ferry costs for commuters who rely on the services to get to work and education. Public transport - as above in 2.



#10835



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Any non-essential new roading initiatives.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Redevelopment looks like the option that would deliver more benefits for the 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

providing for future needs is an important principle, just as saving is for individuals. From the information given it looks like the council would retain just as much control over AIAL's commitments to the interests of Auckland City as it does now. Also - as the gateway to the country and as such a strategic national asset - I assume the central government would be able to restrict any moves by the airport that would be harmful to the nation as a whole.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

I would prefer the port's cargo operations be moved out of Auckland Harbour - they are a blight on the central city - probably to Northport or Tauranga and rail transport



#10835



improved to avoid further road congestion. With that option not on the table the best alternative of what is offered is to lease the operation of the port and invest the funds.

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:

While I want to see better investment in infrastructure and services to support and enhance people's lives (that must be the primary role of the council) and build resilience in the face of increased challenges, it is also prudent to invest in the future. We know for certain that many things are going to get more difficult as the pace of change and challenges picks up.

4d. Do you have 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:

This option will potentially provide great public benefit with little downside to the business operations of the port.

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:



#10835



In the absence of plans to move the port operations out of the central city this seems the next best option on the table - to at least have a time frame for getting rid of that large part of the port operation and its accompanying eyesore and heavy traffic issues.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#10835



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I also advocate for Option 4 for the Natural Environment Targeted Rate that includes the capacity to respond to emerging threats and support community led initiatives.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#10835



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke has often been described as 'the jewel in the crown' of the Hauraki Gulf and of the Auckland Region. It is a huge tourist attraction internationally and visitors often tell us that Waiheke was at the top of their 'bucket list' of places to go to.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

See 7b answers above. the importance of Waiheke to the Auckland region is far greater than the simply its permanent population percentage.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#10836



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

More rail and less roads

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Decent reliable rail service

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

More 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:

Never sell the family jewels.

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



#10836



Tell us here:

We've been told for years that the port will need to move. And we don't want to lose any more of our harbour. So plans should be made to move the port north.

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:

Well obviously council needs the 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?

Other

Tell us why:

The port needs to be moved so all that land can be used to enhance that area for all Aucklanders. And the trucks that clog the wharf area could also move elsewhere.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#10836



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#10836



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#10836



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#10871



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#10871



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#10871



| | |
|---|----------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#10871



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#10871



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

While I agree with the priorities, the lack of funding and removal of new initiatives is a slap in the face to ratepayers. The amount of investment does not equate to the amount of rates taken by council, and will surely see a lot of complaints about why we pay rates and enormous ferry costs to get utterly disregarded by the council.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | |
| 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?



#10900



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle paths and more facility for active transport plus more on busways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

new 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#10900



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



#10900



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of | I don't know |



#10900



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | I don't know |



#10900



| | |
|--|--------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| 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?



#11050



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 lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11050



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#11050



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11050



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#11050



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Possibly, but need precise details on what you are planning to spend on to provide informed response.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Maybe, but need clearer details to make a decision on.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Need forward thinking council to provide a mixed model transport system.

Need students to have access to buses.

Don't limit gold card use - difficult enough already to move about for appts.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

not being utilised enough, when it cld be.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#11064



Bad idea

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:

Not good for 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?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Best idea

4d. Do you have 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



#11064



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#11064



| | |
|---|---------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#11064



| | |
|--|----------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We hve a massive tax take here, not many services for that. Horrifying that you want to STEAL what little we have in this small underfunded community.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Our council reps are best people to respond to this. I echo their voice.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Maintain and/or increase funding for the arts; the environment; clean transport, CRL; upgrade trains; and fix infrastructure malfunctions causing raw sewerage to flow into our seas. STOP driftnetting in the Hauraki Gulf. Clean up Caulerpa and fresh water environments. Work with local councils to build community gardens. Install solar



#11133



panels on Council buildings. Convince citizens of the importance of installing water tanks. Provide access to inform where trees are impacting on power lines and trim/top/ trees before they damage powerlines and cut off power. I could go on ... but basically, we have been underpaying our rates for decades too long and that desperately needs to change to invest in our long-term infrastructure. We are so far behind so many large cities in the world as to appear laughable and completely outdated. We all need to pay for the shortcomings of our forebears in terms of long-term planning. Extend underground power cabling where overhead power lines are - they impact of power outages and on Waiheke, they are a major problem waiting to cause incredible damage.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I don't believe we should pay less - we should pay more.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycle ways are important for our clean future. We must 'get over' our dependance on cars. I fully support completion of any Public Transport infrastructure providing clean and rapid transportation to minimise our dependance on cars.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

as above

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

reliance on building new roads where public transportation could suffice.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management



#11133



Tell us why:

It's built, it's been funded, so use the damned place to enhance local economies and diversify the offering available. Obviously the current management cannot think outside the square.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Why would you get rid of a present/future income earner for your Council coffers?! What do you do when that money runs out? AIAL is upgrading its facilities, so surely income projections will rise.

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:

As above for AIAL - don't kill a golden goose.

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 wouldn't you - that's a win/win.



#11133



4d. Do you have 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:

Get rid of the 'Car park', but maintain some Port business where it is. Move the Cruise Ship berthing OUT OF THE WAY of the ferry terminals. Aucklanders should NOT have to miss ferry connections because of incoming cruise ships. Move them to berth at t

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I'm not sure of the economic impact, but I would like to see the Ports moved out of the city centre. I do not, however, want to see a sports stadium built. We should be planting trees and creating more green spaces in our inner city, both for our inhabitants to enjoy our waterside beauty, and for us to maintain a healthy air quality.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount | Do not support |



#11133



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#11133



We must support the extension and increase of our water quality monitoring and health. We need more investment in WQTR. You must support remediation of our waterways to increase biodiversity necessary for life. You must support recycling - food as well.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |



#11133



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We support what we know - it's simple. Small communities listen to each other and act on behalf of each other.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I would like to see major work done on overhanging trees interfering with power lines - a very dangerous prospect. Drains need constant monitoring to be cleared, so that they can function properly. We need to address income versus accommodation imbalances, to provide affordable funding for the 'workers': tradies, hospo, health, teachers, in general those living on the island trying to find accommodation. Too many houses remain uninhabited year round, preventing those with jobs finding suitable and achievable rental properties. The 'Queenstown' or tourism mecca problems that we see all around the world needs a solution.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#11156



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Spend wisely and not things like extraordinary costs for pedestrian crossings and cycle ways or bus lanes that restrict traffic flow.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Can't make a judgement on an area I don't live in or 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

I have already voted on this. Do not agree to sell all shares in Airport but as proposed.

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



#11156



Tell us here:

Do not want ownership to be transferred to any other operator or leaseholder of 35 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:

Local councils need funding even for most basic operation. Keep the status quo and keep it fair .

4d. Do you have 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:

Status quo.

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?



#11156



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#11156



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11156



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Our local Council is not receiving fair funding for operation. Our Ratepayers PER YEAR pay approx \$27 million. Your proposal for funding is 70% less than we were getting and that is \$2.5 million over 3 years. Unfair, and why the biggest cut of all 21 local boards? Get real and treat Waiheke fairly!

8. Do you have any other comments?

I repeat - unfair funding to Waiheke Local Board. Return to previous years funding model!!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| 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?



#11161



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:

The stadium is too far from the centre city and we are well supplied with major sports 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)?

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:



#11161



Definitely keep ownership and operation of port! We must not lease it out and thereby lose control of operations and risk misuse and abuse of assets. Etc

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:

This valuable space is currently underused by Ports when it could be so much a part of central Auckland and used as a public space in many different ways!

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?



#11161



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#11161



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11161



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

A funding cut of 70% is unthinkable and will cause a flow on effect of deterioration to our assets such as maintenance and development of walking tracks etc. this is a metexc s I've cut and many re than any other board.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

With the current mortgage rate I don't want to do anything or any shopping.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

STOP SPENDING MONEY FOR THE ROAD WORK.



#11162



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11162



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#11162



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Do not support |



#11162



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |



#11162



| | |
|--|--|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11167



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

the proposal is not reasonable, it is "either/or" but there are other choices available

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Make public transport free , to eliminate wasteful clunky ticketing systems and really encourage use, and tailor bus sizes to usage and routes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Why should we as ratepayers hugely support one or two types of mass entertainment (2/3 sports codes & big travelling shows, both are for-profit) and not all the others

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 past history of selling assets should be enough of an answer. Once sold, Aucklanders will pay more and more, for less and less - and the city will never get a proportionate return from the private managers/owners

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#11167



Other

Tell us here:

Move the port. It strangles the central city- and it's not just "ours " it belongs to iwi too

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?

Other

Tell us why:

use the area for almost anything that benefits citizens - NOT another sports stadium or conference venue

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:

use the area for almost anything that benefits citizens - NOT another sports stadium or conference venue



#11167



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#11167



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11167



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

these are just smokescreens, as actually you have proposed slashing actual spending and removing local input, and use of local operators to deliver services

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

not convinced that council can or will deliver: record so far shows contempt for local knowledge

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Whatever you do, make sure that your cuts do not come at the expense of the most vulnerable community members - children and economically disadvantaged people (which includes the elderly). They need access to affordable public transport, libraries and community centres.



#11203



Look after assets - provide for maintenance and renewals and focus on must-do capital projects only.

1d. Is there anything else 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:

I support the focus on public transport. In tough economic times this is more important than ever, and it has environmental benefits.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

The airport is a key public asset that should not be divested to private interests.



#11203



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:

These questions are too simplistic, given the complexity of the issue.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#11203



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#11203



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11203



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Given the economic realities for many, provision of equestrian facilities seems rather unnecessary. Make sure that essential services work - that includes transport on and off-island, which is bordering on the unaffordable for people who live and work on the island. The reduced (AT) commuter ticket is great, and whatever you do, DO NOT reduce AT Gold card transport concessions as this would make it unaffordable for the elderly to go to Auckland - and they are one of the key groups that rely on this, to access medical services.

Introduce better oversight and management and accountability of council-funded programmes that are delivered by local groups.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Less special provision for Maori. This sort of thing is dividing our society.



#11211



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11211



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:

Stop the special provision for Maori. We are getting sick of this BS

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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | |



#11211



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |



#11211



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |



#11211



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

While central government ministers are going off the rails ignorantly reducing spend and the regulations that protect our environment and bending to please overseas political influences, it is essential that Auckland Council remains focused on the



#11226



physical reality that we rely on Auckland's ecosystems and natural environment for our physical and mental wellbeing and enjoyment.

I support additional spend for taking care of our indigenous species and ecosystems and managing threats to them including animal pests (browsers and predators) and plant pests, and diseases such as kauri dieback.

I also support substantial increases in Council's spend on acquiring new park land specifically to protect indigenous ecosystems and natural landforms and landscapes, which is woefully overdue.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Any roading spend (above adequate maintenance) for the benefit of traffic rather than public transport, cycling and pedestrians.

I would not support additional spend to compensate for any recent central government reductions (e.g. the regional fuel tax). Government ministers should take responsibility and be answerable to Aucklanders, without general ratepayers needing to compensate for their poor decisions.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I would not support additional spend to compensate for recent central government reductions in the regional fuel tax. Government ministers should take responsibility and be answerable to Aucklanders, without general ratepayers needing to compensate for their poor decisions.

Under the transport section of the budget I'd support paying more for further improvements in public transport, rail, pedestrian improvements and more separated cycling lanes, and reductions in spend to support car or roading (beyond adequate maintenance).

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?



#11226



Spend more on subsidising Waiheke commuter ferry services as well as pursuing any regulatory processes to regulate and control fares on Waiheke ferry services and limit their profitability

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:

Unaffected by this as I live on Waiheke Island and generally consider such facilities are a bit of a white elephant

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

The leasing option looks like a slippery slope towards privatisation of the port which I am strongly opposed to



#11226



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:

There's clearly a need to manage costs in the present

4d. Do you have 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 wharves transfer option is poorly considered and demonstrates no compelling options or pressing need. Who knows what hare-brained scheme might eventuate - a useless stadium blocking views to and from the harbour?

The wharf transfer option also looks l

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The Bledisloe terminal transfer option is poorly considered and demonstrates no compelling options or pressing need. Who knows what hare-brained scheme might eventuate - a useless stadium blocking views to and from the harbour?

The wharf transfer option also looks like a slippery slope towards privatisation of the port which I am strongly opposed to.



#11226



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#11226



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Support increasing the NETR targetted rate, at least in line with inflation, but at very least resuming NETR as proposed

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, | Very Important |



#11226



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Important for Council to work with mana whenua to support their aspirations and fund them to engage and work with Council effectively.

Also important for the Council group to be proactive, visible and forthright in supporting mana whenua and te reo Māori and to fund these efforts effectively



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Under Transport we would like more investment in public transport (making it cheaper) and less on roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11265



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do not want cycleways stopped

2a. Is there anything you 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:

The Airport is essentially a community resource and a strategic facility that should not be in private hands. The Council should keep its share at the very least.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#11265



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:

Believe that POAL should be moved so the waterfront can be used as a public resource. Leasing it out guarantees it will stay as it is now for a long time.

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:

Some of the profits and dividends could be used in the 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:

It is about time the public got to use these spaces

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



#11265



Tell us why:

As previous

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#11265



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#11265



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Priorities are ok, but the Budget is too small. Any cut to the Budget is unacceptable, let alone 70% which is more than any other region. This means our services will be seriously degraded over time and require more input later.

Equestrian facilities are not required.

With regard to ferry services, we would like to see an emphasis on "affordable", and this includes continuation of the Gold Card free fares from 9am.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The specific mention of equestrian facilities is unfair focus on a very small part of the community.

We would much rather have emphasis on cultural support, e.g. marae activities and the Waiheke Musical Museum, Art Gallery and Theatre



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support 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?



#11267



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11267



| | |
|---|--------------|
| harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |



#11267



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#11267



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#11279



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:

We dont have the money to redevelop. I dont believe it will cost \$3.3m per year in upkeep.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11279



Leasing it would be less of a distraction to council. Let someone else manage it who is better equipped.

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

Support



#11279



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#11279



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |



#11279



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The proposal to cut the budget by 70% is actually embarrassing. The make up of residents on the island has changed so much in the last 5 years. So many young families with kids have come to the island which is amazing. Now is not the time to be cutting our capital investment - we pay significant rates, we (Waiheke) want to see the benefits, not subsidise other parts of Auckland

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

paint sharrows for bicycles on road instead of cycle paths, paint red dot for roundabout , treat money as if your own, reduce staff become efficient, try to be productive



#11312



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

there is no value for money you don't need raised crossings and bicycles don't need lanes they are vehicles and can take as much of lane they choose. Crossings

don't need to be speed bumps sign and lines enough

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Waiheke has very few footpaths

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Top heavy staffing levels too much bureaucracy little commonsense cost plus mentality

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Don't spend money you don't have

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#11312



sell AIA you didn't take last capital raising over covid at half price now wasting ratepayers money shareholding diluted , you don't have a business mentality , sell shareholding and make airport pay rates

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell half to public become public listed company again similar to Port of Tauranga or Southport or Napier Port or Northport

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:

Users will get screwed if sell operating lease not in this countries interest was mistake to take full control of port, before partly owned good company

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

This is nonsense future fund when you have lots of debt

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:

More public benefit if stayed in port control property used more productively



#11312



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Ports of Auckland is a vital national asset especially there is no motorway to Northport yet or rail spur, it is a wonderful working port and harbour

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |



#11312



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

present rating is huge waiheke pays over \$30 million you are not transparent where it is spent , I believe the mayor has an understanding of the problems

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities



#11312



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

When the bus route road I live in doesn't have a footpath and dangerous to walk to village, get your priorities correct

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

build footpaths on island, some roundabouts i.e red dot type center of road and more pedestrian crossings zebra stripes and signs not raised



#11312



8. Do you have any other comments?

Rates you receive now is huge too much goes on staff and contractors and consultants try to be open and transparent, think of public good



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Auckland Council could do more to ensure compliance with existing bylaws, including proactive measurement and management of noise, pollution and anti-social behaviour.

Auckland Council should do more to realise its Climate Plan and Transport Emissions Reduction Plan.



#11360



Auckland Council needs to improve community resilience, which is partly planning and infrastructure, and partly building community networks.

We would advise against reducing staff levels to the point that they are overwhelmed and unable to give good advice.

We recommend that there is sufficient prioritisation of communication and IT systems to improve customer experience.

We should incentivise more development in the existing urban area close to transport links, perhaps by making it cheaper to get consents, and to connect to water infrastructure in existing suburbs. This would significantly reduce costs on the council over time.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Council should stop enabling housing at the edge of the city where there is no infrastructure. We need a compact city to grow a strong economy, a lower carbon future and better services for residents.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

completing the City Rail Link

improving bus, rail and ferry networks for more reliable service

funding new cycleways and shared paths so that more people have access to the network

delivering new and improved footpaths across Auckland, particularly in the city centre.

“Time of use” charging

a “room to move” programme to review parking in critical areas and increase revenue from parking and Park & Rides.

50% electrified buses by 2030

expanding the rapid transport network (RTN)

a weekly \$50 cap on public transport fares



#11360



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Including Waiheke Island in the public transport system

completing the Downtown and Midtown Bus improvements

more cycleway and walking connections

safety projects around schools and town centres.

better funding for maintaining, expanding and promoting the public transport network, including to more remote areas

rolling out electric ferries and more low-emission buses, plus supporting infrastructure

the Lincoln Road and New North Road corridor upgrades

greater investment in rail: rolling stock, and more support for ongoing Kiwi Rail track maintenance

Street trees and rain gardens

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

We think there are areas where council could spend less. For example, instead of expensive and unnecessary widening of already wide roads like Te Irirangi Drive, we could use existing space for bus lanes and active modes. The Eastern Busway could be rescoped to use the existing road corridor and still have room for a cycleway and footpath. The excess land could then be used for housing.

We also do not support the full expansion of the 'unsealed roads' programme.

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)?



#11360



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The airport shares are a strategic asset that has paid good dividends in the past and will again in the future. We are also concerned that the fund would be whittled down in time in a reactive way rather than being used strategically to transition to a low-carbon and resilient economy, and city.

There are currently no ethical parameters for the Future Fund, so it might invest in companies that exacerbate the climate issues that the fund is designed to address. Investing in a non-ethical fund may jeopardise council's access to low-cost infrastructure loans via Green Bonds.

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 would privatise it for a generation or longer. We would lose control over a key part of our waterfront and the income from its profits (\$52M last year). The proposal may also lead to worse outcomes for workers, and higher costs for New Zealand businesses and consumers. We are concerned also that there will not be sufficient maintenance and modernisation in the latter years of the lease, meaning Aucklanders would have to bear these costs.

Our concerns over the Future Fund (as in 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:



#11360



Port dividends have always been used to fund council services and we do not support a reduction in services when the population is getting larger and the challenges are getting greater.

4d. Do you have 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:

It will open up more of the waterfront space for public enjoyment and events. Cruise ships could be relocated from Queen’s Wharf, meaning less impact on ferries and a more enjoyable space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It would be hugely expensive and environmentally damaging to move port operations from Bledisloe Wharf, and the port would be less able to return a dividend to council.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |
|---|----------------|



#11360



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#11360



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#11360



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The local board of Waiheke is very informed as to local needs. Ratepayers of the Waiheke Local Board area paid approx. \$27 million (excl. GST) this financial year. Waiheke has the biggest cut of all local boards. This is disproportionate and will see tour

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support the local boards long term plans. There should be no cuts to their required budget. A chance to get 'fairer funding' for Waiheke is what I support.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Auckland Council could do more to ensure compliance with existing bylaws, including proactive measurement and management of noise, pollution and anti-social behaviour.

Auckland Council should do more to realise its Climate Plan and Transport Emissions Reduction Plan.



#11361



Auckland Council needs to improve community resilience, which is partly planning and infrastructure, and partly building community networks.

We would advise against reducing staff levels to the point that they are overwhelmed and unable to give good advice.

We recommend that there is sufficient prioritisation of communication and IT systems to improve customer experience.

We should incentivise more development in the existing urban area close to transport links, perhaps by making it cheaper to get consents, and to connect to water infrastructure in existing suburbs. This would significantly reduce costs on the council over time.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Council should stop enabling housing at the edge of the city where there is no infrastructure. We need a compact city to grow a strong economy, a lower carbon future and better services for residents.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support:

completing the City Rail Link

improving bus, rail and ferry networks for more reliable service

funding new cycleways and shared paths so that more people have access to the network

delivering new and improved footpaths across Auckland, particularly in the city centre.

“Time of use” charging

a “room to move” programme to review parking in critical areas and increase revenue from parking and Park & Rides.

50% electrified buses by 2030

expanding the rapid transport network (RTN)



#11361



a weekly \$50 cap on public transport fares

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

completing the Downtown and Midtown Bus improvements

more cycleway and walking connections

safety projects around schools and town centres.

better funding for maintaining, expanding and promoting the public transport network, including to more remote areas

rolling out electric ferries and more low-emission buses, plus supporting infrastructure

the Lincoln Road and New North Road corridor upgrades

greater investment in rail: rolling stock, and more support for ongoing Kiwi Rail track maintenance

Street trees and rain gardens

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Instead of expensive and unnecessary widening of already wide roads like Te Irirangi Drive, we could use existing space for bus lanes and active modes. The Eastern Busway could be rescoped to use the existing road corridor and still have room for a cycleway and footpath. The excess land could then be used for housing.

I also do not support the full expansion of the 'unsealed roads' programme.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

There are more urgent things to spend on.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#11361



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The airport shares are a strategic asset that has paid good dividends in the past and will again in the future. We are also concerned that the fund would be whittled down in time in a reactive way rather than being used strategically to transition to a low-carbon and resilient economy, and city.

There are currently no ethical parameters for the Future Fund, so it might invest in companies that exacerbate the climate issues that the fund is designed to address. Investing in a non-ethical fund may jeopardise council's access to low-cost infrastructure loans via Green Bonds.

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 would privatise it for a generation or longer. We would lose control over a key part of our waterfront and the income from its profits (\$52M last year). The proposal may also lead to worse outcomes for workers, and higher costs for New Zealand businesses and consumers. We are concerned also that there will not be sufficient maintenance and modernisation in the latter years of the lease, meaning Aucklanders would have to bear these costs.

Concerns over the Future Fund (as in 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:



#11361



Port dividends have always been used to fund council services and we do not support a reduction in services when the population is getting larger and the challenges are getting greater.

4d. Do you have 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:

It will open up more of the waterfront space for public enjoyment and events. Cruise ships could be relocated from Queen’s Wharf, meaning less impact on ferries and a more enjoyable space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It would be hugely expensive and environmentally damaging to move port operations from Bledisloe Wharf, and the port would be less able to return a dividend to council.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |
|---|----------------|



#11361



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11361



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#11361



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The environment is the most important to protect.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke has the biggest proposed % cut of all 21 local boards - 70%

Spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch-up maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks will be seriously impacted. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up enormously. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, or repair and replace.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I support fair funding

A chance to get 'fairer funding' for local boards – only if this is agreed can Waiheke expect to return to our prior years' funding model levels under this draft plan.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

More climate action and environmental initiatives. Lobby government for support for marine protections in the Auckland area, including the Hakaimango/Mātiatia marine reserve. Desexing subsidies to help reduce the number of puppies/kittens abandoned or neglected.



#11382



Keep pressuring central government for more funding. (Removing the RFT Auckland Fuel Tax was ridiculous) Free school buses.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Undertake an independent financial audit, increase efficiencies and look to reduce consultant, lawyer and bureaucracy costs to save money.

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?

Ensure public transport and environmentally friendly modes of transport are prioritised. Continue low speed limits.. don't waste money changing them again ☹️

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Ensure transport contracts are fair and represent value for money. Standardise some actions/consents for council (like roundabouts and pedestrian crossings) to ensure efficiency.

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)?



#11382



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

No no and no to an Auckland Future Fund and selling/privatising/leasing assets. Ensure they are well managed and maintain the assets and income streams for future generations.

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:

Absolutely no to leasing/privatising the port and all council assets. As above, these should be retained and enhanced for future generations.

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?

Other

Tell us why:



#11382



I support the views of Councillor Mike Lee on the subject of the Port.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

I support the views of Councillor Mike Lee on the subject of the Port.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |



#11382



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#11382



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

A 70percent cut to the Waiheke Local Board’s budget is disproportionate and excessive.

Slightly outside the remit but the Council needs to lobby for more support and funding from central government to tackle major environmental challenges like caulerpa and fisheries/biodiversity decline - and resist pressure from central government to resume environmentally damaging practices (like sea bed mining/fish farming for instance).



#11382



NZers and Aucklanders in particular have already made it abundantly clear they are against these practices with huge marches and protests. Why the heck are they back on the table? WTF?!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

More, better public transport. Less roads. More bike lines and micromobility, less cars. More protection of the environment, more compliance, more weeding and pest control. Less big events, less marinas, less golf courses. Increase rates, take more debt. I say



#11431



no to the new fund and selling and leasing assets. Retain funding for Waiheke. More taxes tourists and more regulation for airbnbs.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less roads.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Reduce gold card hours/subsidies, more services free or discounted for children. More and safer bike lanes, micromobility, footpaths. Less roads and cars. More trains and buses.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Free public transport for children, bike lanes, footpaths.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Gold car pass holders

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell the stadium for intensification, more apartments. Keep only playing field or space used by community if any.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#11431



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Keep our assets, take debt and increase rates. Sell golf courses and ask marinas to pay a market rate for the space they use. Introduce new taxes, like registration of boats instead.

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:

Introduce a visitor levy to Waiheke for the board to have their funds. Cutting our budget by 70% is unfair.

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.



#11431



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:

Not clear where port will go. We still need a port and if you move it, it needs to connect via rail. We don't need more heavy trucks on the road. Move the cruiseships first.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#11431



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Don't increase pool fees for families please.

I support fairer funding for local boards.

Treat airbnbs and landlords as a business, they should pay business rates.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#11431



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | I don't know |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | I don't know |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

Businesses need to step up on climate change and stop relying on govt. Tax airbnbs. Increase compliance work - too many houses have illegal extensions, conversions and sleepouts in the island. Septic tanks are failing.



#11431



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

less advocacy and talk on supporting tourism.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I don't know. Who has time to read and understand all this when you work full time and are raising a young family.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?

No they are already wasting my tax money fix road surfaces to improve safety don't build speed jumps yes I said jumps and pointless congestion creating garbage. leave speed limits as they were don't spend millions on reduced speed signs and cameras to compensate for poor roads and infalstructure otherwise give more power back to local councils not corrupt politicians.



#11435



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes taking my waiheke island rates money and spending it on projects in Auckland City that I don't live in or visit. When our Island has 3rd world infrastructure no curb and channel for storm water roads that resemble a poorly maintained goat track. Half ***** parks nothing for children to do huge lack of verg mowing. Trees grown through all the power lines.

Spend the money where it came from

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because so far evidence has proven the people making and executing these plans only seem to know how to send money to slow public movement and cost the public more.

Like with waiheke get smaller buses that fit the roads and get them driven at the speed limit not 25-35 km everywhere for no reason. They are always half full and destroying the roads .

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Repairing the road surface and removing the congestion causing noise pollution causing speed bumps and reduced speed signs.

Public parks

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Everything pride related. Cctv interference road user charges for roads we already paid you to build especially when they were build so poorly

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct



#11435



Tell us why:

Because it's a sports stadium it should pay it's own way as sports are profit organizations.

The public should not pay so they can play and make money.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

We are in a recession more spending makes no sense

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:



#11435



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | Support |



#11435



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#11435



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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. Auckland Council need more transparency with the way taxpayer funds are allocated and spent. There is a mismatch between how much is gained from rates from an area vs how much is redistributed back into that area. Waiheke Island are paying a substantial proportion of rates and yet the plan is to budget far less for Waiheke Island.



#11450



How is this justified? Where is the evidence to back this decision? How has the 'data' used to lead to this decision been evaluated?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes - Auckland Council need to lower Waiheke Island rates if they are not going to redistribute that money back into the improvement of the island. It is not fair that Waiheke Island rates are being hiked up and yet the budget for Waiheke is being axed to \$600k which isn't even enough to buy a decent house on the island. How is that budget expected to maintain the whole island?

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?

YES. Where the actual needs of the regions are - commensurate with the rates gained from that region. Spend more on improving communities at the local level.

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



#11450



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?

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:



#11450



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#11450



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |



#11450



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

My main and significant concern is the proposal to further cut the budget for Waiheke down to \$600k for a year. This is not justified or fair to the locals on Waiheke Island who are having to pay their rates but are now being short changed. This will not be sufficient to maintain Waiheke Island.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Environmental education. Resource heavy and not leading to biodiversity gains.



#11467



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Not sure electric ferries are a priority. Is the technology there? Would prefer investment in more accessible bus routes and integration of Waiheke into integrated ticketing and to be made part of a resilient network.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

What is the point of having Councillors if you're going to create a fund that is unaccountable, to make decisions that councillors should be making? Why is additional bureaucracy being suggested? We don't need a Future fund to do the things suggested.



#11467



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 is risky - there will be little oversight of the management of the Port and there is a risk the business will be asset stripped before being returned to the Council. This is a stealth proposal to destroy the port and then have to move it elsewhere because it's suffered a death by a thousand cuts. Auckland needs a port. Why construct all that infrastructure at taxpayer expense to then move it elsewhere? Where will that be and why? Auckland needs a 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:

This question is misleading. The councillors can make decisions to use it for future uses or fund council services. The Auckland Future fund is not the only solution to planning for the future. Besides which the fund is designed to sell assets so not sure how or where the fund will be administered or protected.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

The future fund is a way of alienating councillors from resource to manage Auckland for the benefit of Aucklanders. I do not support it at all.

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



#11467



Tell us why:

Why are you trying to kill the port? There is no guarantee that they can have cruiseships on their own terminal if that land is returned to Council use as they don't have the consents. What a silly proposal... this is a transport hub, not an entertainme

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

"something else" is not a proposal and is shortsighted. The fact that you would take out operating port infrastructure for an undefined use without having a concrete fallback idea for the ports smacks of corruption and vested interest or at the very least mismanagement and shortsightedness.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11467



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

NETR has had mixed benefit. A lot was spent on education and chatfests without resulting in biodiversity gains. Lots of lost opportunity to protect areas of high biodiversity. A lot seems to have gone in Auckland Council micromanaging and providing additional staffing to manage community groups. The gains for the Waitakare and Kauri dieback management were good. Predator free in terms of stoat removal has been good, but is now nearing the end of the project. If it continues it should be used for biodiversity protection, not just pest eradication. And more should be spent on community groups working to enhance biodiversity in areas of high biodiversity.



#11467



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |



#11467



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Very Important

Tell us why

I'd like to see more focus on addressing deprivation and social outcomes. Progressing housing strategy initiatives, and integration of Waiheke into public transport model. There needs to be a greater focus on supporting youth with initiatives that prov

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Too much focus on the environment at the expense of social outcomes generally. If we are focusing on the environment, subsidised greenwaste and weed collections. If we are focused on the environment, a biodiversity plan and better support for projects working in areas of high biodiversity. Support developments at Taiwapereira. Support for the proposed marine reserve off Hakaimango-Matiatia.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Disappointing that this consultation is being used to leverage the further selling of Auckland airport shares and implode the port. Disingenuous and manipulative. If you need to raise rates, to protect the assets then do so.

It's absurd to ask Aucklanders what their preferred rates are - the answer will always be as little as possible. Lastly, it would be good to get rates payments means tested or have some clear and easy ways to get a rates rebate. The current system is very unfair to those who are cash poor. The fact that some people cannot afford their rates, does not mean that rates should be kept down, but that there is better, easily accessible support for those who cannot pay.

I support Local board funding that is more based around deprivation than population and I don't think it's fair that Waiheke's capital funding has been axed by 70%. I support a fairer funding model which recognises both the deprivation on Waiheke and the fact that the population increases from 10,000 to 40,000 in the Summer with the pressure that puts on the transport, wastewater and waste management infrastructure.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less beurocracy



#11506



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:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#11506



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#11506



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |



#11506



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |



#11506



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Promote a reliable ferry service

8. Do you have any other comments?

Maintain the Gold Card status as it is currently



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Waiheke local board should not have such a significant cut in funding. The island has to cater to a large number of visitors and needs to invest in assets for locals and visitors. The proposed cut is not justified.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Less economic development and events. Let the private sector do this.

Continue to press the Govt to pay its fair share for Auckland.

Less on roads. Focus on public transport and get more people out of cars.

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:

This is a luxury spend at the moment. If the business case stacks up, the private sector should invest into this facility.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Good luck! It's already too late on climate change and it will be almost impossible to keep up with the costs. We should decide now which areas to retreat from.



#11511



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#11511



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#11511



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11511



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

There are plenty of playgrounds already and lots of outdoor places for kids to go. Save the money to spend on higher priorities.

Focus climate projects only where they are sustainable over time. Let those who bought property in high risk spots own their o

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Proposed cuts to local board budget are excessive. Waiheke needs to cater for locals and over 1m visitors. The proposed cut is illogical and short sighted.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Continue supporting local boards fairly without massively cutting budgets

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11523



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to see a priority for bringing Fullers into AT so that Waiheke residents are not greatly disadvantaged by expensive travel

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fairer travel prices for all

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)?

Other

Tell us why:

I would be hesitant to see All AIAL shares sold

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#11523



Tell us 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

Support



#11523



| | |
|---|----------------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |



#11523



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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 strongly support the Central Proposal for “Fairer Funding” in the LTP

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11523



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We also want to see a priority in dedicating funding to arts and community events. To this end, I strongly support the Central Proposal for “Fairer Funding” in the LTP.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke is an isolated community that has very little access to Aucklands more extensive arts culture and community building venues and activities due to exorbitant ferry prices. We can't afford a massive cut to our budget as our community is already isolated and disadvantaged. We can't sustain it. The Fairer Funding model gives us a chance to continue providing quality community services to our already isolated community



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Retain airport shares

Retain the port operation

Retain historic capital assets



#11527



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Paperwork

Eke Panuku asset sales

Eke Panuku development

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?

Improving heavy rail network

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Tinkering to drive people out of their cars

Raised crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It is a local asset and Auckland Council makes it too expensive and remote for the local community to participate

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#11527



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

This is Intergenerational theft of major public assets belonging to the past, present and future citizens.

Council has not demonstrated to citizens any fiscal prudence with the billions of dollars from previous asset sales. They have all disappeared – been frittered away – without trace while the council operation spends beyond its means. The first airport share sale last year and the 2018 disappearance of the asset fund inherited from the ARC are cases in point.

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



#11527



Tell us why:

Auckland Council needs to keep to its core business of making the city viable and liveable for its citizens without jerking around setting trophy projects that bleed off from genuine prosperity.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11527



| | |
|---|--|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#11527



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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 would be prepared to pay more for storm resilience, climate action and education of our young people, through schools and community group support. We have acknowledged a climate emergency, but we are going too slowly.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11677



I would like to spend less on new roads and focus on Public Transport, buses, ferries which are fast, efficient, frequent and affordable. Minimize cars on the road, carbon emissions and congestion. I do not agree with growth around the rural land in Auckland, I believe we should intensify IN the city, which will put less pressure on new roading. Inner city public transport would be easier and cheaper to implement.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I like the idea of a weekly \$50 cap, however I do not think it is fair to exclude Waiheke Ferries from this for commuters. I believe Waiheke residents and commuters should have a more subsidized fare option which would be balanced by an increased levy for tourists and infrequent travelers. A lot of Waiheke commuters, then pay further public transport fees for busses and trains, either on Waiheke, OR once they reach the city as well as expensive ferry costs.

Public transport fees cannot continue to rise if we want to change behaviour, people will simply opt out and return to private cars.

I agree with a more streamlined ticketing approach, unless it will cost more to deliver.

Optimizing the current road network with dynamic lanes is a great option and combined with more public transport should reduce congestion.

In order to encourage people to cycle and get out of their cars, there needs to be safe cycle routes.

An inner city congestion charge and higher parking fees on cars would also deter the use of private cars in the city. I don't think we should INVESTIGATE a low cost bike ferry as a harbour crossing, I think we should just implement it. Too much money has historically been spent on investigation and not enough on implementation. (eg the numerous harbour crossing/cycle crossings plans, all of which have been shelved and not resulted in any action). Utilizing a ferry for cycle crossings would be efficient, agile and easily adaptable without serious infrastructure cost requirements.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Decarbonizing the public transport fleet, with electric, busses, trains and ferries.



#11677



Encouraging electric vehicles over fossil fuel vehicles (eg these could have a lesser congestion charge) especially for businesses and private use.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Consultation for eg harbour crossings has been expensive and has to date resulted in nothing happening. For instance, I think just try out the bike ferry and see how it goes. It's worked in other international cities such as San Francisco. I disagree with any light rail. I think we will be more agile with electric buses whose routes can easily be adjusted and require less infrastructure eg Dominion Road and a direct Airport service, rather than the circuitous route through Mangere town centre and Onehunga.

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 clearly not delivering what is required. Utilizing the stadium precinct in a more useful and economic way makes sense. Is it possible to hold events, other than sporting ones, so that North Shore people don't have to travel into the city? Their website, doesn't look as though very much is on offer in the stadium precinct at all and is not very inviting.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us 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



#11677



Tell us here:

To future proofing by maintaining the port as an asset helps the city to diversify from income only being through rates and be more resilient financially.

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 airport is an opportunity to earn. If we sell the asset we will never have another opportunity to get it back. Plus once funds are locked up in a "Future Fund" they may not be easily accessible and there is no guarantee that successive Councils will continue with the 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:

I

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#11677



Opening up the waterfront for public is good for the people of Auckland and visitors. Keeping the working part of the port functional will maintain income into the city.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11677



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Re-establish the full funding of the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Revenue gained from NETR affects the delivery of essential projects to protect our biodiversity and taonga species. For example, the rate funds kauri dieback track upgrades, treatment support for landowners with kauri dieback, monitoring of the health of our forests and education for visitors to prevent further spread of the disease and predator control on our islands and the mainland. This work supports the health of our environment, which we need to be healthy to keep humans healthy, by filtering our water, catching and intercepting rainfall, holding our soils and slopes together and cleaning our air. Having spent years with large parts of the track network closed to protect kauri it is important to ensure this work continues as planned to enable safe access to our wild places, which are so important for our mental and physical health, and the health of our forests.

Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Charging schools to recycle would earn limited money when balanced with the potential behaviour change opportunity of encouraging young people to engage in recycling in a school. It is hard enough to establish waste systems to reduce waste to landfill in a school anyway. This support from Council is one of the few positives on offer to support a school around waste minimization.



#11677



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |



#11677



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Fairly Important

Tell us why

I support the following local board priorities (other):

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., wa

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I don't agree that a swimming pool is a priority. We have the Te Huruhi pool and 360 degrees of ocean, including safe bays like Enclosure Bay.

I agree that transport and social housing as well as facilities for elderly are important on the island. Our community is diverse and loses its structure if younger people are forced out from living on the island. As well facilities for the elderly to be able to stay on island, they are being priced out and forced to sell. Plus the ferry issues mean it is complex for them to attend medical appointments in town.

More effective use of Council owned assets is always prudent.

Storm water mitigation is important as Climate Change will continue to increase its impact. It is more cost effective to be proactive, rather than wait for damage and then patch it up later.

Work with Caulerpa is progressing, continued support for Mana whenua and community groups to eliminate this pest is imperative. We cannot continue to celebrate and promote our beautiful island as a tourist destination, which is important for our economy, if we don't care for it first.

Funding for equitable public transport ferry fares for our residents and Auckland based work force is VERY important. Those working off island, bring their earnings back to the island and support local businesses. They should be subsidized further in their commuting costs. The tourist and infrequent travelers should pay a levy to fund local price reductions. I do not agree with any tampering with Gold Cards either.

I agree with Dark Sky plans as this is an important point of difference Waiheke has to offer and should be celebrated. Used wisely it is a great opportunity for tourism as well.



#11677



Waiheke is a very special and diverse community, we should work towards empowering our young people through projects like the Marine Education Initiative (MEI) to connect with and care for our environment from Maunga to Moana.

8. Do you have any other comments?

In addition to the comments made throughout this submission, I think it is imperative that Auckland Council continues to invest in our young people and communities through education. It is transformational for young people to be a part of Sustainable Schools and Enviroschools as well as our Youth Leadership Programmes. If we want our Auckland to be Climate Resilient we need to continue to invest in opportunities for our young people to grow, connect and be empowered to take action and be responsible decision makers.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| 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 think we pay enough for what we get. I would like council to manage the road maintenance and improvement budget better on Waiheke. We seem to have roads done by Downer and then redone within a short space of time. Could they not be more efficient as they seem to waste money.



#11734



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Waste money on contractors that don't do things well in the first place

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Agree with focus on increasing public transport and reducing some of what seems to be very wasteful traffic management requirements which seem to leave orange cones all over the place and restrict use of common sense while we pay people to stand around doing nothing.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public walking tracks and parks as green open space is essential as is good access to it.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Poor quality road maintenance contractors

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



#11734



Tell us why:

Why not ensure that both these assets are better managed and that the return on these is maximised for future generations as well. Spending up now will not leave anything for future funding and why should we plunder this resource at the expense of those who have both gone before and will come after. We should maximise returns and use this without eroding the capital.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Council should focus on managing this valuable asset better. We also want the flexibility to move the port in the interest of the wider city yet if we tie it up in a 35 year lease we will loose this option.

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?



#11734



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 enhance the downtown area for people and to give a more positive experience to tourists who bring in \$

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:

Need to keep this option alive as with Auckland traffic congestion and the seeming inability of anyone to get the rail system working for freight it will be important to get the ports out of downtown auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#11734



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#11734

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#11734



Tell us why

Waiheke gets less access to central resources so we should ensure we spend on promoting and protecting our natural resources

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The priorities are fine but Waiheke needs to be adequately resourced from our rates take to support these over the next 10 years. We should not be having our capital budget cut but be getting our fair share

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke should be fairly treated. We get lots of visitors from Auckland and we should be fairly funded to support this influx. It always seems to be a one way drain. Waiheke paying for the centre and anything we need or want seen as not important.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Don't cut the Waiheke Local Board budget by a ridiculous punitive amount

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11887



Cut senior management roles

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Waiheke is excluded from the fare cap. That's not fair. You should continue with all walking and cycling improvements. Do not cut them.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cap Waiheke fares. Best practice cycling and pedestrian infrastructure supports money saving transport options for all.

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



#11887



Tell us 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:

The value to Auckland of that land is higher when it isn't used by the port.

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 value to Auckland of that land is higher when it isn't used by the port.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#11887



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#11887



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11887



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think the Local Board's priorities are very important. I absolutely oppose the massive proposed cut to the Waiheke Local Board's budget (a far bigger cut than other Local Boards) because they would not then be able to deliver on most of them.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Cut senior management roles not the Waiheke Local Board budget



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?

More free or very cheap public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Sports venues and events - these should be self-supporting



#11894



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 free or cheaper 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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Events should be charged an appropriate rate to cover the maintenance costs.
Stadium should be self-funding. Otherwise, sell 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:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#11894



Tell us 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:

Port operations such as ferries should be expanded.

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:

It's an industrial area of little public value, in a prime location. Car imports etc should be somewhere else.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#11894



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#11894



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#11894



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

A drastic cut in funding is proposed, which will be inappropriate. The local board currently seems to be much more efficient than the Auckland Council, and should get a larger proportion of total funding,

8. Do you have any other comments?

Not mentioned is the administrative and staffing costs of the Council, which should be reduced. Not mentioned is free transport for seniors, which should be maintained.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Free (or heavily subsidised) public transport would assist so many of our citizens to live a better life

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11929



Events and programmes are a nice to have rather than an essential - in these tough times we need to pull back to essentials

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I believe that it is critical that alternative more eco friendly transport / travel options are support. The car/motor transport is not the long-term way forward.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improving integration of public transport options

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 facility exists and should be utilised as much as possible

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Proposal sounds good on the surface - management of and criteria for accessing the funds would be critical



#11929



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Support - but unsure about length of lease - seems 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?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Need to build this 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:

It is no longer appropriate or healthy to have port operations in a part of Auckland that is becoming more used for recreational purposes

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#11929



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

It is no longer appropriate or healthy to have port operations in a part of Auckland that is becoming more used for recreational purposes

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#11929



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#11929



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Strongly support : • continuing to support local organisations with the development of a community swimming pool and consider consulting on a local targeted rate as this would benefit whole community

Do not think:• future provision of equestrian facilities benefits the community as a whole



#11929



8. Do you have any other comments?

Please do not change/restrict the Gold Card access to free public transport - this is a life saver for many of our older citizens. Restricting access would severely impact on many of citizens lives, if anything access needs to be extended - i.e. free public transport for all



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Better traffic flow. Synchronized traffic lights for better flow. Not stopping at every set of lights. Remove all speed humps.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Close all libraries as they are mostly obsolete with E technology. Not be involved in any festivals etc. other than make approval much easier to private organisations.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Removing all raised crossings is an excellent start. No more cycle ways unless fully funded by cyclists. Smaller buses for many routes. Many buses have a maximum of 5 passengers most of the time.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Better traffic flow.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public relations. Salaries for most in management earning more that \$120,000

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Under used most of the time.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#11991



Tell us why:

If it is an asset then you don't sell assets that give a return.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

It's the best option. Ownership continues and a return is maintained.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

It's a good idea.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance is a no brainer. Why give the profit to an insurance company when you can raise funds if needed to repair or replace. The insurance company doesn't run at a loss!

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:



#11991



It is an enhancement to the downtown 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

Tell us why:

It's an enhancement to the downtown area.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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> |



#11991



| | |
|---|---------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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,Waiheke

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?



#11991



| | |
|---|--|
| 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

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support all priorities



#11991



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. | Very Important |
| Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support. | Fairly 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. | Not Important |
| Develop a community-led climate action plan. | Not 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 to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme. | Common sense. |

Tell us why



#11991



As long as the cost benefit proposals are looked at

7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |



#11991



Tell us why

The benefit needs to be for all peoples, not certain groups or race.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

They look for the most, reasonable.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#12081



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The cost involved is extreme. We already have a reasonable public transport service that is mostly integrated. We don't need to spend multi millions of dollars for an American company to provide an integrated ticketing service

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fixing the roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle ways and green transport options

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Once land is sold it is gone forever. I do believe that by working with the North Shore community, there will be solutions on how to improve the usage of it and hence reduce the costs of 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

Tell us why:

I don't believe the airport shares should be sold. They provide an income and retain some council control over what MUST remain publicly owned land.



#12081



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:

A 35 year lease is a very short sighted option when redevelopment can occur in this area in the future, especially when there has been talk of moving the port between Whangarei and Tauranga. I believe this to be a backward step 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?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

There needs to be a future fund that is separate to council spending. Council need to get control of what they spend and not rely on all income for general spending.

4d. Do you have 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:

A major port is not required to be in the centre of Auckland City. If the rail network was effectively and efficiently set up it would be quicker, easier and cheaper for containers and goods to come from Whangarei. There should be no large truck movement



#12081



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 above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#12081



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Aotea/Great Barrier,Howick,Waiheke

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?



#12081



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Fairly Important |
| Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide. | Very Important |
| Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

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. | |



#12081



| | |
|---|--|
| 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

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I do not support most 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. | Not Important |
| Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan. | Fairly Important |



#12081



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support. | I don't know |
| 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. | Fairly 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 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?

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#12081



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

The island needs an 18 hole golf course to encourage longer visitor stays on the island. It benefits all businesses on the island. If anything, council needs to tax target all of the short term Air BnB type accommodation and utilise this tax to fund extra

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Council needs to let the Waiheke community decide what the priorities are. I would prefer to see a \$5 levy from every tourist go back to a community fund that would allow all full time residents (10K people) to access subsidised travel. I don't believe all Aucklanders need to have cheaper access to come here. We pay a fortune on rates and don't require a local targeted rate either. All we are getting is less than our fair share of council spending versus rates paid.



#12081



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#12109



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think the emphasis should be on getting people out of cars, off roads, rather than making efforts to make their driving easier

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Train to airport and light rail development

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I don't think selling assets is a good thing at this time. Debt isn't necessarily bad while people are getting back on their feet after Covid.

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



#12109



Tell us here:

It is a sort of privatisation of operational delivery and it often leads to loss of assets and no control over the quality of delivery, and often different values in implementation.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Why either/or? Couldn't some profits and dividends be used and some be invested

4d. Do you have 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:

Auckland seafront could become a real feature for public benefit and attracting tourists with some creative thought put behind the use of these areas like in other cities.

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:



#12109



As above: Auckland seafront could become a real feature for public benefit and attracting tourists with some creative thought put behind the use of these areas like in other cities.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#12109



| | |
|---|-------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Other |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

NETR and WQTR - there should be no cuts to anything that affects our environment. This should be a number one priority.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#12109



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

They are all important and consultation has been sought to develop these. Support of community groups in protection of Waiheke's environment is important.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The emphasis on protection of the environment and our reserves and natural areas is important.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The Pay Less example of No Gold Card usage during afternoon commuter hours is unfair to the elderly and sick who are not commuting but trying to get home from hospitals and other specialist appointments at that time. It would not be saving much money and would be mean-spirited.



#12109



Why does Waiheke get the greatest percentage CUT in funding and some boards have no cuts at all? This is totally unreasonable. Waiheke is one of Auckland's greatest assets and drawcards and less money will mean run-down tracks, roads and facilities. We pay a lot of Rates to Auckland City - last year 27M excluding GST. Are we getting value for our percentage of Rates paid? There must be FAIRER FUNDING for Local Boards.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | |
| 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?

Less Council Staff

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Increase Council staff productivity



#12200



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

AT is an overall waste of tax payers money. Too many Managers and not enough experiance

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

AT and all Council Staff

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Sell the land to fund a Waterfront 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:

Help keep Rates down

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#12200



Other

Tell us here:

Move the entire Port north. AKL is the only major city to have a container port as its welcome mat.

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 all the funds available to keep Rates down

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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:



#12200



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#12200



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Do not support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Not Important |



#12200



| | |
|--|---------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Only keep Core services, stop wasting money we do not have!

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do 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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#12252



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#12252



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#12252



| | |
|---|----------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?



#12252



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#12252



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Essential for the council to support small communities as these are the backbone of our city and create the glue that sustains our diverse populations. Maintain and extend support for community facilities, programmes and grants. Extend all programmes that commit to climate change mitigation and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Maintain commitment to services such as the CAB



#12262



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce spending on consultants, reducing wasteful spending.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

The council needs to support public transport and green initiatives such as cycle ways, support for electrification and reducing reliance on individual vehicles and road networks.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Spend less on extending roading networks which encourages use of fossil fuels.

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:



#12262



This is a one off return only, eliminates potential future income, and is short sighted.

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:



#12262



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#12262



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

The council has the option to increase borrowing and request support from central government rather than reduce services. These options need to be included in all budgetary planning.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#12262



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It is essential that the priorities serve the specific needs of the Waiheke community taking in to account the additional requirements of our geographical isolation. This requires support for provision of essential service on Island including social services, education, Citizens Advice, AFFORDABLE and RELIABLE ferry services that prioritise the needs of residents including access to medical services, travel to work and school etc. Support for environmental work including marine protection and restoration, flood control is critical. Emergency response provision locally on Island is also essential and requires council support of community groups and social services providers to ensure resilience in challenging times. Waiheke needs to have control over local assets including halls and community facilities so this remain accessible and affordable for the providers who work for our community.



#12262



8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke Island is facing significant budget cuts that are five times higher than those proposed for 19 other local board areas per head of population. This is unfair and needs to be reversed. Fairer funding for local boards would go some way to address this and the central proposal should be implemented so that Waiheke can have support to be a community where all can afford to live, work and be educated and access to 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: Waiheke

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 | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Full review and restructure of Auckland Council with the aim for a lean HP/HE team,



#12295



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?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Small development to upgrade, might as well keep 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:

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



#12295



Tell us here:

Leasing the Port will have an effect on the average Aucklander, operators such as DP World will ramp up the charges to the Freight community which will only be transferred and paid by the average Aucklander when buying food or paying for services. Yes it would give you a lump sum for the Future Fund but could be very short sighted now that the Port of Auckland is estimated to return 74 million this financial year and expect to grow year on year

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:

The Port is already open to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharf back to the council. How does the council intend to make a return on them?

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#12295



As the Auckland population increases so too will the Import of Freight, keep Bledisloe Terminal as an operational area, you need to bring Freight to the doorstep of your largest city and population.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#12295



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.</p> | |
| <p>Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3</p> | |



#12295



| | |
|--|--|
| 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?

Investigate options to sell land



#12295



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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Free public transport for everyone,

(and if not free for everyone) Maintain the Gold Card transport benefits.

Create equality in the Waiheke ferry run by providing decent wharf access and gold card subsidy to competitors of Fullers.



#12314



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less roading works, less signage, less orange cones.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Less roading, more public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Free public transport for all.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less roading works, less signage, less orange cones. Less AT operational costs. I watch tjhis organization waste a huge amount of public money ... examples:

Tearing up Hill road 3 times in the 6 months after refinishing and curbing the road.

The million dollar plus Donald Bruce roundabout renovation that did not improve functionality and looks like it belongs in downtown Tokyo.

Watching the crew come down Belle Terrace and clean out all the guttering on one side of the road and ignoring the single drain on the other side of the road. So that they spent more money coming back to do the single drain.

There are many more instances that I could list. The problem being that there is no oversight or local input into AT's expenditures. A previous mayor event removed the public representation from AT's board.

THIS IS WHERE THE MONEY NEEDS TO COME FROM. THIS ORGANIZATION NEEDS TO BE REDUCED AND CONTROLLED. HUGE SAVINGS ARE POSSIBLE HERE!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#12314



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:

This is just a pantomime set up to liquidate the last of publically owned assets. Unless their is ironclad legislative policy/action to prevent the council from selling what remains of our publically owned assets... I am completely opposed to this action.

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:

Don't want to see Future fund bureaucracy created. Why can't the council manage our assets without creating another layer of bureaucracy?



#12314



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Do not create Future Fund. You idiots are the ones that disbanded the ARC, whose exemplary fiscal management provided good income to city coffers. Of course, most of those assets are long gone now, with little or no financial gain to an operating budget that continues to be mismanaged and out of control. The comparatively few assets remaining should be able to be managed without setting up another structure. Fiscal discipline is what is required, with maybe a public oversight committee to maintain the public's interest versus the short term expediency of our financial (mis) managers.

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 does not need more capital assets to maintain and improve at the moment. The idea should be to significantly reduce operational costs, not take on more!

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Auckland council does not need more capital assets to maintain and improve ay the moment. The idea should be to significantly reduce operational costs, not take on more!

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



#12314



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#12314



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Reduce operating costs by reducing roading and AT's budget.

Cut all council salaries that exceed \$150,000 by at least 5%.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#12314



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Change the structure so that Local boards have more influence and control. Give local board oversight rights to AT (and other) projects.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Maintain community leases for artworks complex.

Increase discretionary budget to support community events/activities

8. Do you have any other comments?

Well, this "have your say" is another pantomime.

This is not having our say. The choices you give in this document are not about having our say, but are about rubber stamping one of your dictates. This is like voting for Donald Trump or Genocide Joe Biden. The choice is to get beaten by cane or by whip... There are very few appropriate choices.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?



#12327



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I particularly support retention of free travel for AT HOP Gold Card users after 9am. Reducing the hours to off peak times in the afternoons would particularly disadvantage seniors on Waiheke who need to make hospital visits during the day and could be stuck for hours waiting for a ferry home in the afternoon.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Auckland International Airport is a long term asset which should be kept, because once sold the money will disappear.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#12327



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

It's not the Council's job to be running business - leave that to those who have expertise.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

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



#12327



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#12327



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#12327



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

I am very concerned about the proposed 70% cut to the Waiheke Local Board's budget for capital spend - the largest cut to any local board. Spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch up maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks will be seriously impacted. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up enormously. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, or repair and replace.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Grouping everything together into three blocks forces us into choosing things that we don't agree with. The council could do more to support Waiheke, by recognising that we are different and giving us a rebate for the fact that we provide our own water and sewerage treatment.



#12371



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Spend less on supporting business to make a fortune from hosting events.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Money is often wasted on over-engineered projects that mean contractors rip the council off. Don't remove gold card funding: For Waiheke Island residents, this is particularly important. If the council cannot afford to maintain this, they could consider subsidising afternoon peak hour services for Waiheke residents only.

There is no doubt much wastage, for example on Waiheke, there are many buses driving around out of service and generally, incompetence from the service that is being offered. It could be much more efficient.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Allowing for a more customised service in response to local needs rather than generic responses: This could actually be more efficient.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

See my first comment above.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#12371



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 something for central govt and is just a sign that the super city is too big: Another CCO, what will happen to it? Will the council really have control, if there is no future for the port, then who will want to take on the lease anyway?

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:

Who will want to lease it if it is not profitable? Should we really commit to a 35 year lease if the port needs to move anyway?

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 to use those funds now, and we should be considering its long term viability. Indeed, the supercity is not viable long term, the sooner we split it up, the better.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#12371



Self-insurance is an appealing idea, but so far, advantages of size, as in the development of a supercity has not paid dividends and there is no reason to hope this will be different. It's just more people making money out of us.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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> |



#12371



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#12371



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#12371



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We need a lot more than this, especially more footpaths.

8. Do you have any other comments?

This is just too much for people to process, and most people do not respond because of this. I would have liked to write more, but I just don't have time.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

Do fewer things in parallel while improving the quality and value of what is done. Push for tolls on National road projects to fund them.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12385



Spend less on cars / road related works. Push back on central govt cancelling AKL fuel tax.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Keep the momentum.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Apply more waste removal across all programmes (eg 6sigma / optimisation)

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Anything that promotes private vehicle ownership.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Other priorities are necessary. Sometimes doing nothing is the right 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:



#12385



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

AK council needs some time to focus. Less is 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

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Waiheke island should have special consideration and retain more local board capital spend due to the nature of the island in context of Auckland. It's a huge tourism draw, q more complex community, additional challenges around living costs and lifestyle, and many islanders volunteer their time for community projects which benefit all aucklanders without remuneration. It's just one jewel in auckland's crown, but it's an important one.

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:

Too many externalised costs not being considered. Water freight likely to be easier to reduce carbon impact. Lower trafficked routes mean less cost/complexity of transport volumes growth than land based transport.



#12385



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

See previous answer.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |



#12385



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#12385



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

new roads, sport stadiums, x-mas decorations



#12392



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

we need more cycle ways and pedestrian areas

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

cycle ways and pedestrian areas

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

new roads, more roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Other

Tell us why:

we need more culture in our city not sports

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#12392



Tell us here:

it makes sense

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

Support



#12392



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#12392



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#12392



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Not Important |

Tell us why

the proposals are good but they don't get adhered to

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

there are to many houses allowed to be built on Waiheke that nobody lives in. Houses that have no continual occupants in them should have higher rates to pay than people who actually live in their house all year round



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Much more affordable, reliable, frequent and pervasive ;public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less road development



#12420



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

improving pedestrian and cyclist safety will encourage more people to travel like this – reducing demands on roads and public transport as well as indirectly benefiting the health of those users.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

protected/separated cycle ways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

more 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:

I think council should retain this Airport ownership



#12420



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

seems like a sensible proposal

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:

this is such a valuable asset for the people of Auckland and should be made more accessible to 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



#12420



Tell us why:

this is such a valuable asset for the people of Auckland and should be made more accessible to them

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |



#12420



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke, Waitematā

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#12420



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke needs better/safer pedestrian and cycling facilities

Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|



#12420



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works. | I don't know |
| Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park. | Fairly Important |
| Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket. | Fairly 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. | Fairly Important |
| Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible. | Not Important |

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: Waiheke

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?



#12425



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If 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:



#12425



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p> | |



#12425



| | |
|---|--|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?



I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

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:



#12438



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#12438



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#12438



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#12438



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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?

Increase funding to Waiheke Local Board

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12479



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support raised pedestrian crossings and traffic calming, and speed reduction plus more speed cameras with fines and parking infringement fees going directly to the areas they are fined in. So, Waiheke gets parking fines and also I support installing a speed camera for Waiheke on Ocenview and on Mako.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Every traffic death/injury costs all of us so much. I think we look to how we make our roads safer for all road users. And to work towards less congestion which means prioritising PT, soft transport options, and introducing congestion charges.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Nope

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



#12479



Tell us why:

It is not needed.

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 disagree with selling off any of our assets to foreign companies and with the Auckland 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:

We need those funds to work on improving our infrastructure.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

We don't need a Future Fund- we need a Now Fund!

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

The Ports needs all the land and I fail to see the need to do that.



#12479



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Auckland Council needs to concentrate of climate change. And soft transport and waste streams. Not on selling assets.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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> |



#12479



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#12479



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke is a show place for Aotearoa NZ and we must remember how many tourists go there. We must also be aware of its fragility and the fact that its community work so hard to keep it pristine. The huge amount of funding that has been taken away from is

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good but we need more budget.



#12479



8. Do you have any other comments?

We need to get back the funding we once had and increase it. I would suggest a visitor levy and revenue from parking infringements and a roll of at least 3 cameras. There should be a limit to private helicopter landings and a flight cost to those landings which goes back to Waiheke Local Board. Our LB is doing a good job and we need those funds. Also we need to look at a transport plan which puts us in PTOM and to consult more with community on any soft transport and PT issues. We also need to look at Emergency Resilience and a plan to get rid of single use containers.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

cycle lanes

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12557



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?

Ferry to Waiheke

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:

dont sell shares in Auckland airport

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#12557



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 **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#12557



programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.



#12557



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | 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



#12574



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways

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:

We need to retain influence in development of our airport

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:

We need to retain control of the port, including options for moving the port



#12574



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#12574



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#12574



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#12574



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#12580



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I wish to see the continued ability to use AT Gold at Hop card available for all hours. I'd prefer the Scandinavia philosophy of paying more for the great services for all

This comment applies across the board for all my answers.

2a. Is there anything you 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 have no attachment to the stadium. I feel whatever is done the money needs to reflect the community and value for 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)?

Other

Tell us why:

Not sure that this asset should be sold

Can see another NZRail sell off and buy back situation in the future

Think a higher rates increase should have moneys invested and ear marked for the disaster fund.



#12580



I do agree with a Future Auckland fund but not for it to be a vehicle for selling off assets.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I'm not certain that the port in Auckland is still fit for purpose as One of NZ major ports. Think this is a central government issue that should be looking at centralised rail/ port options

Auckland city is the wrong place to be trucking freight through. Passenger terminal only

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

As said I think we should be paying more for the services we want for everyone. A percentage of all Auckland income must be invested in a disaster 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



#12580



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#12580



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#12580



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke rates must be used to maintain or improve that which currently exists. There are many many of us that are paying rates and volunteering to improve Waiheke. We work with weed busting, predator control and generally trying to enhance what is here.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I don't think Waiheke gets credit for being the asset I believe it is to Auckland. Among other things I have volunteered for years at the Waiheke community Art gallery and know that the funding for that does not represent the foot traffic through the door.

I think when funding Waiheke local board that Auckland needs to consider the overall benefit to Auckland that Waiheke represents in terms of a tourist attraction for the city. It shouldn't be seen as just another suburb with a population of X . That way we are a



#12580



small suburb but in terms of an attraction we pull a lot more than most Auckland suburbs therefore we need the investment to ensure we continue to benefit the Auckland economy.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I think it is a mistake to feel the majority can not pay a little more for the greater benefit. I would prefer to pay a little more for improved everything that we all want of a great city and know that you can put in place measures to help those that truly can't afford a little more.

I don't mean the widower in his \$5 million home living on superannuation. only. He can choose to sell. I mean the family on very modest incomes. Make rates provisions to help them and leave the majority paying and preparing for the future. Start something that makes us more resilient. I like the gold card hop, the library, the parks etc I want the Hauraki Gulf saved from destruction and I believe we are close to that. I will pay a little more and if it means I don't have that extra for other things I know the money will benefit future generations whilst I can enjoy what already exists. No supporting docs but happy to talk about my wishes for Auckland. Just don't waste our money. Done on a phone so apologies for no editing. Just sorry I didn't remember to do this until the eleventh hour. Thank you for your mahi



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Do more of everything with more efficiency and no one pays more. Get rid of under performing groups like the Emergency Response Group, expensive waste

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12594



as above

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:

Selling profitable operations, or long term leases will gain nothing long term. Create a new department to manage the fund? How much will that take out of the profits? AC can't find any one competent to run the existing CCOs

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#12594



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:

a leasee is there to maximize their profit at any cost.

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?



#12594



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#12594



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#12594



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

all sensible programmes

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

All budget dependent

8. Do you have any other comments?

Waiheke funding is pathetic. CCO accountability does not exist for ratepayers



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

i would like the Auckland Council to incentivise more development in the existing urban area cost to transport links, perhaps by making it cheaper to get consents, and to connect to water infrastructure in exciting suburbs. This would significantly reduce costs on the council over time.



#12615



I would also like the council to improve the water infrastructure - especially the storm water drain system in Greenlane.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Council should stop enabling housing at the edge of the city where there is no infrastructure. We need a compact city to grow a strong economy, a lower carbon future and better services for residents.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

i support the City Rail Link.

I support improved bus, rail and ferry networks and making this a more reliable service.

I support funding for new cycleways and shared paths so that I - and others - have the chance to cycle and walk safely.

I support time-use charging on roads.

I support a weekly \$50 cap on public transport fares.

I support electrified buses by 2030

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Yes, I think the council should complete the City Rail Link and Great North Road upgrades and more dynamic bus lanes.

I think more money should be spent on cycle lanes, on safety around schools and town centres.

I think there should be much more investment in Auckland's storm water drainage system.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



#12615



I do not support building more roads in Auckland - or widening roads. I think the emphasis on roads is NOT the way to get out of our transportation problems.

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 airport shares are a strategic asset that have paid good dividends in the past and will do so again in the future. There is currently no ethical parameters for the Future Fund, so it might invest in companies which exacerbate climate issues.

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:

Wayne Brown was voted in on the belief that he would MOVE the port of Auckland. Now he is suggesting leasing it out for 35 years to another operator. This would privatise the port for a generation or longer. I want this port MOVED and the land used for Aucklanders to enjoy the seafront.



#12615



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 money from the port has always been used to fund council services. We do not support a reduction in services when the needs of Aucklanders are increasing. We need more services in Auckland, not less.

4d. Do you have 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:

This option would open up the water front to Aucklanders. Cruise ships could be relocated from Queen's wharf ensuring less impact on the ferry service and more enjoyable space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It would be prohibitively expensive to move port operations from Bledisloe Wharf and the port would be less able to return a dividend to Auckland council.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#12615



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#12615



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#12615



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Keep on doing your good work.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#12626



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't omit cycleways

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Reliable, affordable public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Prioritising cars

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:

Do not sell assets.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other



#12626



Tell us here:

Ideally close the port down. At least retain ownership of it and reduce its size and operation. Get rid of the cars. Revert the land to public use.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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

Support



#12626



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |



#12626



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#12626



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?



#12657



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Pedestrian and Cycle lanes are important

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Pedestrian and Cycle lanes

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:



#12657



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



#12657



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#12657



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Fairly Important |



#12657



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Improved and increase of cycle and walkways

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12683



Building more roads! We need to encourage use of public transport, cycling and walking

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

NEED to have MORE cycle 7 walkways NOT less. This is a backward move and doesnt make Auckland a very "liveable" city

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle ways and walkways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

What are "dynamic" lanes? Spend less on cars/ roads to discourige their use

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:



#12683



I dont trust the council with their financial management. The sell off of airport shares was a farce - it did not reduce debt in any significant way. ANd no more CCO's!

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:

Use the income to improve and protect Aucklands environment

4d. Do you have 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:

Prioritise the land for public use (not commercial and residential development). There is veery little access to auckland's waterfront compared with other places in NZ and overseas



#12683



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | |



#12683



| | |
|---|---------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#12683



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

All of these initiatives will enhance Waiheke

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

good

8. Do you have any other comments?

Please DO NOT change access for Gold card holders. I see a proposal to not allow free travel between 3-6pm daily. This will have a huge impact on residents on Waiheke as the cost of ferry travel is very expensive. It is very difficult to get to a medical



#12683



appointment in those hours and get back on the 2pm ferry (next one would be 7.15pm!). Also people need to be able to get off the island to visit family and friends - very important for maintaining a healthy life style. If cuts need to be made then look at cutting the number and salaries of council staff. TOTALLY unimpressed with our mayor, Wayne Brown



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

Developing interconnected cycle and walkways, interconnected public transport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12699



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Development of cycleways and walkways will help reduce noise, air pollution, and improve mental and physical health in the future. It's planning ahead to help mitigate against increasing impacts arising from climate change.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

As above

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



#12699



Tell us 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?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 |
|--|---------|



#12699



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of | Support |



#12699



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Natural Environment Targeted Rate:

The Noises group of islands in the Waitemata and Gulf ward, have been fortunate to receive help from this rate. We've seen first hand the environmental gains that also provide the ability to learn more, be able to share more. This rate does much more than enhance the environment. It provides encouragement to bring people and communities together to take ownership of special natural areas, it educates and provides hope. To stop it now would be to undo the good work done and would be a monumental waste of the time, effort and money, that has been undertaken or spent to date. We need healthy, resilient ecosystems to help buffer against the coming impacts of climate change. We also need our conservation people to feel they are empowered and not alone in their efforts. This rate fosters much greater general participation in regeneration of our natural environment so the benefits associated with the rate are amplified considerably by public participation.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.

Fairly Important



#12699



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?

I would prefer a fourth option under 1a - Do More With Less. I would like that done by getting rid of Auckland City Council Resolution number ENV/2019/72 (moved by Chairperson P Hulse, seconded by Member P Goff)



#12703



If Net Zero 2050 is not prioritised this would reduce council funds needed for that implementation, eliminating the costs involved, so that council can focus more on its core activities.

I would prefer the removal of the goals of 2030 50% net carbon and 2050 net zero. The costs of these, including the staffing and reports that the goals would require should not be added to the council's budget.

If this means deregistering from C40 cities and other related Climate Emergency campaign organisations, then I think that is the better option than increasing council costs in that way.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#12703



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 only reason a port operating company, such as DP World, would operate the port is to make a profit and send the profit offshore.

DP World's EBITA margin has exceeded 28% every year, often near 40%, and that profit goes to the private shareholders, in Dubai UAE. It is essential that the profit remains in Auckland, or at least in New Zealand.

The upfront purchase cost of around NZD2 billion, which is tax deductible, also enables DP World to introduce their power over local logistics operators and extract more profit to Dubai. Even if another operator was selected, the effect would be the same.

The Australian experience shows that DP World has paid zero tax in Australia for at least the past eight years, and yet is highly profitable for its owners in Dubai; effectively the UAE government.

Auckland Council has difficulty controlling the CCOs, it would have no chance with such an operator.

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:

Self-Insurance is a well-established and proven system with cost benefit



#12703



advantages. However even without the Future Fund it is simple to accept higher excesses on claims, as we do with our personal insurances.

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:

These two wharves can be used to enhance the ferry services in Auckland, which require expansion. It is important that they do not become places for apartments or similar constructions

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Clean bulk cargoes are still required in Auckland, and also smaller ships are better operating here than at the specialist container terminal on Fergusson Wharf. Bulk cement operations for example work very well now at Bledisloe wharf.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |
|---|----------------|



#12703



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of | Support |



#12703



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 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?

More money for local boards to be able to operate effectively, which is not the case at present.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12707



leave events to private companies

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport is suitable for very few people and is particularly poor on weekends and public holidays and when events are on, the exact opposite to what would happen in a 1st world country.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Good roundabouts instead of traffic lights. Refer to the French system.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The over-elaborate cycle lanes with concrete edges, and the traffic calming measures which wreck cars.

Temporary traffic control measures. The number cones is over-the-top, and many excellent community events are being abandoned because AC traffic management costs are untenable. This is TOTALLY unacceptable.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Money needs to be saved and the present operating model is obviously not working. Maximise community 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)?



#12707



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:

Keep assets. The name says it all

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:



#12707



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | I don't know |



#12707



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Bring back rubbish bins of a good size in public places.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#12707



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Fairly Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Not Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke lacks activities for young people and the Tawapareira Reserve is a very valuable asset and will become more important in the future.

The local board puts various rules in place eg freedom camping for more than a certain number of nights, but nothi

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The amount of money available to the local board bears little resemblance to the rates take from Waiheke Island.

Community swimming pool - people have been working for many years fund raising but where is the money raised?



#12707



Ferry service - AT has proven time and again it is not fit for purpose. Public transport on Waiheke is a joke at every level from Fullers service, or lack of it, to disappearing wharf fees, to buses that carry no people or leave the wharf as a ferry approaches, to erecting timetables on a bus stop that have information at ground level! Sort out the caulerpa issue - lots of words but no signs to inform people and no attempt to communicate with boats ignoring the no-go areas. A bus system similar to that run in Timaru could work here in conjunction with bigger buses to meet the in-demand ferries.

Also need a dump somewhere to take the toxic seaweed which has ruined the last 2 summers for many people. It is a costly and protracted exercise with 1 truckload per day being taken off-island.

Many of the roads are in very poor condition with constant fixes on main roads lasting a very short time.

No new hall for Rakino. Community halls do not get enough use, and this will be a big outlay per ratepayer on the island.

The board could also consider loaning money to householders in the areas like the Little Oneroa catchment to upgrade septic systems instead of paying a group every year to monitor and do nothing.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Review the whole structure of CCOs.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Do more for public transport, no more roads. No more safety improvements. Road safety is due to the lack of responsible and well trained drivers. Do not remove gold card funding. This would be devastating for Waiheke Island residents.

Water: We pay for our own water supplies and treatment on Waiheke. We should get a bonus to acknowledge this.



#12735



City and local development, as well as economic and cultural development: It is not the Councils role to support businesses. On Waiheke we not need more support for businesses as it is over-touristed already and the infrastructure can't cope. All the same we deal with a huge influx of visitors which is not taken into account. And funding for the Local Board has been restricted severely. This is not equitable. Council support would be important if council didn't waste so much money (e.g. on contractors) and useless managers. Waiheke should be more independent.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

There is still a lot wasted in useless bureaucracy, submissions, translations, contractors, and advisors. There is also no need to sponsor events which only benefit businesses. Communities can organise their own events.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

A lot of the projects are over-engineered, e.g. raised pedestrian crossings. I think council is being ripped off by contractors. Do not remove gold card funding. Waiheke residents should get a bonus for putting up with the hordes of often badly behaved and drunken day trippers and tourists. AT public transport planners actually have to take the busses here on Waiheke and see how inefficient they are, e.g. in meeting the ferries. AT never listens to locals who have excellent suggestions.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Especially on Waiheke, more footpaths and cycle ways.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No more roads, we have to organise the existing road infrastructure properly and efficiently, prioritising walking, cycling, efficient public transport. There is no one concept fits the whole city. Projects should be customised to the local needs.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#12735



Other

Tell us why:

Forget about the stadium. We don't need more or better 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

We need the funds now for the future. Not 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 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 is doubtful who will lease the operation if it is not profitable. What about the solution to move the port to Whangarei? Didn't Wayne Brown get elected for his support of that proposal? A 35-year commitment is 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:

It is obvious that we need the money now.



#12735



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

The cause for our dilemma is the Supercity. It does not work as it is too huge, a big immovable moloch with too many rip-off artists.

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate | Do not support |



#12735



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#12735



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |



#12735



Tell us why

Waiheke is mainly rural and has different needs and goals from the mainland.

Businesses and tourist operators advertise our natural environment. It must be supported. However, the local population is also important as they are service providers or in cas

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It is not enough.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The feedback on the longterm plan and the whole submission process is too much for most people. People do not have enough time to put together a concise feedback on every point or digest and analyse all the background information. You want to hear from Aucklanders of all backgrounds but a lot of people do not have the necessary cultural or linguistic knowledge to cope which such extended submissions.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#12738



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

As retired residents on Waiheke, we could not manage with a reduction in Gold Card hours. We often need to attend medical appointments off island and these can be at any hour, the cost for ferry travel back to the island is prohibitive.

2a. Is there anything you 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?

Other

Tell us here:



#12738



We require more info , who would the port be leased to? What happens if the port activities are moved out of Auckland?

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:

These decisions will be made once all information is available.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

As above

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



#12738

| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#12738



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |



#12738



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Residential rates on Waiheke are approx. \$25m to \$30m, yet the council plans to only spend \$885,000 (3.3%)on Key priorities? It hardly seems fair....

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Mediocre, council could do better with our rates.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Fairer Funding for local boards , I we totally agree with. Along with this total transparency from our local board is required , no more behind close door meetings unless they are employment issues. And no more pushing their own views.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Paying consultants



#12774



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support the continuation of Gold card free public transport as we have it now. Strongly opposed to scraping it for afternoon public transport

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?

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



#12774



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#12774



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#12774



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | I don't know |



#12774



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Absolutely essential that AC continues to fund free ferry fares for Waiheke Gold card residues throughout the day. With the proposed changes we would not be able to go to Auckland for medical requirements including cancer treatment. First bus at 9 am, catch a ferry at 10 am, arrive Auckland 10.45 - 11 am, bus to hospital, arriving at 11.30 - 12 am. In order to get the Waiheke bus back home again, would need to be on the 2 pm ferry, which means leaving hospital at 1 pm, so only 1 hour at the hospital - IF it is possible to get that apt time, IF they are not running late, IF the ferry or bus is not running late. The cost of the Waiheke ferry is too high to be covered by superannuation. The Goldcard is the only thing that has allowed Waiheke pensioners to be able to look after their health needs.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12786



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

do more

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

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:



#12786



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | I don't know |



#12786



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#12786



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |



#12786



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12791



Wasting our money with organisations like Eke Panuku and Auckland Transport. Both could provide the same output at 30-50% less cost.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

TMP's are a roort. Laughable waste.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fixing pot holes faster to reduce vehicle and further road damage.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

TMP's, vehicle crossing physical inspections where a suitably qualified contractor is delivering - reduced cost and photos should be sufficient.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Change to a smaller multiuse facility able to be used by smaller groups rather than a big stadium seldom 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#12791



Will funds to be invested to yield better returns but not to be used on operational matters.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:

Should have been returned to public space 30 years ago.

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



#12791



Tell us why:

The port should be able to operate to the east only and Bledisloe redeveloped for a world class waterfront precinct.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing | Support |



#12791



| | |
|---|---------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#12791



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Sewer treatment and water quality. Pest and invasive plant species eradication.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12801



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Raised Crossing and other traffic calming methods save the lives of those in the community. There should be more investment in these to encourage walking and thus taking more traffic off the roads. Car traffic minimisation through investments in safer alternatives is a viable long term plan.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Traffic calming, cycle lanes, lots more. I do not cycle because it is too dangerous.

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:

The value capture would be sent (likely) overseas and between dividends and assets value lift I think it is too short term. The future fund value proposition is by no means certain and to achieve 7.5% would be in the middle/higher risk make up of investments. That's not what a Council should be looking at or paying external consultants fees for.



#12801



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 amount of potential income of \$2.3b is approx \$65,000,000 per year in today's money. For an external entity to operate the port and generate the proposed lease figure plus a return on that either up front figure or annual figure, the costs to the supply chain or staff will be significant. Costs either need to come down, or prices need to increase. I would hate to see that value captured by anyone other than Auckland Council. With purely competent management, those returns that the external operators think they can generate ($\$2.3b \times 6.5\%$) should be able to be captured by the rate payers of Auckland and thus the benefits.

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 generates the same outcome as the leasing proposal but with higher overall income year on year i.e. the \$65m plus 6.5% etc.

4d. Do you have 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



#12801



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:

So that it can be used to generate economic growth for the region of auckland as opposed to handing that to Northland. All other ports would crawl over broken glass for that economic activity, just becuae its in downtown doesn't make it bad.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. | Do not support |



#12801



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#12801



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#12817



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)?

Tell us 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:

Because if it is leased Auckland is locked into that lease for 35 years, 5 to 10 years there may be the need to move the port, we need to retain full ownership.



#12817



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

That is my choice.

4d. Do you have 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:

My choice.

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



#12817



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#12817



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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 AM OPPOSED TO INTRODUCING CHARGES TO GOLD CARD HOLDERS TO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT ON WEEK DAY AFTERNOONS, FOR SOME LIKE MYSELF TO TRAVEL TO MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS AT GREENLANE OR AUCKLAND HOSPITAL USING PUBLIC TRANSPORT AS I HAVE NO OTHER CHOICE BUT TO TRAVEL THAT WAY CAN REGULARLY REQUIRE TRAVEL AT THAT TIME OF DAY. WHAT IS EASILY FORGOTTEN IS THAT TRAVEL ACROSS AUCKLAND TAKES TIME, FOR ME HERE ON WAIHEKE ISLAND AN APPOINTMENT AT GREENLANE IS A DAY AWAY FROM HOME. THAT IS AT LEAST TWO HOURS EACH WAY PLUS THE TIME AT THE CLINIC. I TRAVEL FROM WAIHEKE TO MASSEY AT LEAST ONE EACH MONTH THAT IS A MINIMUM OF 3 HOURS EACH WAY WITHOUT DOING ANYTHING WHEN I GET THERE. THIS AUCKLAND NOT HAMILTON IT TAKES TIME TO GET ANYWHERE AND BACK.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

I wish to maintain the status quo for the AT Hop card for over-65's.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12865



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I do not support the capped weekly transport passes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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:



#12865



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#12865



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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> |



#12865



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#12905



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#12905



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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> |



#12905



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, 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?



#12905



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |



#12905



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

More money is needed so Waiheke is maintained.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do not lease the Port long term



#12918



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:

Underutilized, needs more promotion

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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

Tell us here:

We want to see a plan to MOVE the Port - we do not need more commercial freight operations in the heart of our Harbor City -or worse' wharves further extended



#12918



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:

Reduce Council staffing Overheads - to save more money

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's CBD waterfront - heart of city - we need more people back

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 above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#12918



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |



#12918



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#12918



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Our Local Board has good knowledge of our unique community environment - totally support Local Board



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#12982



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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?



#12982



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#12982



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | I don't know |



#12982



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |



#12982



| | |
|--|--|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not enough budget going forward.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Tourism- if you are not in business, you would not benefit from it.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Employing too many outsourcing companies and contractors.



#12995



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I have limited access to Auckland transport as I live Waiheke Island.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Free school bus

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:

Old stadium may cost more to maintain.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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



#12995



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#12995



| | |
|---|--------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#12995



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |



#12995



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Cycle lanes, traffic reduction, air quality improvement

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Na



#13020



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Reducing traffic, reducing the reliance on cars, integrated public transport as in many European cities is the future. That will require investment and planning now.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Traffic reduction, cycling lanes, pollution reduction

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The stadium is a great community facility and increasing utilization 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:

The city doesn't need to be an investor in the airport

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#13020



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 council is not a port operator, that's not its core competence

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:

This focuses the money on investment

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

The port should move from the city centre in the long term

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



#13020



Tell us why:

The port should move from the city centre

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#13020



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#13020



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Ferry subsidies for all and better health care for the aged and support for them.
Waiheke rates should go back to Waiheke. Easier process for building and resort consents. We should have a small hospital on the island, accomodation for the sick.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#13036



Less consultants and money wastage. For example the helicopter pad in onetangi was quoted through council for over \$100k it cost us without consents \$5000 and has saved many people's life.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Gold card needs to be available on Waiheke with subsidised ferry's. If people have hospital appointments without a gold card it should be free or at a discounted rate. Double deckers need to go as Waiheke roads can't cope with the weight - there should be a rule on weight on these roads.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Trains - more reliable trains in town - possibly a hydro ferry for Waiheke and essentially public transportation to curb the traffic in town

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Redoing roads that do not need redoing and badly managed projects

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



#13036



Tell us why:

Losing control - Auckland need to be in control of the international airport

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:

Against selling productive assets. Short term gain., long term loss.

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:

To fund council and Auckland.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

It shouldn't be done - Auckland council should hold full ownership.

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:



#13036



Auckland need to find another out of town area for a port with the relevant rail services in place for transport.

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:

IT is prime land, essential for tourism and could be used to increase Aucklands appeal internationally.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. | Do not support |



#13036



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I think we need to have a clearer understanding of the fairness of where the \$ are going and to what local boards - it seems to be directed at certain locations rather than an overall Auckland policy

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#13036



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We need to concentrate on the environment here as it is a sell point internationally and brings people from all over the world. Without our environment, tracks etc being maintained properly the cost in the future would be huge to regain what we have alre



#13036



7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Great priorities but again more needs to be done for people in need here not just the environment. I believe that Waiheke should have and manage their own council as an offshot with the rates we pay and the minds that could manage this on the island. We'd be far better off being self sufficient especially with the lack of funding we are now getting. Where is our money going?

8. Do you have any other comments?

It needs to be tightened - less meetings and getting nowhere - too many chiefs and not many indians.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | 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 support the pay more, get more option. Above selections are based on the assumption that more of/less of are based on current activity.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#13042



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The large number of public transport initiatives is commendable, particularly the \$50 weekly cap for bus, trains and inner harbor ferries. The congestion pricing scheme compliments this also, nice.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Investment in cycling that is just focused on completing existing projects and delivering lower cost cycleways isn't enough. Cycleways should also dovetail with making public transport more accessible and congestion reduction (congestion pricing).

Currently cycleways outside of the CBD are barely functional. The CBD cycleways actually work, sort of connect with each other, and can be used by a range of cycles. On Waiheke Island for instance the only new cycleway that has been installed in the last 8 years or so (probably about 200m of it) is below council's own standard for width and probably for surface irregularity too. In this time (last 8 years) more cycleways have fallen into disrepair and been abandoned than that (are no longer used by cyclists - they use the road instead). The standard on Waiheke seems to be asphaltic concrete over basecourse with timber or no edging which is not very long-term thinking and most of these can now not be ridden by a ten-speed style bicycle. Furthermore, the type of cycleway arrangement at intersections that is still being installed on Waiheke puts cycles, pedestrians and vehicles in conflict. Separating out the transport modes as it's done in the city is much safer and encourages more people onto cycles (reducing congestion and carbon).

Although it doesn't personally affect me, I strongly oppose the 'pay less' proposed cut to Gold Card AT HOP hours of use. Many Waiheke Island residents rely on Gold Card concessions to get to important health and other services.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#13042



I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't know the stadium complex or its management and the consultation document isn't nuanced enough to gauge the best direction here.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

plan is to sell over time, so hopefully this will be at a more auspicious time share-pricewise than last time. I don't think AIAL is a good long-term investment, but selling when there is a market downturn was not very strategic.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 less brand-new expensive development on climate change sensitive land the better. The waterfront is much more suited to low-cost public spaces. While these areas are still usable, they can bring enjoyment to a lot of people.

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:



#13042



We're going to need it.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance sounds prudent - the insurance landscape is becoming less reliable as disasters get worse and more common.

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:

Even more CBD development would be inappropriate at this stage. The CBD is first world already while many suburban centres are not. Otahuhu for instance should be completed, or the two parts that have been done should be connected in some fashion anyway.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Same answer as 5a.

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 |
|---|---------|



#13042



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#13042



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Children need to be encouraged and taught to recycle. reintroducing recycling charges for schools really sends the wrong message and could even be detrimental long-term to good wate management strategies.

The Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) should be re-established in full to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

In regard to targeted rates generally - I support the proposal to abandon the previous plan to slowly reduce the share of rates that business properties pay.

I would like the Accommodation Providers Targeted Rate reintroduced and available to Local Boards to use as a lever to adjust housing inequities. For instance, introducing this to Waiheke Island for Air B&B type accommodation would likely boost the number of long-term rentals available. This is one of the biggest problems on Waiheke Island and there appears to be nothing in the Long Term Plan that will provide any balance to our long-term versus short-term accommodation problem. Auckland-wide it might help densification if there was also an rates rebate/reduction package available to homeowners who let part of their own residence on a long-term basis (slightly off-topic sorry).

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#13042



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I disagree that the Local Board funding proposal is fairer.

Waiheke Island struggles in many respects to achieve services that are available elsewhere in Auckland such as fit-for-purpose cycleways. Taking 70% out of the Waiheke Island budget over the next three years seems callous and poorly thought through. The benefit to tourism of a well-functioning Waiheke Island hasn't been considered perhaps.

Given that a different calculation is used for Waiheke Island (& Aotea) the 'fairer' label is not very convincing. Particularly when it appears that only some 10% or so of rates



#13042



revenue from Waiheke Island will be reinvested in the Local Board. Also, since targeted rates vary between local Board areas any 'fairness' implied by applying the same Local Board funding formula to most Local Boards is getting quite subjective - the 'fairness' may only be in the minds of the team that have constructed this funding formula.

Spending at this low level will mean most of our assets deteriorate and will just get patch up maintenance for the next three years. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up significantly. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, repair or replace.

Infrastructure that is part of Waiheke Islands attraction to tourists and residents includes getting around by e-bike (cycleways) and walking trails. Both of these will suffer with any reduction in Waiheke Local Board funding.

There is also a strong possibility that predator free and marine conservation initiatives will be negatively affected by such a reduction. These programs are supported by hundreds of residents who back-up Te Korowai o Waiheke and the Waiheke Marine Project with (collectively) hundreds of hours work each week.

If community support projects like Budgeting Services or Project Outreach are affected then there will be vulnerable members of our community that are likely to need major changes to their living arrangements. If staff from organisations like these are lost as a result of cuts to our budget, then that's an irreversible loss. The institutional knowledge people who do this sort of work have is invaluable; their remuneration is usually just a fraction of their true worth to our community in terms of direct benefits.

8. Do you have any other comments?

I support the pay more, get more proposal and very strongly object to the pay less, get less one.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | 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?



#13050



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:

DON't sell off our assets - it's a short term solution

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:



#13050



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#13050



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | Support |



#13050



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |



#13050



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 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?

Sort the ferry service PTOM arrangement out - it is ridiculous for Waiheke, we deserve to be subsidized. We need more localised health amenities for our elderly and youth

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#13059



Less cones and ripping up and redoing pavements and curbs and other unnecessary cosmetics in the more affluent suburbs while Waiheke pavements are few and far between.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Absolutely against limiting Gold card users in peak times. Most users have no choice re times for medical appointments. I don't

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Sort the ferry services out to make it more equitable and competitive,

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle lanes, raised pedestrian crossing,

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

They need housing more than 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#13059



Tell us why:

I'm against selling productive assets when the value can never be recovered. IT's foolish short term economic thinking.

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:

35 years is far too long to lease anything

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 it.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Not interested in this future fund at all.

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:



#13059



It enhances Aucklands waterfront.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Because it is fine as it is.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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> |



#13059



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

WE need more transparency with the reasons specific suburbs are allocated revenue where as we have had ours cut to the bone

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#13059



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke is used as a cash cow destination for Auckland and our infrastructure, and facilities are inundated with people that don't pay rates here so we bear the cost. It's a attraction and destination for the famous and wealthy and needs to look the part

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Unsure haven't read it yet - too short notice which is shocking.



#13059



8. Do you have any other comments?

Council controlled organisations are at best privatised ports that aren't accountable and at worst neither transparent or accountable. Commercial sensitivity is not an excuse to keep the public ignorant. At is a classic example.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Improve public transport so that all people can get around easily and reliably, not just those who can drive

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#13067



Reduce spend on roading infrastructure, accept increased congestion so that there are incentives for people to use public transport

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support public transport measures, need to ensure good value for money and significant improvements. Eg do raised pedestrian crossings actually improve safety significantly?

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways, bus/public transport frequency and range of routes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roading

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Keep land as strategic long term investment, maximise utilisation of asset and defer upgrade until it's more affordable.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#13067



Tell us why:

AIAL and Port ownership is of long term strategic assets, far beyond simply the financial value as an investment. Contractual securities and restrictions are never as watertight as ownership. This should be valued more highly than simply the financial return on 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:

As above, this is a long term strategic asset which already delivers a financial return. Contractual conditions are never as definitive as ownership.

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:

No need for separate Auckland Fund, take the dividends and invest directly in Council initiatives

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Don't implement Future Fund. Self-insurance makes some sense, however, experience in the Christchurch earthquakes demonstrates the value of off-sure under-writers for events NZ cannot afford to self-insure for.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#13067



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:

Need to maximise utilisation of assets for wider community/societal benefit, not just industrial. This will maximise the attractiveness of the downtown 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

Tell us why:

Seems relatively cost-neutral if port operations can be transferred elsewhere so might as well increase public utility

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#13067



| | |
|---|---------|
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#13067



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

Take serious approaches to addressing existential climate change. Council's efforts so far have been inadequate.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#13074



Stop wasting money across all areas. The real problem is AC's operational and capex spending, its poor procurement record and spending on external accounting, legal and consulting firms. Auckland is simply not paying its way. Citizens and businesses are not paying enough to maintain the services consumed.

It is unbelievable that we are presented with three either or options. Budgets and plans are not binary as suggested. An open submissions process would allow mix and match options.

It is unacceptable that the proposed rate increases in all scenarios is less in the second year which just happens to be the Council's election year.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Oppose capped weekly public transport passes and not developing cycleways. Auckland needs to adopt public and active transport modes rather than over reliance on cars.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Electrification of the ferry fleet.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The roading network.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

This issue should be decided by North Shore citizens.



#13074



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 scheme is totally unrealistic. It is simply a PR exercise to fool the public into thinking something is being done to smooth out future costs.

If such a scheme was to have any chance of success it would have to be contributory and/or use compound interest to increase the capital pool.

A one-off fund of probably no more than \$2.5 billion will produce at a net return of 5 per cent only \$125 million per year. This will only contribute about 1 per cent to the Council's overall spending of approximately \$111 billion per year.

Such facts are not included in the analysis. Why not?

Also where is the expert review of the concept.?

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 will not provide sufficient funds to make a sustainable funding pool. Councils must own crucial 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



#13074



Tell us here:

Leasing the port will not provide sufficient funds to make a sustainable funding pool.
.As previously mentioned the Auckland Future Fund will have no real impact on reducing the CAPEX and OPEX costs of Council.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

The self-insurance option can happen under any scenario and is an operational policy decision not a capital issue.

Port land must stay in public ownership.

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:

Sensible option.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

A reduction in the scale of port operations in Auckland with more shipments needing to be transported into Auckland by truck or rail is simply not acceptable in an era of climate change. Transport emissions are Auckland's largest source

of greenhouse gases. All steps must be taken to reduce emissions. Therefore, Bledisloe must remain as an operational area.



#13074



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#13074



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Just reduce the overall cost of Auckland Council.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for | Very Important |



#13074



| | |
|--|----------------|
| community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The priorities outlined are crucial to the functioning of the community.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Appalling. It is unbelievable that Waiheke Local Board is facing the largest cut back (70%) from \$8.2 million for the next three years to \$2.5 million for the next three years.

Given the rate return of \$27 million per year this is simply not acceptable.

We need fair board funding.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The submission process is undemocratic with predetermined questions and options which prevent an open and frank discussion of the options.

The consultation process doel not involve the general public presenting to AC. This is clearly a violation of citizen's rights.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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 resilience.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop wasteful spending.



#13103



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do not support capped weekly transport passes.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Support more active transport modes.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roading projects.

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:

A non feasible proposal which will have little if any impact.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#13103



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 leasing option does not produce much if any additional funds but effectively cedes public ownership 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?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Auckland Future Fund is just not a viable option.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

For certain assets self-insurance should be a normal operating policy of the Council

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:

Sensible.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#13103



Tell us why:

Best greenhouse emissions option.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#13103



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#13103



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Waiheke budget must be increased. Why was its funding reduced the most?

We should have a fair funding system.

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waiheke ratepayers pay for the so-called tourism jewel not the overall Auckland ratepayers. Let's be fair.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Dislike the format of HaveYourSay with its predetermined questions. Its stifles discussion, innovation and does not build a resilient sustainable communities.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#13113



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

As a resident of Waiheke island, we are severely impacted by poor delivery of the public ferry service by Fullers. Fullers and the Waiheke route need to come under PTOM. Gold Card rights to free public ferry transport for the island are to be maintained at the usual hours. Use local contractors rather than Downers and get cost effect road repairs.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways on Waiheke

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

New 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Establish an Auckland Future fund and lease the Ports of Auckland. Use this funding for stocks and shares.

Do not sell AIAL shareholding. The returns are good and will get better.



#13113



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the 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 for both funding of council services AND investing in 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?

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:



#13113



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#13113



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Increase the water quality targeted rate so that we protect our water ways rather than maintain them at their current level

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, | Very Important |



#13113



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

First of all, we are an island, Waiheke Island rather than Waiheke. We have a strong and connected community. We are not a suburb of Auckland nor are we funders of Auckland infrastructure. Our natural environment is very important to protect. We need mari

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I totally support the Waiheke Local board priorities.....

to meet key community needs such as transport, housing, environmental and economic

- increased decision-making over all council owned and operated assets on Waiheke to facilitate future asset development and enhanced community facilities for the community
- implementation of effective flood control by use of nature-based solutions, proactive stormwater



#13113



maintenance and necessary capital investment

- working with relevant authorities, partners, and mana whenua to support the implementation of marine protection strategies, and eliminate the exotic Caulerpa from the Hauraki Gulf
- continuation of the AT LB capital fund, and funding for the Waiheke 10-year Transport Plan
- progressing the Auckland Transport Mātiatia Landside Improvements project
- funding for equitable public transport ferry fares for our residents and our Auckland based work force
- affordable, reliable ferry services and wharf infrastructure that is fit for purpose and future proofed
- funding line to facilitate required changes in the Hauraki Gulf Island District Plan for Dark Sky

THE FUNDING FOR THE WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD should not be cut by 70%. That is not acceptable or necessary and not democratic. WE KNOW WHAT WE NEED HERE.

8. Do you have any other comments?

The funding for the Waiheke Local Board should not be cut!!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Disband the SuperCity

Increase the proposed funding for Waiheke Local Board

Any idle land that was originally gifted by Maori to be returned



#13121



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the number of consultants, and lower the expenses/fees paid to those who are left

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycleways need to go ahead

There needs to be a direct train line to the airport

Bring Waiheke ferries in line with others with regards to subsidising

Do NOT reduce the availability of the Gold Card

Introduce a Clean car rebate for EV purchase

Introduce congestion charges

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No. The above should be able to self fund

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No.

Good management should be able to enable self-funding

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#13121



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

They are an asset we need to retain. It's bad enough that the majority have already gone.

Is this a proposal for Mayor Wayne Brown to get a 2nd bite of the cherry after not getting all the shares to sell first time round?

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:

We need to retain the control of the port in Auckland

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 haven't studied the repercussions of either enough

h to decide

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#13121



No

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I'm not qualified to understand the ramifications of any of the proposals

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

i don't know enough about the pros and cons to make a good decision.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | Support |



#13121



| | |
|---|----------------|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Pursue the government to pay rates on property that is government owned (hospitals / airports etc)

Disband the Super City -or at the very least have a referendum for Auckland rate payers



#13121



Do not continue with the unfair plan to cut so much funding from the Waiheke Local Board

Ensure Waiheke and any other areas that is on septic tank and tank water are not charged for services they don't benefit from.

Do not change the current benefits and hours of the Gold Card

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan | Very Important |



#13121



| | |
|--|----------------|
| and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I support all those initiatives listed as well as whatever the Local Board proposes.

What I DO NOT SUPPORT is the drastic cut to the funding that is being proposed

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

See above

8. Do you have any other comments?

The proposed % cut to funds for Waiheke is unfair and ill-conceived

.it's a growing area that needs far better support.

Our island does not warrant or deserve to be treated like a poor cousin who doesn't matter

DISBAND the SuperCity



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Waiheke

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 | 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?

Give priority, do more for families with children

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#13138



More to rubbish collection every 2 weeks.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do more for public transport and cycling

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Trains, buses, bikes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads and cars

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell 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:



#13138



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?



#13138



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#13138



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |



#13138



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Fairly Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke 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: Waiheke

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 | 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?



#13140



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I object to the reduction of planned cycleways

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I object to the sale of any of stadium precinct land

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Establishing and managing the fund involves ongoing extra costs and means further privatisation of public assets. airport shares should be held on to, they provide a steady income, allow some input in future airport development, and are likely to increase in value.

The investment experts will most likely want to invest in the most profitable businesses, which could potentially cause environmental harm, carbon emissions, worker exploitation, and health risks. The Future Fund will siphon off revenue to investment advisors and consultants. reduce public control, lower the quality of services that should be run for the benefit of people not profit.



#13140



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 out the port means loss of control over a key strategic asset. It will lead to increased prices for everyday products in Auckland, reduced profits for the Auckland economy with profits potentially going overseas. It could also mean reduced jobs for New Zealanders, diminished safety regulations for workers and less environmental protection.

The port operating business is a key part of Auckland's infrastructure, and needs to stay in the hands of the people of Auckland.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Continuing current investment in public services must be protected and going outside of the current investment practice raises a risk to the public services that Aucklanders rely upon.

4d. Do you have 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



#13140



Tell us why:

the transfer of ownership to Auckland Council would limit the space that Auckland Port has for its operations. there is no guarantee that Council won't sell the land off or lease it out rather than using it to create public space.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

the transfer of ownership to Auckland Council would severely reduce the space for Auckland Port to run its operations.

And as in 5a. there is no guarantee that Council won't sell the land off or lease it out rather than using it to create public space.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | Do not support |



#13140



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waiheke



#13140



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | Very Important |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | Very Important |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | Very Important |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Very Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | Very Important |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support the Waiheke Local Board's



#13140



8. Do you have any other comments?

It is proposed to cut Waiheke's capital budget to \$2.5 million in total for the next three years. Spending at this low level would see most of our assets deteriorate due to insufficient levels of maintenance for the next three years. Our tracks, reserves, halls, playgrounds etc. will be seriously impacted. By then the costs to remediate them will have gone up enormously. Choices will then have to be made about which assets we lose, or repair and replace. This is absolutely unacceptable and unsustainable.

Any budget cut lacks insight in the island's high requirements for repair, maintenance and enhancement of its vulnerable ecosystems. It also lacks fiscal foresight as Waiheke's well kept walking tracks, reserves, community spaces and natural attractions are a major draw card for visitors thus boosting Auckland's income from tourism.