



Long-Term Plan 2024-2034

**Summary of feedback received during
Auckland Council's public consultation from
28 February to 28 March, 2024**



Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 Summary of Feedback

Purpose

This report summarises feedback received during the long-term plan public consultation in February/March 2024. It aims to capture key themes regarding views and preferences rather than detailing every point of feedback received. This report does not include any advice or recommendations for decision making.

Executive summary

Consultation items were agreed by Governing Body on 6 December 2023. The Consultation Document and Supporting Information were adopted by the Governing Body on 20 February 2024. Public consultation ran between 28 February and 28 March 2024.

We consulted the public on the following key issues:

1. The overall direction for the long-term plan budget, including overall implications for rates
2. Options and trade-offs for seven areas of council-funded services and activities
3. Our proposed transport plan
4. A proposal to establish a diversified investment fund (Auckland Future Fund) including options for making changes to our shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited and the operation of Port of Auckland Limited, with proceeds to be invested in the fund
5. Options for future use of Captain Cook Wharf, Marsden Wharf and Bledisloe Terminal (Port of Auckland)
6. Options for the future of the North Harbour stadium precinct

We also sought feedback on changes to our rating policy (including changes to business rates and several targeted rates), fees and charges, and Local Board priorities (not covered in this report as these are summarised and provided to Local Boards separately). In addition, we asked the public to provide feedback on other issues that are important to them.

Feedback to inform the long-term plan was received through written forms (including online and printed feedback forms as well as emails) and in person at dedicated *Have Your Say* events and other events where Auckland Council representatives were present to engage with the public and capture their feedback.

We received a total of 27,978 pieces of feedback, including 2,142 pieces of feedback at in-person events. We heard from 391 organisations (including 38 attending one of three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say events), and 23 Māori entities.

Included in submissions from organisations was one petition:

- From Seal Rodney Roads, containing 1,354 signatures supporting the funding of sealing rural roads in Rodney.

We also received submissions from six pro forma campaigns, including three with over 100 submissions. The largest three were:

- From the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance campaign, contributing 4,207 responses
- From the Save our Stadium campaign, contributing 863 responses

- From the Sports and Recreations Facilities Investment Fund support pro forma, contributing 221 responses.

A summary of these templated submissions is provided in the body of the report.

Many submissions addressed only some of the proposals, therefore the quantity of feedback on each proposal differs. In the summary that follows, percentages are based only on submissions which responded to the relevant topic. Percentages on some proposals may not add up to 100 due to rounding or, in the case of the North Harbour Stadium proposals, because submitters were able to choose more than one proposed option.

Feedback is shown via four categories:

- Individuals (which includes feedback received from individuals at events)
- Organisations (which includes submissions from organisations received at the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say events)
- Māori entities and
- Pro forma campaigns.

It is important to note that submissions from organisations are counted as a single submission. While organisations may represent multiple individuals, we cannot verify how many individuals' views are represented by an organisations' submission, how many also belong to other submitting organisations or submitted their own individual responses. In addition, their perspectives which may reflect larger groups or people and/or expert views would be diluted by the volume of individual submissions if not reported separately. enabling elected members to determine the weight to be given to the feedback received.

All feedback received is processed and included in the overall analysis with the following exceptions:

- Feedback submitted under a clear and obvious false identity have been excluded
- Where there are multiple submissions from the same individual, only the last has been included (under the assumption this represented their final view) unless the submissions answered different questions
- Where there are multiple submissions from the same organisation the submissions have been merged into one record, or where it is not clear that the submission is from an official representative of the organisation the submission has been counted as individual feedback
- A submission from Ports of Auckland Limited will be outlined separately in staff advice provided to decision makers on the proposals relating to the future of the Port, including Captain Cook and Marsden wharves and Bledisloe Terminal.

This summary follows the order in which questions appeared on the feedback form.

For brevity, this executive summary covers the response options provided in the feedback form. Many submitters also provided comments with their response and common themes from this feedback are provided in the body of the report.

1.0 Consultation items

1.1 Preferred overall direction of the Long-term plan

Of the 15,954 **individual** responses, 37 per cent supported 'do less (reduce council services/investment)', 34 per cent indicated 'proceed with the central proposal' and 20 per cent supported 'do more (increase council services/investment)'. Four per cent selected 'other', and a further five per cent selected 'I don't know'.

Of the 259 **organisation** responses, 21 per cent supported ‘do less (reduce council services/investment)’, 36 per cent indicated ‘proceed with the central proposal’ and 24 per cent supported ‘do more (increase council services/investment)’. 13 per cent selected ‘other’, and a further seven per cent selected ‘I don’t know’.

13 **Māori entities** responded to this proposal, one supported ‘do less (reduce council services/investment)’, three indicated ‘proceed with the central proposal’, two supported ‘do more (increase council services/investment)’ and seven selected ‘other’.

Of the 4,249 **pro forma** responses to this proposal, 99 per cent indicated support ‘do less (reduce council services/investment)’ and one per cent indicated an ‘other’ option.

1.2 Do more or do less

Submitters were asked to give feedback on whether they supported the central proposal, doing less or doing more in respect of seven areas of council-funded services and activities.

Transport

Of the 16,554 **individual** responses, 20 per cent supported ‘do less’, 36 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 44 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Of the 234 **organisation** responses, 13 per cent supported ‘do less’, 36 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 51 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Water

Of the 16,495 **individual** responses, 11 per cent supported ‘do less’, 47 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 42 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Of the 226 **organisation** responses, four per cent supported ‘do less’, 42 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 54 per cent supported ‘do more’.

City and local development

Of the 16,302 **individual** responses, 40 per cent supported ‘do less’, 39 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 21 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Of the 225 **organisation** responses, 28 per cent supported ‘do less’, 41 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 31 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Environment and regulation

Of the 16,443 **individual** responses, 25 per cent supported ‘do less’, 39 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 36 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Of the 224 **organisation** responses, 17 per cent supported ‘do less’, 40 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 43 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Parks and community

Of the 16,683 **individual** responses, 26 per cent supported ‘do less’, 40 per cent indicated ‘as proposed’ and 34 per cent supported ‘do more’.

Of the 243 **organisation** responses, 14 per cent supported 'do less', 27 per cent indicated 'as proposed' and 59 per cent supported 'do more'.

Economic and cultural development

Of the 16,386 **individual** responses, 41 per cent supported 'do less', 37 per cent indicated 'as proposed' and 22 per cent supported 'do more'.

Of the 226 **organisation** responses, 24 per cent supported 'do less', 34 per cent indicated 'as proposed' and 42 per cent supported 'do more'.

Council support

Of the 16,431 **individual** responses, 28 per cent supported 'do less', 48 per cent indicated 'as proposed' and 24 per cent supported 'do more'.

Of the 221 **organisation** responses, 18 per cent supported 'do less', 49 indicated 'as proposed' and 33 per cent supported 'do more'.

Feedback from Māori entities

All mana whenua entities that answered questions about the seven investment themes agreed that council should proceed with the proposal or do more in each area. The areas which received the strongest support were 'Environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment' followed by 'Water: Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways.'

Mataawaka entities want to see more done in the areas of te reo Māori, youth development, sports and wellbeing programmes, driver licensing, rangatahi representation, promoting bi culturalism, multi culturalism and more meaningful engagement with council. Mataawaka entities wanted to see less bureaucracy, less council staff turnover and less expenditure on services that do not contribute to the wellbeing or development of Māori.

1.3 Transport proposal

Of the 16,746 **individual** responses, 30 per cent supported 'all the proposal', 43 per cent indicated support for 'most of the proposal', 13 per cent did not support 'most of the proposal' and eight per cent did not support 'any of the proposal'. Another six per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 223 **organisation** responses, 24 per cent supported 'all the proposal', 49 per cent indicated support for 'most of the proposal', 14 per cent did not support 'most of the proposal' and three per cent did not support 'any of the proposal'. Another 10 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, one supported 'all the proposal', three supported 'most of the proposal', and four did not support 'most of the proposal'. One indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 43 **pro forma** responses to this proposal, one supported 'all the proposal', and 42 supported 'most of the proposal'.

1.4 North Harbour stadium

Of the 15,203 **individual** responses, 33 per cent selected 'keep the stadium precinct as it is', 33 per cent selected 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct' and 26 per cent selected 'change the operational management'. Four per cent indicated 'other', and a further 18 indicated 'I don't know'.

For this question, submitters were able to select more than one option with the exceptions that they could not select both 'keep the stadium precinct as it is' and 'consider redeveloping the stadium', and they could not select 'don't know' and any other option.

Of the 15,090 **individual** responses where their selections can be cross-referenced¹:

- 27 per cent selected 'keep the stadium precinct as it is' and did not select 'change the operational management'
- 5 per cent selected both 'keep the stadium precinct as it is' and 'change the operational management'
- 26 per cent selected 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct' and did not select 'change the operational management'
- 8 per cent selected both 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct' and 'change the operational management'
- 12 per cent selected 'change the operational management' and did not select either 'keep the stadium precinct as it is' nor 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct'.

Of the 200 **organisation** responses, 28 per cent selected 'keep the stadium precinct as it is', 31 per cent selected 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct' and 30 per cent 'change the operational management'. Seven per cent selected 'other', and a further 23 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 11 **Māori entity** responses, one selected 'keep the stadium precinct as it is', two selected 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct' and two selected 'change the operational management'. Five indicated 'other', and one other indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 872 **pro forma** responses to this proposal, 99 per cent selected 'keep the stadium precinct as it is', less than one per cent selected 'consider redeveloping the stadium precinct', and 99 per cent 'change the operational management'.

1.5 Auckland Future Fund and Auckland International Airport Limited shareholding

Of the 15,012 **individual** responses, 43 per cent supported 'proceed with the proposal' and 35 per cent indicated 'do not proceed'. Four per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 17 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 200 **organisation** responses, 37 per cent supported 'proceed with the proposal' and 29 per cent indicated 'do not proceed'. 10 per cent indicated 'Other', and a further 25 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

¹ This excludes 113 pieces of feedback from local events that were not on a feedback form meaning that the individual selections from one person can not be cross-referenced to determine if they made only one selection or more than one and identify the combination selected.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, one indicated 'proceed with the proposal' and three 'do not proceed'. Five provided an 'other' response.

Of the 4,282 **pro forma** responses to this proposal, 99 per cent indicated 'proceed with the proposal' and one per cent 'do not proceed'.

1.6 Future of Port of Auckland (leasing operation of Port of Auckland)

Of the 15,297 **individual** responses, 42 per cent supported 'continue council group operation of the port' and 38 per cent indicated 'lease the operation of the port'. Six per cent indicated an 'other' option and a further 14 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 197 **organisation** responses, 36 per cent supported 'continue council group operation of the port' and 31 per cent 'lease the operation of the port'. 12 per cent indicated 'other', and a further 21 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 10 **Māori entity** responses, three supported 'continue council group operation of the port' and one indicated 'lease the operation of the port'. Six gave an 'other' response.

Of the 4,282 **pro forma** responses to this proposal, two per cent supported 'continue council group operation of the port' and 98 per cent 'lease the operation of the port'.

1.7 Port of Auckland profits and dividends

Of the 15,075 **individual** responses, 50 per cent indicated 'continue to use it to fund council services' and 33 per cent 'invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund'. Six per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 12 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 183 **organisation** responses, 35 per cent indicated 'continue to use it to fund council services' and 32 per cent 'invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund'. 13 per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 20 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 9 **Māori entity** responses, two indicated 'continue to use it to fund council services' and three 'invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund'. Four provided an 'other' response.

Of the 4,211 **pro forma** responses to this proposal, nearly 100 per cent fell into 'other' and less than one per cent provided other responses. In this instance, 'other' were Auckland Ratepayers Alliance submitters that did not explicitly address this proposal but supported the Auckland Future Fund and "*ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down*".

1.8 Captain Cook and Marsden wharves

Of the 14,666 **individual** responses, 53 per cent indicated 'proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council ...' and 31 per cent indicated 'no change'. Three per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 14 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 190 **organisation** responses, 45 per cent indicated 'proceed' and 22 per cent 'no change'. Seven per cent provided an 'other' response and a further 26 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, two indicated 'proceed' and seven 'other'.

There was no **pro forma** that specifically addressed this proposal as part of the templated content.

1.9 Bledisloe Terminal

Of the 14,519 **individual** responses, 45 per cent indicated 'Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area' and 35 per cent indicated 'Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 18 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 186 **organisation** responses, 33 per cent indicated 'keep' and 33 per cent 'transfer'. Six per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 28 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the eight **Māori entity** responses, one indicated 'keep' and three 'transfer'. Four provided an 'other' response.

There was no **pro forma** that specifically addressed this proposal as part of their templated content.

1.10 Changes to other rates, fees and charges

Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)

Of the 14,598 **individual** responses, 54 per cent supported the proposal and 36 per cent 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further nine per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 185 **organisation** responses, 56 per cent supported the proposal and 24 per cent 'do not support'. Four per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 16 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 10 **Māori entity** responses, 8 supported the proposal, one indicated 'do not support' and one 'other'.

Of the 42 **pro forma** responses, all supported the proposal.

Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)

Of the 14,507 **individual** responses, 70 per cent supported the proposal and 20 per cent 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further eight per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 177 **organisation** responses, 66 per cent supported the proposal and 14 per cent 'do not support'. Eight per cent provided an 'other' responses, and a further 12 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 10 **Māori entity** responses, seven supported the proposal, one indicated 'do not support' and two 'other'.

Of the 42 **pro forma** responses, one supported the proposal and 41 provided an 'other' response.

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)

Of the 14,374 **individual** responses, 57 per cent supported the proposal and 28 per cent 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 13 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 171 **organisation** responses, 57 per cent supported the proposal and 19 per cent 'do not support'. Four per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 20 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, four supported the proposal, two 'do not support' and three provided an 'other' response.

Of the 42 **pro forma** responses, all supported the proposal.

Long Term Differential Strategy (LTDS)

Of the 14,320 **individual** responses, 46 per cent supported the proposal to discontinue the LTDS and 33 per cent 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 18 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 175 **organisation** responses, 43 per cent supported the proposal and 29 per cent 'do not support'. Three per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 25 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, four supported the proposal and two indicated 'do not support'. Two provide dan 'other' response, and one indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 42 **pro forma** responses, 40 supported the proposal and two indicated 'I don't know'.

Re-introducing recycling charges for schools

Of the 13,803 **individual** responses, 32 per cent supported the proposal and 53 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 14 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 165 **organisation** responses, 29 per cent indicated support and 50 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 19 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the eight **Māori entity** responses, three supported the proposal, four did not support and one provided an 'other' response.

Of the 42 **pro forma** responses, all did not support the proposal.

Rates funded refuse collection

Of the 14,208 **individual** responses, 50 per cent supported the proposal and 32 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 16 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

Of the 166 **organisation** responses, 55 per cent supported the proposal and 20 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Three per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 22 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the seven **Māori entity** responses, one supported the proposal and two indicated 'do not support'. Three provided an 'other' response, and one indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 42 **pro forma** responses, 38 supported the proposal, one did not support, two provided an 'other' response and one indicated 'I don't know'.

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate

Of the 3,892 **individual** responses, 47 per cent supported the proposal and 31 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Three per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 19 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 21 **organisation** responses, 11 supported the proposal and two did not support. Two provided an 'other' response and six indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the two **Māori entity** responses, one supported the proposal and one provided an 'other' response.

No **pro forma** submissions responded to this proposal.

Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate

Of the 14,104 **individual** responses, 43 per cent supported the proposal and 16 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 39 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 165 **organisation** responses, 44 per cent supported the proposal and eight per cent indicated 'do not support'. Four per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 45 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, three supported the proposal and two indicated 'do not support'. One provided an 'other' response and one indicated 'I don't know'.

There was no **pro forma** that specifically addressed this proposal as part of their templated content.

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate

Of the 14,163 **individual** responses, 52 per cent supported the proposal and 19 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Two per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 27 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 166 **organisation** responses, 48 per cent supported the proposal and 15 per cent indicated 'do not support'. Four per cent provided an 'other' response, and a further 34 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the nine **Māori entity** responses, 3 supported the proposal and one indicated 'do not support'. Three provided an 'other' response and two indicated 'I don't know'.

There was no **pro forma** that specifically addressed this proposal as part of their templated content.

2.0 Other feedback

Feedback on topics outside of those directly consulted on can be found in [Attachment Three and Four](#).

3.0 Local board priorities

Feedback received on Local Board priorities will be presented separately in Local Board meetings.

Table of Contents

Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 Summary of Feedback	2
Purpose.....	2
Executive summary.....	2
1.0 Consultation items	3
2.0 Other feedback	10
3.0 Local board priorities	10
Table of Contents	11
Glossary of terms.....	14
Engagement approach	15
Māori engagement	15
Reporting	16
Feedback from organisations.....	16
Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say events.....	16
Pro forma campaign feedback	17
Petitions	20
Consultation feedback.....	22
Question 1 – Overall direction	22
Question 2 – Transport Plan.....	33
Question 3 – North Harbour Stadium	40
Question 4a – Major Investments, Council’s shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited and the Auckland Future Fund.....	46
Question 4b – Major Investments, The future of Port of Auckland	50
Question 4c – Major Investments, Port of Auckland profits and dividends.....	54
Question 4d – Major Investments, other feedback.....	58
Question 5a – Captain Cook and Marsden wharves.....	60
Question 5b – Bledisloe Terminal.....	64
Question 6a – Changes to other rates, fees and charges.....	68
Question 6b – Other changes to fees and charges.....	83
Question 7 – Local board priorities	85
Question 8 – What else is important to you?.....	85

ATTACHMENTS.....	86
ATTACHMENT ONE: Submitter breakdown.....	87
ATTACHMENT THREE: Funding requests.....	89
ATTACHMENT THREE: Other feedback received (Q8)	91
ATTACHMENT FOUR: Additional submission priorities for Māori entities (Q8).....	93
ATTACHMENT FIVE: Māori entities - Changes to other rates, fees and charges.....	100
ATTACHMENT SIX: Organisations that attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events.....	105
ATTACHMENT SEVEN: Results by local board	107
1.1 Overall direction for the long-term plan	107
1.2 What should Auckland Council to do more or less of	109
1.2.1 Transport	109
1.2.2 Water	111
1.2.3 City and local development.....	113
1.2.4 Environment and regulation.....	115
1.2.5 Parks and community.....	117
1.2.6 Economic and cultural environment.....	119
1.2.7 Council support.....	121
2.1 Proposed transport plan.....	123
3.1 North Harbour Stadium	125
4.0 Major investments	127
4.1 Proposal to establish Auckland Future Fund (AFF)	127
4.2 Future of Port of Auckland	129
4.3 Port of Auckland profits and dividends.....	131
5.0 Port land.....	133
5.1 Captain Cook and Marsden wharves	133
5.2 Bledisloe Terminal.....	135
6.0 Proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges	137
6.1 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR).....	137
6.2 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)	139
6.3 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR).....	141
6.4 Long Term Differential Strategy (LTDS).....	143

6.5	Recycling charges for schools.....	145
6.6	Rates funded refuse collection.....	147
6.7	Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate	149
6.8	Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate.....	151
6.9	Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate	153

Glossary of terms

Term	Definition
Individual response	A submission from a member of the public. Generally representative of that individual's views.
Organisation response	A submission on behalf of an organisation. The views expressed may represent multiple people. Organisation types may be a mix of commercial entities, community organisations, residents and ratepayers' associations, business associations, sports clubs, churches, and trusts, representing a variety of sectors and organisational sizes.
Māori entity	Submissions from mana whenua and mātāwaka organisations.
Mana whenua	Mana whenua are Māori whose ancestral relationships are in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland, where they exercise customary authority
Mātāwaka	Mātāwaka are Māori living in the Auckland Council region who are not from a mana whenua group
Pro forma	A submission that has been prepared from a template provided by a community group or other external organisation
Pieces of feedback	All types of feedback including written, online and in person
Response	Where a submission has answered the question (e.g. responded that they support, do not support, or other)
Feedback point	An individual point made by a submitter (in addition to their response of support, do not support, or other)
Written feedback	Includes hand-written forms or letters, emails or emailed forms, and forms completed online
In person feedback	All feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events

Engagement approach

A total of 125 public events were held across the region during the month-long consultation period. These were a mix of event styles including drop-ins at existing or bespoke events, community group meetings, and hearing style events. Across these events, delegated staff and community engagement partner representatives interacted with over 11,000 Aucklanders.

Online engagement was via AKHaveYourSay, and hard copy engagement materials were made available through libraries, service centres and via community engagement partners. Aucklanders were also given the opportunity to provide feedback by phone for those who prefer non-digital or community events, but no-one chose this option.

Events organised included two online information sessions early in the consultation period, to allow people to gather information and better understand the topics before making a submission. These were well subscribed, with over 150 people attending across the two sessions. These sessions were also recorded and uploaded for people to view and ask further questions.

There were also other online/hybrid events including hui with mana whenua, a Pasifika fono and regional organisation feedback sessions. There were also opportunities for Aucklanders to provide feedback via email, or following a link to the online feedback form from emails or text messages that were sent to ratepayers, previous submitters, and a range of other relevant databases.

Community engagement partners continue to be an integral part of our engagement strategy to reach diverse Aucklanders because of their strong established and trusted relationships with their communities. These partners represent a range of community groups across Auckland, including Pacific, ethnic, youth and disability sectors.

The engagement approach also included two series of participatory forums. One was with a demographically representative group of Aucklanders, the other with representatives from the Demographic Advisory Panels and community leaders. Each of these will be reported on separately with their group's feedback.

Māori engagement

Ahead of the consultation period, pre-consultation engagements were facilitated at Waitangi Day events at Manukau and Hoani Waititi Marae to raise awareness of the long-term plan and facilitate Māori engagement on the document. Before and during the consultation period, a series of online workshops were held with mana whenua and mataawaka groups to support their engagement and submission. A specific 'Have your say' event was held at Auckland Council Town Hall for mana whenua and mataawaka to present in person or online on 21 March 2024. There were 12 presentations from mana whenua and mataawaka groups at the event.

Reporting

Consistent with the approach agreed to by Governing Body in December 2023, reporting is split into the following four categories:

1. Individuals
2. Organisations
3. Māori entities
4. Pro forma.

This approach provides a more granular level of reporting of feedback which assists elected members in giving the feedback received due consideration.

For example, an organisation's submission may represent the views of numerous individuals and/or expert views. Having these submissions reported as a separate category allows elected members to take these factors into account when considering the feedback.

Similarly, the views of Māori entities (mana whenua and mātāwaka organisations) are reported separately to enable elected members to clearly identify the views of those groups and to give consideration to those views as part of the decision-making process.

The final category reported on is pro forma submissions – these are submissions that have come through to council via a platform created by an external organisations or using a templated response prepared by an external organisation. While each pro forma is different in its approach, in some cases people submitting via a pro forma may not have had the same information presented to them as those who submit via the council's official consultation platform, using the council's adopted consultation document and feedback form. Reporting on pro forma submissions separately assists elected members to give these submissions due consideration as part of their decision-making.

Feedback from organisations

We received feedback from 391 organisations (including 38 attending over three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say events but excluding Māori entities). These came from a variety of organisations, including commercial entities, community organisations, residents and ratepayers' associations, business associations, sports clubs and trusts, representing a variety of sectors and organisational sizes.

It is noted that organisations may represent multiple people in their responses. However, as we cannot verify how many individuals supported the feedback from each of these organisations, and we do not know how many of those individuals also belong to other submitting organisations or if they submitted their own responses as an individual, organisation responses have each been counted as a single submission. It is up to elected members to determine the weight they give to this feedback.

Note that a submission was received from Ports of Auckland through the public feedback process. As POAL is part of the council group, their feedback is not included in this report but will be included in the advice provided to the Budget Committee on the proposals relating to the future of the Port.

Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say events

These events were open to all regional organisations or interest groups (i.e. have regional membership and/or a regional focus) who wanted to provide feedback on the long-term plan consultation topics. Representatives from 38 organisations attended and gave feedback over three sessions.

Attendees included commercial organisations, unions, the arts sector, transport groups, environmental sector and other community organisations.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

Pro forma campaign feedback

Sometimes we receive feedback via a platform created by an external organisation or using a templated response prepared by an external organisation - we refer to this as pro forma feedback.

As with all feedback, pro forma feedback must be given due consideration with an open mind, and it is up to decision-makers to determine the weight they give to this feedback.

During this long-term plan public consultation, we identified feedback from six pro forma campaigns – three with over 100 submissions and three with fewer. These campaigns provided their own templated responses, encouraging members to submit this via their own platform, which would trigger an email to our consultation inbox or was printed onto modified feedback forms and delivered to us.

The templated responses for the largest three submissions were as follows:

1. Auckland Rate Payers' Alliance

4,207 responses received during the consultation period and after removing duplicate submissions (i.e., additional submissions by the same entity).

Dear Auckland Council,

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

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

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

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

This should include:

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

weekly rubbish collection.

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

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

2. Save our Stadium

863 responses received during the consultation period and after removing duplicate submissions.

The following two selections were pre-selected on an online platform which referred only to the North Harbour stadium:

Preferred option- Keep Stadium as it is

AND- Put it under new management

There was no other templated content associated with these submissions, however this pro forma also provided space for submitters to 'Tell Council why you want to save our stadium', the main themes of which are summarised in this report in the section on North Harbour Stadium feedback.

3. Sports and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund

221 responses received during the consultation period and after removing duplicate submissions from two separate pro forma on this topic with overlapping content.

One of two variations:

I wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

I do not support the deconstruction of North Harbour Stadium:

- I support retaining the stadium and its precinct for the use of the local community*
- I support a thorough process to be undertaken in understanding what the best outcomes are the North Harbour community which may include changing the Operational Management, exploring redevelopment opportunities.*

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

*I **support** the following aspects of the consultation:*

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.*
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.*
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.*
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.*
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.*
- I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.*
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.*

*I specifically **support** the proposed multi-code indoor facility at the Albany Tennis Park in Oteha Valley Road. The reasons for this support are as follows:*

Two of two variations:

This is an organisational submission in support of the funding for sport and recreation facilities as part of the Auckland Council's Long-Term Plan.

As an officer of a Tennis Auckland affiliated club, and someone who is an active sports and recreation participant, I appreciate the commitment and support that Auckland Council has made and continues to make to the sport and recreation landscape of the city, especially to the network of tennis clubs. I also am very aware of pressures and challenges the Council is facing.

As an active tennis player and club member, I have personally experienced a wide disparity in the quality of club and public tennis facilities across Auckland. At our club in particular, funding is required to address the building renovation project we have planned. A greater level of investment to maintain, improve, and protect facilities from the ever-increasing ravages of weather extremes, would be hugely beneficial to the sport and its participants.

To address these issues, I fully support the retention of the existing Sport & Recreation Facilities Investment Fund at its current level, plus adding the proposed (non-contestable) additional \$35m investment. This will be vital in addressing the sport and recreation infrastructure deficit and upgrading the existing infrastructure.

I hope that the changes to the LTP in the sports and recreation sector are adopted, and the Council can continue to assist in enhancing the infrastructure, to ensure the massive economic, societal, and health & well-being benefits of sport and recreation are maximised.

4. Other pro forma

There were also three smaller pro forma campaigns identified, all with less than 100 submissions. They were:

1. Half Moon Bay dump station (83)

An email campaign with submitters requesting the Howick Local Board replace the recently closed Half Moon Bay dump station with another facility in the Howick/East Auckland area.

2. Ē Tu Union (71)

Ē Tu created their own submission form asking people to indicate whether they supported, or not, the following prompts:

- i. I oppose the introduction of "time-of-use charging" (congestion charges)
- ii. I support Auckland Council retaining its current stake in Auckland International Airport
- iii. I oppose any privatisation of Ports of Auckland Limited, including the operations and the land
- iv. I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living Wage Council

3. Auckland Council's Climate Plan (42)

An email template providing responses to Q1 – overall direction, Q2 – transport plan and Q7 local board priorities, advocating for measures that align with Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri, Auckland's Climate Plan and endorse climate action initiatives.

Petitions

We received one petition related to the long-term plan:

1. **Seal Rodney Roads**

1,354 signatures were received during the consultation period and after removing duplicate entries.

*This is a **community petition** supporting the Mayor of Auckland's drive to get unsealed roads **sealed** and to be better maintained.*

Even if you don't use rural roads we would ask for your help by supporting this petition.

*Mayor Wayne Brown is in the process of setting his promised "Fix Auckland" budget. This budget sets the spending priorities for Auckland for the **next 10 Years**.*

*As part of the budget, the Mayor is championing to dramatically increase the amount of money to \$124.5 million for rural unsealed gravel roads to be **sealed**, better maintained and made safer.*

*This petition is open until 28 March 2024. Please complete the petition now, it only **takes approximately 3 minutes**.*

*Once completed the full petition will be presented to the Mayor, and to Auckland Transport, by the Rodney Ward Councillor Greg Sayers on behalf of the community and elected members of the Rodney Local Board. This will give the Mayor a very strong steer on **how our community feels** about the amount of money he plans to spend on unsealed roads.*

Consultation feedback

This section of the report summarises the feedback received. Each analysis of the consultation questions begins with the question and response wording.

Question 1 – Overall direction

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


- Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and debt
- Proceed with the central proposal
- Do more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases and more debt
- Other
- I don’t know

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

(Note that while we can do less of some activities, we will still fund those things that we legally have to do)

	Do less	As proposed	Do more
<i>Transport: Roads, public transport and safety improvements across the transport network</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Water: Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>City and Local development: Deliver urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Parks and community: A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Economic and cultural development: Major events funding and economic development</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Council support: Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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



Note: this chart uses the same colours for the first three options as in the Consultation Document and feedback form

	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro formas
Do less (reduce council services/ investment), with lower rates increases and less debt	5,873	55	1	4,207
Proceed with the central proposal	5,422	93	3	0
Do more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases, and more debt	3,164	61	2	0
Other	683	33	7	42
I don't know	812	17	0	0
Total	15,954	259	13	4,249

1.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 15,954 pieces of feedback from individuals on the **overall proposal** (including submissions, responses collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 37 per cent supported doing less (reduce council services/investments), with lower rates increases, and debt
- 34 per cent supported the central proposal
- 20 per cent supported doing more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases, and debt
- 4 per cent selected 'Other'
- 5 per cent indicated they did not know.

In terms of the **seven areas of council-funded services and activities** asked about in question 1b, we received between 16,302 and 16,683 pieces of feedback on each proposal from individuals. The responses in each category are displayed in the chart below.

Areas for which the most common response was the central proposal were:


- water (47 per cent as proposed)
- environment and regulation (39 per cent as proposed)
- parks and community (40 per cent as proposed)
- council support (48 per cent as proposed).

Areas for which the most common response was the 'do less' were:

- city and local development (40 per cent do less)
- economic and cultural development (41 per cent do less).

For transport, the most common response was 'do more' (44 per cent do more).

What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of? Individuals



Note: in this chart, the vertical line represents the mid-point of the proportion that supported the central proposal on each item. This is intended to allow easier visual comparison of the proportion that supported the central option in each of the seven areas.

Individual feedback on seven council-funded service areas and activities

Response	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Transport (n=16,554)	3,314	6,001	7,239
Water (n=16,495)	1,758	7,752	6,985
City & local development (n=16,302)	6,464	6,349	3,489
Environment & regulation (n=16,443)	4,086	6,454	5,903
Parks and community (n=16,683)	4,348	6,690	5,645
Economic & cultural development (n=16,386)	6,689	6,107	3,590
Council support (n=16,431)	4,656	7,840	3,935

In the feedback form, following question 1a on the above the seven areas of council-funded activities and services, submitters were asked two open questions:

- *1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?*
- *1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?*

Written feedback on questions 1c and 1d was varied, however the most common themes raised by individuals are outlined below.

Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for? (individuals)

Of the 7,866 individuals who provided a comment:

- 1,699 mentioned the need for better public transport services and more investment in train and bus infrastructure
- 796 mentioned walking and cycling improvements
- 660 mentioned investment in roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance)
- 616 mentioned regional community places and services, including community development and safety.

Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less? (individuals)

Of the 7,255 individuals who provided a comment:

- 1,404 mentioned reducing spending (sometimes referred to as wasteful), such as staff and support costs or improving efficiency
- 714 mentioned roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance)
- 696 mentioned regional arts, culture and events
- 643 mentioned walking and cycling improvements.

Feedback themes on doing more or doing less, by response to overall direction

Submitters' priorities for what they wanted the Council to 'do more of' or 'do less of' varied depending on their stance towards the overall direction of the long-term plan or central proposal, although many themes were common to all. For example, those who wanted to do more overall, are featured in the orange box on the right, they were more likely to comment that they wanted the council to do more on public transport services and infrastructure, walking and cycling improvements, and climate change and preparedness. Conversely, this group wanted to council to 'do less of' roads and footpaths, wasteful spending / inefficiency, and regional planning.

Most common themes in 'do more' and 'do less' written feedback, by response to overall direction (individuals)

Pay less and get less (overall)	Core proposal (overall)	Pay more and get more (overall)
Do more:	Do more:	Do more:
Find other savings / Improve efficiency (13 per cent) Public transport service / infrastructure (11 per cent) Roads and foot paths (11 per cent)	Public transport service / infrastructure (17 per cent) Roads and foot paths (7 per cent) Regional community and places (including community facilities and public space themes such as graffiti and alcohol bans) (7 per cent)	Public transport services / infrastructure (23 per cent) Walking and cycling improvements (15 per cent) Climate change and preparedness (5 per cent)
Do less:	Do less:	Do less:
Wasteful spending / inefficiency (find other savings) (17 per cent) Walking and cycling improvements (8 per cent) Regional arts, culture and events (Auckland-wide) (8 per cent)	Wasteful spending / inefficiency (find other savings) (15 per cent) Regional arts, culture and events (Auckland-wide) (11 per cent) Walking and cycling improvements (9 per cent)	Roads and foot paths (22 per cent) Wasteful spending / inefficiency (find other savings) (13 per cent) Regional planning (spatial and infrastructure) (6 per cent)

Note: Percentages show the % of comments by that subgroup which included the relevant theme, as a proportion of all comments. For example, of all individuals that responded 'do less' overall AND commented on what they would like council to do more of (top left box in blue), 13 per cent mentioned finding other savings / improving efficiency.

Feedback from Māori individuals

918 of the individual responses to this proposal identified as Māori. Of these, 35 per cent supported the core proposal, 20 per cent indicated paying more to do more and 29 per cent paying less to do less. In addition, five per cent provided an 'other' response and 11 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

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

Of the 514 Māori individuals who provided a comment 13 per cent mentioned better public transport services and more investment in train and bus infrastructure, 8 per cent roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance) and another 8 per cent regional parks, sport and recreation.

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

Of the 455 Māori individuals who provided a comment 18 per cent mentioned finding other savings, such a staff and support costs or improving efficiency, 8 per cent walking and cycling investment and 7 per cent roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance).

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

1.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

29 addressed the overall proposal in their feedback. 10 of these organisations stated that they support the central proposal and eight preferred paying more to do more. One indicated ‘I don’t know’ and 10 selected ‘other’ in their submission, two of which stated their preference for the central proposal, another two stating that pay more doesn’t go far enough and one stating that pay less is still too high.

Organisations also responded to the seven council-funded service and activity areas as follows:

(Note that while we can do less of some activities, we will still fund those things that we legally have to do)	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Transport: Roads, public transport and safety improvements across the transport network	0	3	7
Water: managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways	0	2	6
City and Local development: Deliver urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre	0	4	5
Environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment	0	3	6
Parks and community: A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards	0	2	12
Economic and cultural development: Major events funding and economic development	0	4	6

Council support: Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities	2	4	3
---	---	---	---

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

Of the organisations who selected ‘do more’ five made comments with themes including greater public transport funding, cycle and recreation infrastructure and arts amenities, with one advocating for surface light rail. Common themes from the comments of nine organisations who supported the central proposal included support for arts, culture and recreation investment. Two of these mentioned they would support the pay more than the proposal if the rates increases were acceptable or for specific areas of spending. Another nine organisations selected ‘other’ and made comments referencing water infrastructure investments, greater investment in current assets and support for community and social support (e.g. grants).

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

Of the organisations who selected ‘do less’ two made comments advocating gaining greater government contributions for public transport spending and revising aspects of the CRL. Themes from the comments of the three organisations who supported the central proposal included less contractors and consultants, lowering operating costs and reduced investment in speed bumps. Two of these mentioned they would support the pay more proposal if the rates increases were palatable or for specific areas of spending. Another three organisations selected ‘other’ and made comments referencing less use of consultants and back-office council functions, while reducing red tape.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 391 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to ‘Reporting’ and ‘Feedback from organisations’ on p16 of this report.

We received 259 pieces of feedback from organisations on the **overall proposal** (including submissions, responses collected at events, emails, and written submissions. Of these:


- 21 per cent supported doing less (reduce council services/investments), with lower rates increases, and debt
- 36 per cent supported the central proposal
- 24 per cent supported doing more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases, and debt
- 13 per cent provided an ‘Other’ response
- 7 per cent indicated they did not know.

In terms of the **seven areas of council-funded services and activities** asked about in question 1b, we received between 221 and 243 pieces of feedback on each proposal from organisations. These responses are presented in the figure below.

Areas for which the most common response was support for the central proposal were ‘city and local development’ and ‘council support’.

For the other five areas, the most common response was ‘do more’.

What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of? Organisations



Note: in this chart, the vertical line represents the mid-point of the proportion that supported the central proposal on each item. This is intended to allow easier visual comparison of the proportion that supported the central option in each of the seven areas.

Written feedback on questions 1c and 1d was varied, however the most common themes raised by organisations are outlined below.

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

Of the 191 organisations who provided a comment:

- 33 mentioned regional parks, sport and recreation
- 25 mentioned environmental strategy and policy
- 25 mentioned regional community places and services (including community facilities and public space themes such as graffiti and alcohol bans);

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

Of the 103 organisations who provided a comment:

- 32 encouraged Auckland Council to find other savings, such as reducing staff and support costs;
- 11 mentioned regional arts, culture and events
- 10 mentioned roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance).

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

1.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Seven entities responded to the overall proposal.

Option	Entity
Do less (reduce council services/ investment), with lower rates increases and some debt	Ngāti Rehua-Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Proceed with the central proposal	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust
Do more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases, and some debt	Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Trust Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust
Other	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Trust Ngāti Tamaoho Ngātiwai Trust Board
I don't know	

The three mana whenua entities that supported the central proposal or supported doing more emphasised the need for increased levels of investment to achieve outcomes for Māori, to protect the taiao, and to ensure that services are retained.

The one entity which proposed doing less cautioned that increasing rates at a time of recession would not benefit the community.

Other comments pertaining to the overall direction emphasised the need for council to focus on housing, and to engage more with iwi partners on significant decisions.

Specific areas that mana whenua entities submitting supported doing more on

All mana whenua entities that answered questions about the seven investment themes agreed that council should proceed with the proposal or do more in each area. The areas which received the strongest support were 'Environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment' followed by 'Water: Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways.'

Specific areas that mana whenua entities submitting supported doing less on

For the questions on the seven investment themes all mana whenua selected do more, or proceed. No entities selected do less.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Six mataawaka entities addressed question 1a in their feedback. Two of these entities stated that they support proceeding with the central proposal but did not provide a reason.

The remaining four did not explicitly support the central proposal or doing less or doing more, and selected 'other' in their response. They stated that the long-term plan process should focus more on the concerns and aspirations of rangatahi and wāhine, and should address concerns around housing. These entities expressed that the proposal overlooks diverse values and perspectives, offering one-size-fits-all solutions without genuine consultation.

Specific areas that mataawaka entities submitting supported doing more on

Mataawaka entities want to see more done in the areas of te reo Māori, youth development, sports and wellbeing programmes, driver licensing, rangatahi representation, promoting bi culturalism and multi culturalism. Entities also requested more meaningful engagement with council, for all, and for whanau hauā (whānau with disabilities) and the ability to work with council to co-create solutions.

Specific areas that mataawaka entities submitting supported doing less on

Mataawaka entities want to see less bureaucracy, less council staff turnover and less expenditure on services that do not contribute to the wellbeing or development of Māori. One entity cautioned that cutting essential services could deepen existing socio-economic disparities and compromise residents' quality of life, particularly for those already facing significant challenges.

1.3 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

Of all pro forma, two provided feedback on the overall direction for the long-term plan. Extracts from these two pro forma submissions relevant to this issue follow:

1. Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance (4,207 submissions)

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

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

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

on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

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

2. Sports and Recreations Facilities Investment Fund support pro forma (1 of 2 similar pro forma – 221 submissions in total)

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council’s Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.


I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 2 – Transport Plan

What do you think of the transport proposal?

- Support all of the proposal*
- Support most of the proposal*
- Do not support most of the proposal*
- Don't support any of the proposal*
- I don't know*



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support all of the proposal	5,055	53	1	1
Support most of the proposal	7,220	110	3	42
Do not support most of the proposal	2,174	31	4	0
Don't support any of the proposal	1,354	7	0	0
I don't know	943	22	1	0
TOTAL	16,746	223	9	43

2.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 16,746 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, response collected at events, emails and written submissions). Of these:

- 30 per cent supported all of the proposal
- 43 per cent supported most of the proposal
- 13 per cent did not support most of the proposal
- 8 per cent did not support any of the proposal
- 6 per cent indicated they don't know.

Written feedback on this proposal was varied, however the most common themes raised by individuals are outlined below.

Of the 6,886 individuals who **supported all or most of the proposal** and provided comments responding to the question ‘Tell us why’:

- 1,627 generally re-stated their support for the proposal without providing a reason
- 1,157 mentioned investment in improving public transport services and/or public transport efficiency
- 1,074 generally stated support for public transport investment.

Of the 2,248 individuals **who did not support most or any the proposal** and provided comments responding to the question ‘Tell us why’:

- 338 mentioned investment in improving public transport services and/or public transport efficiency;
- 239 expressed their dissatisfaction with Auckland Transport
- 213 generally mentioned active transport (e.g. walking and cycling), this contained a mix of concern about a lack of investment in this, concern about current investment in this and related comments without clear sentiment.

Transport areas submitters would like to see more or less investment

Of the 7,011 individuals who provided a comment about what they **would spend more on**, the most common themes were:

- 2,790 mentioned public transport services / infrastructure, including more bus and train services.
- 1,633 mentioned walking and cycling improvements
- 1,127 mentioned roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance).

Of the 6,203 individuals who provided a comment about what they **would spend less on**, the most common themes were:

- 1,283 mentioned walking and cycling improvements
- 1,127 mentioned roads and footpaths
- 820 mentioned raised pedestrian crossings.

Areas suggested to ‘spend more on’ or ‘spend less on’ by sentiment to the transport plan overall (individuals)

Support the proposal (all or most)	Do not support the proposal (most or all)
<p>Would spend more on:</p> <p>Public transport services / infrastructure (32 per cent)</p> <p>Walking and cycling (19 per cent)</p> <p>Roads and footpaths (11 per cent)</p>	<p>Would spend more on:</p> <p>Public transport services / infrastructure (23 per cent)</p> <p>Roads and footpaths (17 per cent)</p> <p>Walking and cycling (15 per cent)</p>
<p>Would spend less on:</p> <p>Walking and cycling improvements (21 per cent)</p> <p>Roads and footpaths (19 per cent)</p> <p>Raised pedestrian crossings (14 per cent)</p>	<p>Would spend less on:</p> <p>Walking and cycling (13 per cent)</p> <p>Wasteful spending / inefficiency (find other savings) (13 per cent)</p> <p>Roads and footpaths (11 per cent)</p> <p>Public transport services / infrastructure (11 per cent)</p>

Note: Percentages show the % of comments by that subgroup which included the relevant theme, as a proportion of all comments. For example, of all individuals that responded support all or most of the proposal AND commented on what they would like council to ‘spend more on’ (top left box in green), 32 per cent mentioned Public transport services / infrastructure.

Feedback from Māori individuals

868 of the 16,746 individual responses to this proposal came from those who identified as Māori. Of these, 25 per cent supported all of the proposal, 46 percent most of the proposal, 13 per cent indicated they did not support most of the proposal and 8 per cent indicated they did not support any of the proposal. In addition, 9 per cent selected ‘I don’t know’.

Of the 360 individuals who **supported all or most of the proposal** and provided comments responding to the question ‘Tell us why’:

- 75 mentioned improved public transport services and/or efficiency
- 55 generally re-stated their support for the proposal
- 53 made other generally supportive comments about public transport investment.

Of the 116 individuals who **did not support most or any of the proposal** and provided comments responding to the question ‘Tell us why’:

- 12 mentioned improved public transport services and/or efficiency
- 12 generally re-stated their opposition to the proposal
- 11 expressed their dissatisfaction with Auckland Transport.

Is there anything you would spend more on?

Of the 420 Māori individuals who provided a comment 37 per cent mentioned public transport services and infrastructure (including more investment in both existing and new stops, stations or terminals and other route infrastructure), 17 per cent walking and cycling improvements and 14 per cent roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance).

Is there anything you would spend less on?

Of the 367 Māori individuals who provided a comment 18 per cent mentioned walking and cycling improvements, 13 per cent roads and footpaths and 11 per cent raised pedestrian crossings.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

1.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

14 addressed the overall transport proposal in their feedback. 11 of these organisations stated that they supported all or most of the proposal, and none indicated they did not support most or any of the proposal. Three organisations commented on the proposal but did not explicitly support or not support it, including one that selected 'I don't know' in their submission.

Is there anything you would spend more on?

Of the 11 organisations who supported all or most of the proposal, nine made comments on this topic. Themes included equitable, reliable, cheaper and safe public transport options, including trains, buses, as well as investment in cycleways and walking. Another common theme included creating traffic flow efficiencies. Another seven organisations provided a comment on what they would spend more on, but did not provide explicit support for one of the overall transport proposal options. This group made comments referencing similar themes as those who support all or most, with the exception that roading infrastructure take into consideration the movement of emergency services.

Is there anything you would spend less on?

Of the 10 organisations who supported all or most of the proposal, five made comments on this topic including less private vehicle roading projects and generally reducing unnecessary spending, without specifying on what.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events and Māori entities, 223 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

223 of submitting organisations stated their position on this proposal. Of these, 24 per cent support all of the proposal, 49 per cent support most of the proposal, 14 per cent did not support most of the proposal and three per cent did not support any of the proposal. 10 per cent responded 'I don't know'.

Among the 87 organisations who **supported all or most of the proposal and provided a comment** in response to the question 'Tell us why', common themes were:

- 20 supportive of investment in active transport, often stating that while they supported the plan overall they were concerned or opposed to reduced investment in this area
- 19 were in favour of improving public transport services including efficiency
- 17 made non-specific comments generally in support of public transport.

Only 25 organisations who **did not support most or any of the proposal provided a comment** in response to the question 'Tell us why'. The two most common themes were:

- 6 improving public transport services and/or public transport efficiency
- 5 generally pro-active transport, opposing reduced investment in this.

Of the 117 organisations that provided feedback in response to the question 'Is there anything you would **spend more on?**':

- 50 mentioned improving public transport services including efficiency
- 43 mentioned walking and cycling improvements
- 28 mentioned investment in roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance).

Of the 84 organisations that provided feedback in response to the question 'Is there anything you would **spend less on?**':

- 21 mentioned roads and footpaths (including new infrastructure, improvements and maintenance)
- 13 mentioned walking and cycling improvements
- 11 requested finding other savings and/or improving efficiency.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

1.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua made a submission on the long-term plan.

Four entities addressed the transport proposal in their feedback.

Three mana whenua entities supported all or most of the proposal. One entity did not support most of the proposal.

Option	Entity
Support all of the proposal	Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Support most of the proposal	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Ngātiwai Trust Board
Do not support most of the proposal	Ngāti Tamaoho
Do not support any of the proposal	
I don't know	

Mana whenua entities who supported all or most of the proposal, supported initiatives that were aimed at sustainable public transport infrastructure, and improvements to local roads. Mana whenua entities encourage Auckland Council to prioritise meaningful engagement with mana whenua, iwi Māori, marae, and whānau in the development of the integrated transport plan to ensure that Māori perspectives, values, and needs are considered.

What they would spend more on

Mana whenua who commented on this question suggested spending more on providing progressive procurement opportunities for mana whenua, iwi Māori, marae and whānau. They also suggested greater stabilisation of roading infrastructure.

What they would spend less on

Mana whenua who commented on this question suggested spending less on excessive infrastructure projects that do not benefit Māori.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed the transport proposal in their feedback.

Three mataawaka entities do not support most of the proposal. One supports most of the proposal, and the fifth entity is unsure.

Support reasons

Mataawaka entities emphasised the need for safe, affordable transport options, road maintenance, and accessible public transport. One entity stated that more should be spent on safety and accessibility for people with disabilities.

Do not support reasons

Mataawaka entities who responded to the transport proposal stated that council should involve communities in decision-making, and spend less on infrastructure projects that do not benefit Māori.

1.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

None of the pro forma identified included templated feedback relevant to this topic, however in some instances small amounts of feedback were added by the submitter.

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – pro forma campaign feedback).


Question 3 – North Harbour Stadium

Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

- Keep the stadium precinct as it is*
- Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct*
- Change the operational management*
- Other*
- I don't know*

Note that for this question, submitters were able to select more than one option with the following exceptions:
a) they could not select both 'keep the stadium precinct as it is' and 'consider redeveloping the stadium', and
b) they could not select 'I don't know' and any other option.

Therefore, percentages may add to more than 100 per cent. Percentages represent the number of times an option was selected, divided by the number of submitters on this topic.



	Individuals	Organisations	Maori entities	Pro forma
Keep the stadium precinct as it is	4,958	55	1	868
Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct	5,042	61	2	4
Change the operational management	3,877	59	2	864
Other	649	13	5	0
I don't know	2,787	46	1	0
NOTE: CELLS CAN NOT BE ADDED TO OBTAIN THE TOTAL, AS SUBMITTERS COULD MAKE MORE THAN ONE SLECTION				
Total submitters	15,203	200	11	872

1.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 15,203 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, response collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 33 per cent supported **keeping** the stadium precinct as it is
- 33 per cent supported **considering redevelopment** of the stadium precinct
- 26 per cent supported changing the **operational management**
- four per cent selected other
- and 18 per cent indicated they don't know.

Written feedback was varied, however the most common themes raised by individuals are outlined below.

Of the 2,007 individuals who supported **keeping the stadium precinct** and provided a comment about the stadium, common themes were:

- 509 that the area / community needs the stadium
- 287 to increase usage and/or attract more events
- 279 that other options were not worth the investment
- 268 that the stadium is mismanaged or could be managed better.

Of the 2,420 individuals who supported **considering redevelopment of the stadium precinct** and provided a comment about the stadium, common themes were:

- 540 that it is currently underutilised
- 489 the need to increase usage / attract more events
- 294 specific proposals for alternative use, such as community or general sporting use.

Of the 2,199 individuals who supported **changing operational management** and provided a comment about the stadium, common themes were:

- 646 that it is mismanaged or could be managed better
- 637 that usage should or could be increased / more events held
- 353 that the area / community needs the stadium

Note that of the total submitters who supported changing the operational management, 52 per cent also selected either keep the stadium as it is or consider redeveloping, and feedback themes may relate to one or more of these options.

Of the 1,176 individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', common themes were:

- 400 stated they didn't know / had no opinion
- 207 suggested selling the stadium.


North Harbour Stadium response combinations

As submitters could choose more than one option for this question, we also show in the figure below common combinations of responses for individual submitters. This shows:

- The most common response to this proposal among individual submitters was selecting only 'Keep the stadium as it is' at 27 per cent
- The second most common response to this proposal was selecting only 'Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct' at 26 per cent

- The third most common response to this proposal was selecting ‘I don’t know’ at 18 per cent (which could not be selected in combination with any other option)
- The most common combination of responses was selecting both ‘Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct’ and ‘Change the operational management’ at 8 per cent.

Common response selections for North Harbour Stadium proposal Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation feedback



Note: 1) The above shows six common option selections (including combinations) from a total of 12 possible. The five combinations not broken out separately in the above are combinations including ‘other’ which in total made up approximately one per cent of all submissions. 2) The above excludes 113 pieces of feedback from local events that were not on a feedback form as in this case the individual selections from one individual cannot be cross-referenced to identify combinations.

Feedback from Māori individuals

807 of the 15,203 responses to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori. Of these, 29 per cent supported keeping the stadium precinct, 32 per cent supported considering redevelopment of the stadium precinct, and 28 per cent supported a change in operational management. Eight per cent provided an ‘other’ response and 18 per cent indicated ‘I don’t know’.

Of the 116 Māori individuals who supported **keeping the stadium precinct** and provided a comment about the stadium, the most common themes were:

- 24 the area and/or community needs the stadium
- 21 that alternatives are not worth the investment
- 17 that it is mismanaged or needs to be better managed.

Of the 152 Māori individuals who supported **considering redevelopment of the stadium precinct** and provided a comment about the stadium, common themes were:

- 35 that it's underutilised
- 25 to increase usage and / or attract more events
- 22 suggestions for specific alternative uses for stadium land, such as community and sporting use.

Of the 151 Māori individuals who supported **changing operational management** and provided a comment about the stadium, common themes were:

- 45 that it's mismanaged and/or needs to be better managed
- 37 to increase usage / attract more events
- 30 that the area and/or community needs the stadium.

Of the 92 Māori individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', the most common themes were:

- 29 stating they didn't know / had no opinion
- 13 selling the stadium.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

3.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

Of these organisations, 11 addressed this question in their feedback. Two of these organisations stated that they supported keeping the stadium precinct, one of which also selected 'change operational management'. Four indicated support for reconsidering redevelopment of the stadium precinct, two of which also selected 'change operational management'. Two selected 'Other' and three 'I don't know' in their submission.

Of the organisations who supported 'keep the stadium precinct' two made comments referring to ensuring workers conditions were safeguarded and if any redevelopment costs should be spent on arts instead of the stadium. Common themes from the comments of the three organisations who supported redevelopment included turning it into a community supporting facility, with one stating that any change in management should ensure optimising use of the facility.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 391 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

200 of submitting organisations stated their position on this issue. Of these, 28 per cent supported keeping the stadium, 31 per cent supported considering redevelopment of the stadium and 30 per cent supported a change in operational management. Seven per cent provided an 'other' response and 23 indicated 'I don't know' on this proposal.

Of the 29 organisations in this group that supported keeping the stadium and provided a related comment, the main theme was that the local area and/or community needs the stadium.

Of the 39 organisations in this group that supported considering redeveloping the stadium and provided a related comment, common themes were that the asset is mismanaged / needs to be better managed and underutilised.

Among the 42 organisations that supported changing the operational management and provided a related comment, a common theme was that the stadium is mismanaged or needs to be better managed.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

3.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 3 in their feedback.

Option	Entity
Keep the stadium precinct as it is	
Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust
Change the operational management	Ngāti Tamaoho
Other	Ngātiwai Trust Board Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust
I don't know	Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board

Mana whenua indicated that redevelopment could enhance the stadium precinct, offering new opportunities for community use and cultural events, and the potential for economic benefits. Others indicated that the local community should make the choice about whether to redevelop the stadium or not.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Six entities addressed question 3 in their feedback.

Mataawaka entity submissions represented a range of views. One agrees with keeping the stadium precinct as it is, one proposes redeveloping it and one proposes changing the operational management. Three entities selected 'other'.

Mataawaka entities who commented requested to know more about why such a large amount of money is proposed for a project which appears to benefit few people. Mataawaka entities request more input into council decision-making for the community, utilising wānanga as a culturally responsive process. One entity stated that the stadium land should be used to build accessible homes.

3.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

Of all pro forma, two provided feedback on question 3:

Sports and Recreations Facilities Investment Fund support pro forma (1 of 2)

I do not support the deconstruction of North Harbour Stadium:

- *I support retaining the stadium and its precinct for the use of the local community*
- *I support a thorough process to be undertaken in understanding what the best outcomes are the North Harbour community which may include changing the Operational Management, exploring redevelopment opportunities.*

Save our Stadium

Preferred option- Keep Stadium as it is


AND- Put it under new management

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 4a – Major Investments, Council’s shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited and the Auckland Future Fund

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

- Proceed with the proposal*
- Don’t proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding*
- Other*
- I don’t know*



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Proceed with the proposal	6,527	74	1	4,219
Don't proceed with the proposal	5,280	57	3	63
Other	597	19	5	0
I don't know	2,608	50	0	0
TOTAL	15,012	200	9	4,282

4a.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 15,012 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, response collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 43 per cent supported the proposal
- 35 per cent did not support the proposal
- 4 per cent provided an ‘other’ response
- 17 per cent indicated they don’t know.

Of the 2,123 individuals who provided a comment about **proceeding with the proposal**, common themes were:

- 509 generally supported the proposal, with comments such as ‘makes sense’
- 362 supported selling this asset or asset sales in general
- 339 mentioned financial benefits, such as liquidity and income generation.

Of the 2,681 individuals who provided a comment about **not proceeding with the proposal**, the most common themes were:

- 1,180 opposed selling this asset or asset sales in general
- 430 mentioned that Council should maintain control or influence on Auckland Airport
- 231 had concerns about investment risk such as that investing in the share market may increase risk.

Of the 1,004 individuals who provided a comment and selected ‘**Other**’ and ‘**I don’t know**’, common themes were:

- 277 said they did not know or had no opinion
- 171 opposed selling the shareholding or asset sales in general
- 89 emphasised having clear rules or restrictions around such a fund and/or said their opinion on the proposal was contingent on these.

Feedback from Māori individuals

784 of the 15,012 individual pieces of feedback on this proposal came from those who identified as Māori in their feedback. Of these, 39 per cent supported the proposal, and 34 per cent indicated they do not support the proposal. In addition, six per cent provided an ‘other’ response and 21 per cent ‘I don’t know’.

Of the 123 Māori individuals who provided a comment about **supporting the proposal**, common themes were:

- General, non-specific support the option
- Financial benefits such as lower rates.

Of the 152 Māori individuals who provided a comment about **not supporting the proposal**, the most common themes were:

- Not to sell the shareholding or general opposition to asset sales
- That Council should maintain influence over the airport.

Of the 76 Māori individuals who provided a comment and selected ‘**Other**’ or ‘**I don’t know**’, common themes were:

- That they don’t know or have no opinion
- Opposition to the shareholding sale or asset sales in general.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

4a.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

Of these organisations, 16 addressed the Auckland Future Fund proposal in their feedback. Seven of these stated that they supported the proposal, and two indicated they do not support the proposal. Four selected 'Other' and three 'I don't know' in their submission.

Of the organisations who selected 'proceed' five made comments of general support. Three organisations responded 'other' with two of these supporting the fund but not the shareholding sale while the third advocated selling the shareholding, but not creating the fund.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 200 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

200 organisations provided their position on this proposal. Of these, 37 per cent supported the proposal and 29 per cent did not support. 10 per cent provided an 'other' response and 25 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 37 per cent that supported this proposal, 31 provided a comment. Of these, common themes included support for selling the shareholding, general support for the fund without particular reasons and the financial benefits.

The main theme among the 36 organisations who did not support this proposal and provided a related comment was opposition to selling the shareholding.

Of the 17 organisations who provided an 'other' or 'I don't know' response, a common theme was stating that they were not sure or had no opinion.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

4a.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 4a in their feedback.

Option	Entity
Proceed with the proposal	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust
Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Trust Ngāti Tamaoho Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Other	Ngātiwai Trust Board
I don't know	

Mana whenua who addressed this proposal stated that maintaining shares would lead to better returns in the long run for mokopuna, whānau, Māori communities and iwi.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Four entities addressed question 4a in their feedback.

The four entities who commented on question 4a neither agreed nor disagreed on proceeding with the proposal, and selected 'other'.

One mataawaka entity stated that, if the proposal proceeds, funds should be invested in ethical investments that are beneficial to Māori, including whānau hauā. Another entity emphasised the need to ensure that the fund's objectives align with Auckland residents' interests, and that public assets are safeguarded. Two entities again reiterated the need to be involved in decision-making regarding council's objectives and policies.

4a.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

Of all pro forma, one provided feedback relevant to this issue:

3. Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance


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

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 4b – Major Investments, The future of Port of Auckland

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

- Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and **continue council group operation of the port** (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council
- Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and **lease the operation of the port** for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Other
- I don't know



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Continue council group operation of the port	6,436	71	3	65
Lease the operation of the port	5,870	61	1	4,217
Other	901	0	5	0
I don't know	2,090	41	0	0
TOTAL	15,297	173	9	4,282

4b.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 15,297 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, response collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 42 per cent supported continuing council group operation of the port
- 38 per cent supported leasing the operation of the port
- Six per cent provided an 'other' response
- and 14 per cent indicated they don't know.

Of the 2,568 individuals who provided a comment about **continued council group operation of the port**, common themes were:

- 618 expressed general opposition to the lease proposal without a specific reason
- 605 suggested council should maintain control or influence over the port
- 303 expressed opposition to selling the port or asset sales.

Of the 1,886 individuals who provided a comment about **leasing the operation of the port**, common themes were:

- 456 expressed general support for leasing the port operation without a specific reason
- 292 mentioned positive financial benefits, such as cash flow
- 267 commented that the port is mismanaged or could be managed better.

Of the 1,201 individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', common themes were:

- 309 suggested that the port should be relocated
- 208 indicated they don't know what option is best or have no opinion
- 117 advocated selling the port and/or general support for asset sales.

Feedback from Māori individuals

768 of the 15,297 responses to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori in their feedback. Of these, 41 per cent supported continued council group operation of the port, 34 per cent indicated support for leasing the operation of the port, nine per cent provided an 'Other' response and 17 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 156 Māori individuals who provided a comment about their support for **continued council group operation of the port**, common themes were:

- Council maintaining control or influence over the port
- Generally opposing leasing the port
- Opposition to asset sales / selling the port.

Of the 99 Māori individuals who provided a comment about **leasing the operation of the port**, common themes were:

- Support for leasing the port
- General support for the proposal without noting why
- Financial benefits, such as income generation.

Of the 83 Māori individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', the most common themes were:

- That the port should not be relocated and/or that it should not be in the CBD
- That they don't know or have no opinion.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

4b.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attend

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

14 of this group addressed this question in their feedback. Six of these organisations stated that they supported continued council group operation of the port, and four indicated their support for leasing the operation of the port. One selected 'Other' and three 'I don't know' in their submission.

Of the organisations who supported continued council group operation of the port, four made comments with themes including council maintaining control or referred to previous reports published on the future of the port with alternative recommendations (e.g. that the port will outgrow its space within 10-20 years).

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 197 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

197 of submitting organisations stated their position on this issue. Of these, 36 per cent supported continued council group operation of the port, 31 per cent supported leasing the operation of the port, 12 per cent provided an 'other' response and 21 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Common feedback from the 35 organisations who supported council group operation and provided a comment, included stating opposition to leasing port operations, that council should maintain control and influence over the port and that alternatives were not worth the investment.

Common feedback from the 30 organisations who supported leasing the port operation and provided a comment included re-iterating support for leasing the port and referring to financial benefits.

There were no significant themes in comments about this proposal from organisations whose response was 'other' or 'I don't know'.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

4b.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 4b in their feedback.

Option	Entity
Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust
Other	Ngātiwai Trust Board Te Ahiwaru
I don't know	

Mana whenua who commented on both options mentioned the need for increased involvement and influence by mana whenua, iwi, and Māori communities on port-related decisions and activities.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 4b in their feedback.

One mataawaka entity selected 'Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port'. The four other entities who commented on question 4b selected 'other'.

Three mataawaka entities stated that all decisions regarding the port should be made with iwi Māori. One stated that the port should be returned to iwi, and two referred to the need for shared management of the port between Auckland Council and iwi. One entity referenced the need for port funds to be allocated to accessible housing.

4b.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

Of all pro forma, one provided feedback relevant to this issue:

4. Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance


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

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 4c – Major Investments, Port of Auckland profits and dividends

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

- Continue to use it to fund council services*
- Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund*
- Other*
- I don't know*



■ Continue to use it to fund council services ■ Invest in the proposed AFF ■ Other ■ I don't know

Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Continue to use it to fund council services	7,497	64	2	3
Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund	4,931	59	3	1
Other	869	23	5	4,207
I don't know	1,778	37	0	0
TOTAL	15,075	183	10	4,211

4c.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 15,075 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, response collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 50 per cent supported the use of profits and dividends to fund council services
- 33 per cent supported investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Six per cent provided an 'other' response
- and 12 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 1,874 individuals who provided a comment **about use of profits and dividends to fund council services**, common themes were:

- 376 generally stated support for this option, often without stating a specific reason
- 239 suggested it would benefit ratepayers
- 201 suggested that Auckland Future Fund profits should fund council services.

Of the 1,186 individuals who provided a comment about **investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund**, common themes were:

- 315 generally restated support for this option
- 289 mentioned financial benefits, including the benefits of long-term investment for Auckland
- 100 suggested that Auckland Future Fund profits should or could fund future infrastructure.

Of the 979 individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', common themes were:

- 238 that earnings should be divided between funding council services and the Auckland Future Fund
- 143 said that they don't know or don't have an opinion
- 71 suggested using the profits and dividends to reduce debt.

Feedback from Māori individuals

769 of the 15,075 responses to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori. Of these, 48 per cent supported use of profits and dividends to fund council, 31 per cent supported investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund, nine per cent provided an 'other' response and 12 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 113 Māori individuals who provided a comment about **use of profits and dividends to fund council services**, common themes were:

- General statements of support for this option without a specific reason
- That it would benefit ratepayers
- That Auckland Future Fund profits could fund council services.

Of the 66 Māori individuals who provided a comment **about investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund**, the most common themes were:

- General statements of support for this option, without specific reasons
- Financial benefits for the future.

Of the 68 Māori individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', the most common themes were:

- Using profits and dividends for both Council services and the Auckland Future Fund
- Not knowing or having no opinion.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

4c.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

Of these organisations, 10 addressed this question in their feedback. Three of these organisations stated that they supported use of port profits and dividends to fund council services, and three indicated their support for investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund. Two selected 'Other' and two 'I don't know' in their feedback.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 183 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

183 organisations provided feedback on this issue. Of these, 32 per cent supported the use of profits and dividends to fund council services, 35 per cent supported investing the profits and dividends in the proposed Auckland Future Fund, 13 per cent provided an 'other' response and 20 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 28 organisations supporting the funding council services option and providing a comment, common themes were general support for this option and that council should fund 'core services'.

Of the 14 organisations supporting investing port profits and dividends in the Auckland Future Fund, common themes generally restating support for this option and highlighting potential financial benefits.

Among the 19 organisations who provided an 'other' or 'I don't know' response, the common theme was dividing profits and dividends between funding council services and an Auckland Future Fund.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

4c.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 4c in their feedback.

Option	Entity
Continue to use it to fund council services	Ngātiwai Trust Board Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust
Other	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngāti Tamaterā Settlement Trust
I don't know	

Mana whenua endorse a balanced approach which considers both short-term service provision and long-term investment strategies to ensure the financial and cultural wellbeing of Māori communities, marae and whānau. One entity also stated that any council discussions regarding ports should be made with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei under Treaty redress.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 Mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Four entities addressed question 4c in their feedback.

Two entities selected 'Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund' and the remaining two selected 'other'.

Mataawaka entities want profits and dividends directed towards initiatives that promote community well-being, sustainable development, and equitable access for Māori to resources and opportunities.

4c.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

Of all pro forma, one provided feedback relevant to this issue:

5. Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance

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

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 4d – Major Investments, other feedback

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

Including the proposal for self-insurance and implementation options for the Future Fund and possible changes to the council's shareholding in Port of Auckland Limited and to the ownership of the Port Land.

4d.1 Feedback from individuals

Overall, 1,579 individual submissions provided additional feedback. Common themes were:

- 153 mentioned self-insurance, with 71 in support of this in general or to some extent, 47 not supportive and 35 comments on another aspect of this
- 128 mentioned opposition to selling the port or asset sales in general
- 101 generally disagreed, particularly to the Auckland Future Fund but also port lease or non-specific
- 98 gave general financial feedback including that rates are too high/should not be increased, are too low/should be increased, that different parts of the community should pay different amounts, that debt should be used or not used, that assets should be sold or not sold
- 87 comments on having clear rules and restrictions around the Auckland Future Fund
- 86 expressed general dissatisfaction with Auckland Council
- 80 suggested finding other savings or improving efficiency, including suggestions on how to do this
- 70 voiced general support, particularly for the Auckland Future Fund but also port proposals or non-specific
- 66 commented on maintaining control or influence of key assets
- 51 encouraged a focus on 'core services'.

4d.2 Feedback from organisations

Overall, 29 submissions from organisations provided additional feedback. Common themes (with just four comments each) were:

- Support for the self-insurance concept
- Having clear rules and/or restrictions around the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Maintaining control or influence over the port.

4d.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua entities made on a submission on the long-term plan.

Three entities addressed question 4d in their feedback.

One mana whenua entity stated that council should retain ownership of the port and deliver improved profitability. Another advocated for investing profits and dividends in the Auckland Future Fund to secure long-term financial stability, growth opportunities, and sustainable investments that benefit future generations of Māori. The third entity emphasised that the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi should be prioritised in all areas of the proposal.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Two entities addressed question 4d in their feedback.

One entity stated that iwi Māori should be leading discussions about the Ports of Auckland, and that indigenous voices should be included in high-level decisions for the benefit of Auckland's community. The second entity also noted that mana whenua iwi and Māori communities should be active partners and participants at all levels of the council group's decision-making.


4d.3 Feedback from proforma

Of all pro forma, none addressed question 4d in their feedback.

Question 5a – Captain Cook and Marsden wharves

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

- Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit*
- No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations*
- Other*
- I don't know*



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Proceed with the proposal	7,751	86	2	4
No change - leave under port operations	4,478	42	0	0
Other	371	13	7	0
I don't know	2,066	49	0	0
TOTAL	14,666	190	9	4

5a.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 14,66 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, responses collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 53 per cent supported the proposal
- 31 per cent supported no change
- 3 per cent provided an ‘other’ response
- 14 per cent indicated ‘I don't know’.

Of the 2,183 individuals who provided a comment **supporting the proposal**, common themes were:

- 1,361 that this option provided better public benefit
- 283 general support for this option.

Of the 1,501 individuals who provided a comment and supported **no change**, common themes were:

- 297 that the port provides as essential service, often expressing or implying concerns about the impact on port operations
- 228 doubted that the transfer would provide public benefit
- 170 general opposition to this option.

Of the 601 individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', common themes were:

- 128 that they don't know or have no opinion
- 118 that their position on the proposal depends on the intended use and/or that more detail is needed
- 76 that the proposed transfer would or may provide better public benefit.

Feedback from Māori individuals

753 of the 14,666 responses to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori. Of these, 51 per cent supported the proposal, 31 per cent supported no change, four per cent provided an 'other' response and 14 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 125 Māori individuals who provided a comment **supporting the proposal**, the common theme (84 comments) was that the proposal would provide for better public use and benefit.

Of the 96 Māori individuals who provided a comment and supported **no change**, common themes were:

- General opposition, often without stating a specific reason
- That the port provides an essential service and/or concerns about the impact of the transfer on port operations
- Concerns about cost of development required to enable the transfer.

Of the 44 Māori individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', the most common themes was that their position was contingent on the proposed use of the wharves and/or that they needed more detail.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

5a.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six or the list of attending organisations.

Of these organisations, 12 addressed this question in their feedback. Seven of these organisations supported the proposal, two supported no change and three indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the organisations who selected 'proceed' three made comments including no residential property on the wharves and that moving to alternate use on Captain Cook and Marsden wharves will require Bledisloe for port operations.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 190 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

190 of submitting organisations stated their position on this proposal. Of these, 45 per cent supported the proposal, 22 per cent supported no change, seven per cent provided an 'other' response and 26 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of organisations that supported the proposal, the common theme was that it would provide for better public use or benefit, including destination and tourism promotion. Among organisations that did not support the proposal, the common theme was concern about the impact on port operations / the importance of the Ports of Auckland service.

There were no significant common themes among organisations that submitted 'Other' or 'I don't know' on this proposal.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

5a.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 5a in their feedback.

Option	Entity
Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
No change - leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations	
Other	Ngāti Tamaoho Te Ahiwaru Ngātiwai Trust Board
I don't know	

One mana whenua entity expressed it would support the haukāinga (local people) position on this issue, and another stated that ports should be a major discussion with Ngāti Whātua under Treaty redress. Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei did not specifically respond to question 5a, but provided information identifying that, as one of the key decision-makers, it must be involved in any future decisions that are to be made about the Port of Auckland and the land and seabed underlying its operations.

Another position expressed was that redevelopment of the wharves could create new public and community spaces that benefit Māori communities, support cultural preservation and contribute to environmental preservation efforts. One mana whenua entity suggested that the wharves be renamed. Another entity expressed that co-governance or iwi ownership of the ports would enable better social, economic and cultural outcomes for Māori.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made on a submission on the long-term plan.

Four entities addressed question 5a in their feedback.

The four entities who commented on question 5a selected 'other'.

Three entities commented on the need to rename the wharves with te reo Māori names in order to respect Māori heritage and culture. The fourth entity required council to work actively with mana whenua and Māori in the management, restoration, and protection of water resources, and to deliver environmental management and community-led conservation initiatives.

5a.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns


None of the pro forma identified included templated feedback relevant to this topic, however in some instances small amounts of feedback were added by the submitter.

Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – Pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 5b – Bledisloe Terminal

What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

- Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area*
- Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years*
- Other*
- I don't know*



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Keep under port operational area	6,551	61	1	3
Transfer the terminal	5,071	61	3	1
Other	353	11	4	0
I don't know	2,544	53	0	0
TOTAL	14,519	186	8	4

4b.1 Feedback from individuals

We received 14,519 pieces of feedback from individuals on this issue (including online submissions, response collected at events, emails, and written submissions). Of these:

- 45 per cent supported keeping Bledisloe Terminal as a port operational area
- 35 per cent supported transferring Bledisloe Terminal to council use
- Two per cent provided an ‘other’ response
- And 18 per cent indicated ‘I don’t know’.

Of the 1,837 individuals who provided a comment about **keeping Bledisloe Terminal as a port operational area**, common themes were:

- 697 mentioned that the port provides an essential service / were concerned about the impact on port operations
- 166 disagreed or doubted that it would provide public benefit

- 108 were concerned about disruption from development.

Of the 1,131 individuals who provided a comment about **transferring Bledisloe Terminal to council use**, common themes were:

- 710 mentioned that it provides for better public use and benefit
- 126 suggested that the port should be relocated.

Of the 592 individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', the most common themes were:

- 138 indicated they don't know or have no opinion
- 130 commented that their position is contingent on the proposed use and/or that they need more detail.

Feedback from Māori individuals

743 of the 14,519 individual responses to this question came from those who identified as Māori. Of these, 42 per cent supported keeping Bledisloe Terminal as a port operational area, 38 per cent supported transferring Bledisloe Terminal to council use, three per cent provided an 'other' response and 17 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 102 Māori individuals who provided a comment and support **keeping Bledisloe Terminal as a port operational area**, common themes were:

- That the port provides an essential service
- That the transfer would not provide public benefit.

Of the 66 Māori individuals who provided a comment and support **transferring Bledisloe Terminal to council use**, the common theme was that it would provide better public use and benefit.

Of the 37 Māori individuals who provided a comment and selected '**Other**' or '**I don't know**', the common theme was that their position depends on the proposed use and/or that they need more detail.

Feedback from individuals by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

5b.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six or the list of attending organisations.

Of these organisations, 11 addressed this question in their feedback. Five stated that they supported keeping Bledisloe Terminal as a port operational area and three indicated their support for transferring Bledisloe Terminal to council use. Three selected 'I don't know' in their submission.

Of the organisations who supported keeping Bledisloe terminal under Ports of Auckland operation, two made comments about reduced control and scale of port operations. Comments from the two organisations who supported transferring the terminal included the potential for investment in rail to the port and stopping cruise ship use of the ferry basin.

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 186 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

186 of organisation submissions provided a response to this question. Of these, 33 per cent supported keeping Bledisloe Terminal as a port operational area, 33 per cent supported transferring Bledisloe Terminal to council use, six per cent provided an 'other' response and 28 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Of the 32 organisations that supported the status quo and provided a comment, common themes were that the port is an essential service stating or implying concern about the impact on operations and concern for public disruption from redevelopment.

Of the 18 organisations that supported the transfer of Bledisloe and provided a comment, the common theme was that it will provide for better public use and benefit.

Feedback from organisations by local board

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven.

5b.3 Feedback from Māori entities

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua made a submission on the long-term plan.

Four entities addressed question 5b in their feedback.

Option	Entity
Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area	
Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Other	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngātiwai Trust Board
I don't know	

No additional commentary was offered for question 5b (refer to question 5a for commentary).

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Four entities addressed question 5b in their feedback.

One entity proposed to 'Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area', a second agreed with transferring Bledisloe Terminal and the remaining two selected 'other.'

The entity who agreed with 'Keeping Bledisloe terminal' wants iwi-led decisions. The entity who selected the transferring Bledisloe option stated that long term thinking will produce benefits for the community. One entity reiterated that te Tiriti must be honoured, and the fourth encouraged council to use this proposal to explore employment opportunities for whānau hauā Māori and rangatahi.

5b.4 Feedback from pro forma campaigns

None of the pro forma identified included templated feedback relevant to this topic, however in some instances small amounts of feedback were added by the submitter.


Full copies of pro forma templates are included earlier in the report (p17 – Pro forma campaign feedback).

Question 6a – Changes to other rates, fees and charges

What do you think of these proposals?

	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for the next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates charge.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	7,831	104	8	42
Do not support	5,204	44	1	0
Other	266	8	1	0
I don't know	1,297	29	0	0
TOTAL	14,598	185	10	42

Natural Environment Targeted Rate: individual feedback

We received 14,598 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 54 per cent supported the proposal
- 36 per cent did not support
- 9 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Natural Environment Targeted Rate: organisation feedback

We received 185 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 56 per cent supported the proposal

- 24 per cent did not support
- 16 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 4 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Natural Environment Targeted Rate: Māori entities feedback


Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Natural Environment Targeted Rate: pro forma feedback

We received 58 pieces of feedback from pro forma submissions on this proposal. Of these:

- 100 per cent supported the proposal

Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	10,214	116	7	1
Do not support	2,876	25	1	0
Other	328	15	2	41
I don't know	1,089	21	0	0
TOTAL	14,507	177	10	42

Water Quality Targeted Rate: individual feedback

We received 14,507 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 70 per cent supported the proposal
- 20 per cent did not support
- 8 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Water Quality Targeted Rate: organisation feedback

We received 177 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 66 per cent supported the proposal
- 14 per cent did not support
- 12 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 8 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Water Quality Targeted Rate: Māori entities feedback


Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Water Quality Targeted Rate: pro forma feedback

We received 42 pieces of feedback from pro forma submissions on this proposal. Of these:

- 2 per cent supported the proposal
- 98 per cent provided an 'other' response. These all advocated re-establishing "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."

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	8,148	97	4	42
Do not support	4,077	33	2	0
Other	290	7	3	0
I don't know	1,859	34	0	0
TOTAL	14,374	171	9	42

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate: individual feedback

We received 14,349 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 57 per cent supported the proposal
- 28 per cent did not support
- 13 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate: organisation feedback

We received 171 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 57 per cent supported the proposal

- 19 per cent did not support
- 20 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate: Māori entities feedback


Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate: pro forma feedback

We received 42 pieces of feedback from pro forma submissions on this proposal. Of these:

- 100 per cent supported the proposal

Long Term Differential Strategy



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	6,641	76	4	40
Do not support	4,762	50	2	0
Other	323	5	2	0
I don't know	2,594	44	1	2
TOTAL	14,320	175	9	42

Long Term Differential Strategy: individual feedback

We received 14,320 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 46 per cent supported the proposal
- 33 per cent did not support
- 18 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Long Term Differential Strategy: organisation feedback

We received 175 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 43 per cent supported the proposal
- 29 per cent did not support
- 25 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 3 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Long Term Differential Strategy: Māori entities feedback


Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Long Term Differential Strategy: pro forma feedback

We received 42 pieces of feedback from pro forma submissions on this proposal. Of these:

- 95 per cent supported the proposal
- 5 per cent indicated 'I don't know'.

Recycling charges for schools



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	4,374	48	3	0
Do not support	7,266	82	4	42
Other	232	4	1	0
I don't know	1,931	31	0	0
TOTAL	13,803	165	8	42

Recycling charges for schools: individual feedback

We received 13,803 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 32 per cent supported the proposal
- 53 per cent did not support
- 14 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Recycling charges for schools: organisation feedback


We received 165 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 29 per cent supported the proposal
- 50 per cent did not support
- 19 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Recycling charges for schools: Māori entities feedback

Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Rates funded refuse collection



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	7,082	91	1	38
Do not support	4,535	33	2	1
Other	277	5	3	2
I don't know	2,314	37	1	1
TOTAL	14,208	166	7	42

Rates funded refuse collection: individual feedback

We received 14,208 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 50 per cent supported the proposal
- 32 per cent did not support
- 16 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Rates funded refuse collection: organisation feedback

We received 166 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:


- 55 per cent supported the proposal
- 20 per cent did not support
- 22 per cent indicated 'I don't know'

- 3 per cent provided an ‘other’ response.

Rates funded refuse collection: Māori entities feedback

Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	1,827	11	1	0
Do not support	1,204	2	0	0
Other	105	2	1	0
I don't know	756	6	0	0
TOTAL	3,892	21	2	0

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate: individual feedback

We received 3,892 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 47 per cent supported the proposal
- 31 per cent did not support
- 19 per cent indicated ‘I don’t know’
- 3 per cent provided an ‘other’ response.

Because this proposal affects residents and ratepayers in the Franklin Local Board area differently from those outside of Franklin, the tables below further separates individual feedback on this proposal according to submitters' area of residence, where this was provided.

Overall, we received 3,484 pieces of feedback from individuals who indicated whether they live within or outside the Franklin Local Board area. Submitters indicating their local board was Franklin were:

- more likely than others to support this proposal (71 per cent compared to 37 per cent)
- less likely than others to not support this proposal (21 per cent compared to 35 per cent)
- less likely than others to provide an 'I don't know' response to this proposal (six per cent compared to 25 per cent).

Franklin Local Board Targeted Rate: Feedback from individuals by area of residence

Response	Franklin	Franklin	Outside Franklin	Outside Franklin
Support	813	71%	1,014	37%
Do not support	245	21%	959	35%
Other	25	2%	80	3%
I don't know	66	6%	690	25%
TOTAL	1,149	100%	2,743	100%

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate: organisation feedback


We received 21 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 11 supported the proposal
- 2 did not support
- 6 indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 provided an 'other' response.

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate: Māori entities feedback

Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	6,027	72	3	0
Do not support	2,257	13	2	0
Other	319	6	1	0
I don't know	5,501	74	3	1
TOTAL	14,104	165	9	1

Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate: individual feedback

We received 14,104 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 43 per cent supported the proposal
- 16 per cent did not support
- 39 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Because this proposal affects residents and ratepayers in the Rodney Local Board area differently from those outside of Rodney, the table below further separates individual feedback on this proposal according to submitters' area of residence, where this was provided.

Overall, we received 14,104 pieces of feedback from individuals who indicated whether they live within or outside the Rodney Local Board area. Submitters indicating their local board was Rodney were:

- more likely than others to support this proposal (58 per cent compared to 42 per cent)

- just as likely as others to not support this proposal (both 16 per cent)
- less likely than others to indicate 'I don't know' for this proposal (25 per cent compared to 40 per cent).

Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate: Feedback from individuals by area of residence

Response	Rodney	Rodney	Outside Rodney	Outside Rodney
Support	431	58%	5,596	42%
Do not support	120	16%	2,137	16%
Other	13	2%	306	2%
I don't know	185	25%	5,316	40%
TOTAL	749	100%	13,355	100%

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate: organisation feedback

We received 165 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 44 per cent supported the proposal
- 8 per cent did not support
- 45 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 4 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Overall, we received 165 pieces of feedback from organisations where the submitter indicated whether they are located within or outside the Rodney Local Board area, including eight from within Rodney:

- Two of these organisations supported this proposal (compared to 46 per cent of organisational submitters outside Rodney)
- Half (four) indicated 'I don't know' (compared to 44 per cent outside Rodney)
- One did not support this proposal and one gave an 'other' response.


Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate: Feedback from organisations by location

Response	Rodney	Rodney	Outside Rodney	Outside Rodney
Support	2	25%	70	45%
Do not support	1	13%	12	8%
Other	1	13%	5	3%
I don't know	4	50%	70	45%
TOTAL	8	100%	157	100%

Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate: Māori entities feedback

Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Māori entities	Pro forma
Support	7,345	79	3	0
Do not support	2,745	25	1	0
Other	305	6	3	0
I don't know	3,768	56	2	1
TOTAL	14,163	166	9	1

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate: individual feedback

We received 14,163 pieces of feedback from individuals on this proposal. Of these:

- 52 per cent supported the proposal
- 19 per cent did not support
- 27 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 2 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Because this proposal affects residents and ratepayers in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area differently from those outside of Waitākere, the table below further separates individual feedback on this proposal according to the submitters' area of residence, where this was provided.

Overall, we received 14,163 pieces of feedback from individuals who indicated whether they live within or outside the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area. Submitters indicating their local board was Waitākere Ranges were:

- less likely than others to support this proposal (44 per cent compared to 53 per cent)
- more likely than others to not support this proposal (38 per cent compared to 18 per cent)
- less likely than others to indicate 'I don't know' for this proposal (15 per cent compared to 27 per cent).

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate: Feedback from individuals by area of residence

Response	Waitākere	Waitākere	Outside Waitākere	Outside Waitākere
Support	227	44%	7,118	52%
Do not support	199	38%	2,546	19%
Other	13	3%	292	2%
I don't know	80	15%	3,688	27%
TOTAL	519	100%	13,644	100%

For a breakdown of responses by Local Board please refer to Attachment Seven. See question 6b for a summary of other feedback on proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges.

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate: organisation feedback

We received 166 pieces of feedback from organisations on this proposal. Of these:

- 48 per cent supported the proposal
- 15 per cent did not support
- 34 per cent indicated 'I don't know'
- 4 per cent provided an 'other' response.

Overall, we received 166 pieces of feedback from organisations where the submitter indicated whether they are located within or outside the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, including seven from within the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area:

- None of the organisational submitters indicating their local board was Waitākere Ranges supported the proposal (compared to 49 per cent for organisations outside the area)
- Six did not support it (compared to 11 per cent for organisations outside the area).

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate: Feedback from organisations by area of residence

Response	Waitākere	Waitākere	Outside Waitākere	Outside Waitākere
Support	0	0%	79	49%
Do not support	6	86%	19	11%
Other	1	14%	5	3%
I don't know	0	0%	56	35%
TOTAL	7	100%	159	100%

Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate: Māori entities feedback

Refer to Attachment Five for breakdown of Māori entities feedback by Mana whenua, mataawaka and individual entity.

Question 6b – Other changes to fees and charges

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

6b.1 Feedback from individuals

Overall, we received 2,289 pieces of feedback from individuals that provided comments on one or more of the rates, fees and charges proposals listed in question 6a or elsewhere in the Consultation Document.

Further analysis of this feedback including the themes in feedback around each proposed rate, fee or charge in the Consultation Document, will be outlined in separate staff advice to support decision-making on these points.

However, common topics were:

- 385 commented on general financial strategy, including rates are too high or shouldn't be increased, financial hardship, encouraging council to reduce the scope of services provided, delaying or postponing of non-essential projects and/or services.
- 184 commented on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate
- 168 mentioned grants and subsidies, almost all regarding Surf Life Saving facilities
- 154 addressed the rates funded refuse collection
- 129 included comments on solid waste services including recycling
- 115 expressed general support, including for the specific items under 'other changes' on rates, fees and charges or otherwise generally supportive comments
- 107 encouraged finding other savings and/or improving efficiency
- 105 provided feedback on another specific rating, charges or fees item, not included in the table of proposed changes at 6a.

6b.2 Feedback from organisations

Feedback from Organisations/Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Who attended

In total 38 organisations attended across three Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events. All 38 provided feedback in a presentation and/or submission.

See Attachment Six for the list of attending organisations.

Proposal	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	8	1	2	1

Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	11	1	2	
Broaden the description of services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	9		1	1
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	7	4		1
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	1	4	1	1
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	3	4	1	1
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.				
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	1	1	1	3
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	2	3	1	3

Feedback from all organisations

Including those who attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events (but excluding Māori entities), 391 pieces of feedback indicated they were on behalf of an organisation.

For more information on what types of organisations submitted and how their feedback is analysed, refer to 'Reporting' and 'Feedback from organisations' on p16 of this report.

Overall, we received 72 pieces of feedback from organisations that provided comments on one or more of the rates, fees and charges proposals listed in question 6a or elsewhere in the Consultation Document.

Of these common themes were:

- 18 comments on the proposal to discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy
- 19 comments on the proposal to resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate
- 13 comments on the proposal to resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate
- 11 responses on general financial strategy, including feedback on targeted rates in general and addressing equity through differential rates.

Further analysis of this feedback including the themes in feedback around each proposed rate, fee or charge in the Consultation Document, will be outlined in the staff advice to support decision-making.

6b.3 Feedback from Māori entities

One mana whenua entity who commented had previously expressed their concern in earlier questions regarding the impact of increasing rates at a time of financial duress for the average resident of Tāmaki Makaurau caused by cost-of-living increases and the ongoing economic effects of Covid-19.

One mataawaka entity emphasised the need to use mātauranga Māori and Te Ao Maori practices to protect native ecosystems and species so that rates are not increased.

Question 7 – Local board priorities

Feedback received on local board priorities will be presented separately in local board meetings.

Question 8 – What else is important to you?

We also invited the public to provide feedback on issues that were important to them. The question was kept broad and open ended:

Do you have any other comments?

Some feedback received included further comment relating to proposals covered earlier in this report. Feedback received was themed to the relevant proposal and has been included in the summary of feedback for that proposal.

Comments related to issues not being consulted on are summarised by topic areas in Attachment Three, by individual and organisation feedback. See Attachment Four for the breakdown of other Māori entity feedback.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment		Page number
Attachment One:	Submitter breakdown	86
Attachment Two:	Requests for funding	88
Attachment Three:	Other feedback received	90
Attachment Four:	Additional submission priorities for Māori entities (Q8)	92
Attachment Five:	Māori entities - Changes to other rates, fees and charges	99
Attachment Six:	Organisations that attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events	104
Attachment Seven:	Results by local board	106

ATTACHMENT ONE: Submitter breakdown

Who we have heard from

The information below shows demographic information as provided by submitters. Not all submitters responded to each question. This consultation received the most individual submitters of Māori, Pasifika and Asian ethnicity, of any Auckland Council consultation (by number, not per cent).



TOTAL RECEIVED

GENDER	#	%
Male	9,387	49%
Female	9,820	51%
Another gender	124	1%
Total	19,331	100%

AGE	Male	Female	Other	Total	%
< 15	345	318	3	676	4%
15 – 24	925	1,110	33	2,113	12%
25 – 34	1,288	1,223	39	2,604	14%
35 – 44	1,747	1,579	11	3,391	19%
45 – 54	1,478	1,549	6	3,073	17%
55 – 64	1,232	1,317	6	2,577	14%
65 – 74	1,243	1,361	4	2,618	14%
75 +	618	510	4	1,138	6%
Total				18,190	100%

ETHNICITY	#	%
European	8,837	46%
Pākehā/NZ European	8,231	43%
Other European	606	3%
Māori	1,365	7%
Pasifika	3,362	18%
Samoaan	2,171	11%
Cook Islands Māori	104	1%
Tongan	694	4%
Other Pasifika	393	2%
Asian	5,990	31%
Chinese	3,371	18%
Indian	1,352	7%
Southeast Asian	551	3%
Korean	582	3%
Other Asian	134	1%
Middle Eastern/Latin/African	356	2%
Other	741	4%
Total	19,105	NA*

COMPARISON TO CENSUS




* Does not add to 100% as people may select more than one ethnicity

TOTAL RECEIVED

'YOUR LOCAL BOARD'	#	%
Albert-Eden	1848	7%
Aotea/Great Barrier	50	<1%
Devonport-Takapuna	975	3%
Franklin	1518	5%
Henderson-Massey	1683	6%
Hibiscus and Bays	2082	7%
Howick	2310	8%
Kaipātiki	1168	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	1286	5%
Manurewa	1031	4%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	1073	4%
Ōrākei	1037	4%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1190	4%
Papakura	754	3%
Puketāpapa	516	2%
Rodney	1546	6%
Upper Harbour	1451	5%
Waiheke	393	1%
Waitākere Ranges	729	3%
Waitematā	1024	4%
Whau	892	3%
Not supplied or outside Auckland	3,422	12%
Total	27,978	100%

COMPARISON TO CENSUS



* Note:

Albert-Eden may be over-represented as it is the first option in the local board list and some submitters may select this rather than identify their local board (around a quarter did not provide any feedback to the Albert-Eden local board question).

Local boards are listed in alphabetical order for ease of navigation and submitters can provide their suburb or look-up their local board online should they not know this.

ATTACHMENT THREE: Funding requests

Submitter: Surf Lifesaving Northern Region

Submission number: 4130

Local/Regional: Regional

Local Board/Council area: Active communities, Sport and Recreation

Description of request: Rescues are direct interventions where the risk of a fatality is high. The current Value of Preventing a Fatality is estimated at \$12.1 million.² Using this metric, Surf Life Savings economic benefit by fulfilling its duties provides cost savings into the billions. SLSNR's LTP submission requesting \$8.02 million will provide AC with a cost-effective solution to enable community safety on its coastlines.

Value of request: \$8.02 million

One off or ongoing? One off

Current State (existing funding level, confirmed agreements/plans; relevant historic info):

Surf 10:20 is a Capital Works programme undertaken by Surf Life Saving Northern Region for the rebuild (replacement) and refurbishment of surf club facilities in the Auckland region only. To date one refurbishment has been completed (Red Beach); two replacement facilities completed (Muriwai and Karekare); one due for completion in May 2024 (United North Piha); and one where construction works has recently commenced on 2 April 2024 (Kariaotahi). A total of circa \$6.5M has been granted previously.

This request is for grant funding requests for the rebuild of two facilities: Bethells Beach (destroyed in Cyclone Gabrielle) \$2.4M in FY25; Mairangi Bay \$2.42M FY27; and refurbishment of two facilities: Omaha (\$1.8M) and [South] Piha (\$1.4M) - both in FY28.

The funding request can therefore be spread out across several financial years, it is not necessary to allocate all the funding in one financial year. Total over the four-year period = \$8.02M. This amount will be a capped amount even if the overall costs of construction increase.

Separately \$2M has been granted to Orewa surf club for a rebuild via the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund (SRFIF) (estimated build cost of \$8M).

This is the third tranche of funding requested through the LTP for the rebuild/refurb programme since 2011.

Officer comment:

This is the third request for funding through an LTP process and should see the completion of the Surf 10:20 rebuild/refurbishment programme. Despite the challenges of rising costs and an exceedingly tough fundraising environment, four club house have been completed; two are underway with one due for completion imminently. SLSNR has proven to be an excellent governing body to work with and has been instrumental in

assisting the fundraising efforts to source funds from Surf New Zealand, as well as central government. SLSNR and the club have so far delivered on the programme of works.

Bethells Beach surf club was destroyed in Cyclone Gabrielle and is advancing plans for a new site and facility - working closely with council staff and WRLB. Mairangi Bay surf club has been working closely with council (both staff and HBLB) to agree a new site for its facility as its exiting water-side location will be impacted through rising sea levels in due course.

Although the amounts requested as contributions to the four projects in 2025 through 2028 has increased over previous grant amounts, this is reflective of the significantly increased cost of construction. The total estimated cost of the four projects is c\$22M. The requested grant represents circa 36% of the overall build cost, with the balance being sourced from other sources. This ratio is consistent with the contributions and overall cost of the already completed and partially completed rebuilds.

ATTACHMENT THREE: Other feedback received (Q8)

Regional Council activity area	Individuals	Organisations
General financial feedback (e.g. rates are too high, stick to core services, reduce debt etc)	1,819	84
Parks, sport and recreation	435	83
Local Board Funding Policy	286	30
Public transport	175	16
Community places and services	158	26
Regional governance and support	138	17
Roads and footpaths	114	9
Regional planning (spatial and infrastructure)	111	17
Solid waste services	96	7
Environmental strategy and policy	91	17
Walking and cycling improvements	87	4
Local governance and support	85	10
Climate change/preparedness	83	14
Arts, culture and events	79	13
Transport safety	77	12
Grants and subsidies	76	37
Urban regeneration and local planning (Eke Panuku)	54	15
Māori outcomes	54	23
Organisational support	53	6
Housing	47	8
Air, water quality and land management	37	9
Libraries	33	2
Parking and enforcement	31	5

Regional Council activity area	Individuals	Organisations
Stormwater	30	15
Development Contributions Policy	30	16
Biodiversity protection and biosecurity	29	7
Roading network optimisation	28	3
Regulatory services	26	4
Rating policy	22	4
Economic strategy and business growth	21	7
Bylaws	15	2
Cultural and built heritage protection	15	7
Stadiums and major facilities	15	1
Destination/tourism promotion	14	4
Wastewater	12	6
Storm recovery	12	4
Major events	12	3
Local economic development	11	3
Regional Parks	10	2
Tūpuna Maunga	7	3
Water supply	6	1
Auckland emergency management	6	3
Requests for funding	2	12
Revenue and Financing Policy	1	1
BIDS (Business Improvement Districts)	0	6

ATTACHMENT FOUR: Additional submission priorities for Māori entities (Q8)

Mana whenua entities (14 submissions received)

Partnership and engagement	
Meaningful engagement and enduring partnerships must include council involving mana whenua representatives in decision-making, and at all stages of project design, implementation and monitoring	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua Trust Board
Encourages partnership and collaboration with iwi in decision-making processes, particularly those relating to land use, infrastructure development, and environmental management.	Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua Trust Board
Request that council's engagement is made directly with individual iwi	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui) Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
Council needs to ensure that only the 'right' or 'appropriate' iwi and hapū are involved in decision-making processes "at place" on matters affecting their rights and obligations as ahi kā and tāngata whenua	Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
Cultural heritage preservation and recognition requires strong engagement with iwi	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)
Council needs to employ new and innovative approaches when delivering services to meet fiscal challenges and key priorities, mana whenua need to be central to the design and delivery	Ngāti Tamaterā
Māori representation	
Ensure that the governance structure includes mechanisms for meaningful Māori representation, such as the establishment of Māori wards or seats on the Governing Body,	Ngāti Tamaterā Ngaati Whanaunga
Expressing strong disappointment in the governing body decision to vote against Māori Wards in 2023- showing archaic thinking and a lack of commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua Trust Board Ngāti Tamaterā
Local board amalgamation	
Supports continued independence of current local boards	Te Ahiwaru
Supportive of amalgamation of some local boards if localised priorities and kaupapa are not impacted	Ngāti Tamaterā

Treaty / te Tiriti related matters	
Request that rights and interests (under Te Tiriti, Settlements, and Accords) are recognised and protected with any policy development and decisions	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)
Council must honour Treaty Partnerships, which means cooperating for mutual outcomes, making decisions together and acting together in good faith; essential in relation to the management of natural resources and heritage.	Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust
Treaty settlement needs resolution to enable progression of strategic priorities for this iwi	Ngaati Whanaunga
Procurement	
Greater levels of social procurement needed for Māori businesses	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Ngāti Manuhiri
Māori Outcomes Fund	
Māori Outcomes fund to be directly distributed to iwi to help support, implement and realise shared aspirations	Ngāti Tamaterā
Māori Outcomes Fund should be increased	Ngāti Tamaterā
Taiao and Kaitiakitanga (environment and guardianship of the environment)	
Preserve the health and mauri of the natural environment -economic development cannot be at the expense of the environment	Ngāti Manuhiri Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
Ensure a continued commitment to Te Mana o te Wai principles in freshwater management	Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
Focus on waste pump stations to ensure harbours are not polluted	Ngāti Manuhiri
Deep concern at council allowing development on sacred waterways	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
Supports draft Tūpuna Maunga Operational Plan 2024/2025	Ngāti Tamaterā
Environmental projects require multiyear funding not single year funding to enable them to achieve environmental goals	Ngāti Rehua-Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board Ngati Rehua (Tu Mai Taonga)
Social wellbeing	
Promote social equity and inclusion by prioritising initiatives such as affordable housing, accessible healthcare, and educational opportunities for all residents, including Māori and other marginalised communities.	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)
Prioritising support for iwi and hapū educational, social, and economic development as foundational aspects of partnership agreements.	Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei

Housing	
Policies and investments that prioritise affordable housing for all Aucklanders must be a council focus	Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei
Increased housing is required to meet immediate needs of communities	Ngaati Whanaunga Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
Council should not continue to decline iwi the ability to develop and provide housing for their own people and existing community in their heartland	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
Supports bilingual signage and increased investment in cultural events to present Auckland as the largest Polynesian centre in the world, and to generate economic activity for small businesses	Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
Iwi-specific kaupapa	
<p>Request for Auckland Council to reset its relationship with Te Kawerau ā Maki and work together on the following six areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure ongoing capacity support • Development of a Memorandum of Understanding and annual work programme • Complete the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Deed by the end of 2024 • Financial support for the development of Te Henga Marae • Commitment to support their aspirations at Onikiritea (Hobsonville) • Commitment to support their aspirations at Riverhead Forest 	Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust
<p>Requests that council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets to discuss partnership opportunities in housing and papakāinga projects • Formally acknowledges that any decisions regarding the future of Port of Auckland and the land and seabed underlying it include Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei directly • Consider an option for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei purchase or lease back whatever remnant of the land and seabed underlying the Port of Auckland that is available, with the support of other investors such as other iwi and hapū and other established New Zealand investors • The establishment of a formal joint working group between Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and Auckland Council, to explore future economic opportunities that benefit both Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and wider Auckland region. 	Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking 50% co funding from Auckland council to achieve goals of pest eradication on Aotea 	Ngāti Rehua-Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board Ngati Rehua (Tu Mai Taonga)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs greater level of consultation to understand fit between council activity and iwi aspirations 	Ngāti Tamaoho
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that the rights and interests of the Iwi (under Te Tiriti, Settlements, and Accords) are recognised and protected with any policy development and decisions Seeking inclusion in planning, design and decision making within area of interest Has outstanding Te Tiriti o Waitangi grievances – once redress confirmed requests discussion with council to ensure that LTP supports iwi aspirations 	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)

Note that in addition to answering the LTP questions, the following mana whenua entities provided detailed written submissions outlining aspirations for their iwi and how they seek to work with council:

- Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust
- Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust
- Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Trust
- Waikato-Tainui
- Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Trust

Mataawaka entities (9 submissions received)

Partnership and engagement	
Seeks to work with council in a Treaty-based partnership – Waipareira is the largest kaupapa-Māori health, education, and training, social and housing provider in Aotearoa	Te Whanau o Waipereira
Council needs to employ new and innovative approaches when delivering services to meet fiscal challenges and key priorities, iwi and marae need to be central to the design and delivery	Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Treaty must be upheld in all areas of the LTP proposal	Te Kaha o Te Rangatahi
Advocating for meaningful participation and partnership in decision-making processes, emphasising the need for quality services led by and for Wāhine	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)
Seeks more equitable representation of wāhine at the councillor table	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)
Want input into decision-making before the age of 18, and to have their aspirations heard	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora

Council to make better use of its current data and information in general and prior to engaging	Te Whanau o Waipereira Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Enable effective Māori participation in council decision-making and ensuring that council staff are empowered to deliver on outcomes for and with Māori	Whanau Haua CCS Disability Action
Accessible, transparent communication is key for whānau hauā – how does council plan to achieve this?	Whanau Haua CCS Disability Action
IMSB	
Seeking representation of mataawaka on Independent Māori Statutory Board	Te Whanau o Waipereira
Waipareira proposes, through its status as an urban Māori-Crown Treaty Partner, that it becomes the Council groups' Principal Mātāwaka Partner to advocate on behalf of mataawaka	Te Whanau o Waipereira
Reallocation of funding	
Devolve a proportion of Māori outcomes funding (including Local Board funding) to Waipereira to enable effective coordination and delivery of community driven outcomes	Te Whanau o Waipereira
Release Māori outcomes funding to Māori communities to realise better outcomes,	Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Enable more direct funding that will benefit community services and contribute to the wellbeing or development of Maori.	Te Kaha o Te Rangatahi
Housing	
Seeking council's urgent response to housing crisis – provides detailed recommendations on behalf of 40 communities and civil society organisations	Te Ohu Whakawhanaunga Tāmaki Makaurau
Recommends the building of urban apartments/housing and kaupapa Māori health clinics on Council-owned land	Te Whanau o Waipereira
Invest in accessible homes and marae for Māori communities and whānau hauā	Whanau Haua CCS Disability Action
Taiao and Kaitiakitanga (environment and guardianship of the environment)	
Strengthen environmental protection measures and sustainable practices to ensure the preservation of natural resources and cultural landscapes	Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Kaitiakitanga – the council should provide for Māori participation in the management of taonga resources.	Whanau Haua CCS Disability Action

Marae support	
Seeking funding for marae developments in acknowledgement that the marae serves the whole community in a myriad of ways	Hoani Waititi Marae
Proposes collaborative ventures in partnership to deliver benefits to communities	Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Procurement	
Seek greater levels of social procurement for pakihi Māori	Hoani Waititi Marae Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Financial crisis	
Extreme financial pressure in Auckland creates homelessness and hunger	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)
Improve employment and economic access for rangatahi	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora
Increase support for Māori-specific programmes, cultural events, language revitalization, and capacity-building initiatives	Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective
Inclusion and wellbeing	
Reduce discrimination and foster a safe and inclusive environment for rangatahi, LGBGT, Trans and homeless rangatahi through safe spaces, health care services and resources	Rainbow Youth (Takatāpui)
Whānau haua (whānau with disabilities) require accessible places, and to be welcomed and included in all aspects of community life, including council processes	Whanau Haua CCS Disability Action Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)
Transport	
Prioritise safe, affordable, accessible public transport	Rainbow Youth (Takatāpui) Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora Te Kaha o Te Rangatahi
Te reo	
Take steps to ensure te reo Māori is alive and thriving	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori) Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora
Other	
Prevent further liquor and vape shops in communities	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)
Need more major events and activities for rangatahi to participate in	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora

Note that in addition to answering the LTP questions, the following mataawaka entities provided detailed written submissions outlining their aspirations and how they seek to work with council:

- Te Whanau o Waipareira
- Te Ohu Whakawhanaunga Tāmaki Makaurau
- Te Kotahi a Tamaki Makaurau Marae Collective

ATTACHMENT FIVE: Māori entities - Changes to other rates, fees and charges

Mana whenua entities

A total of 14 mana whenua entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed question 6a in their feedback. Not all entities responded to each proposal under question 6a.

Proposal	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Q6_A_1 - Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust Ngātiwai Trust Board Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board	Ngāti Tamaoho		
Q6_A_2 - Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust Ngātiwai Trust Board Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board	Ngāti Tamaoho		
Q6_A_3 - Broaden the description of services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Te Kawerau Iwi Tiaki Trust Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board	Ngāti Tamaoho	Ngātiwai Trust Board	

Proposal	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Q6_A_4 - Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngātiwai Trust Board		
Q6_A_5 - Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board	Ngāti Tamaoho Ngātiwai Trust Board		
Q6_A_6 - Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust	Ngāti Tamaoho	Ngātiwai Trust Board	Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Q6_A_7 - Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust Ngātiwai Trust Board	Ngāti Tamaoho		Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board
Q6_A_8 - Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust	Ngāti Tamaoho	Ngātiwai Trust Board	Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board

The one mana whenua who commented had previously expressed their concern in earlier questions regarding the impact of increasing rates at a time of financial duress for the average resident of Tāmaki Makaurau caused by cost-of-living increases and the ongoing economic effects of Covid-19.

There were no additional comments against proposals outlined in question 6a.

Mataawaka entities

A total of 9 mataawaka entities made a submission on the long-term plan.

Five entities addressed proposals in question 6a in their feedback. Not all entities responded to each proposal under question 6a.

Proposal	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora Te Kotahi a Tāmaki Makaurau Marae Collective Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)		Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora Te Kotahi a Tāmaki Makaurau Marae Collective Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)		Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	
Broaden the description of services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)	Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	

Proposal	Support	Do not support	Other	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.	Te Kotahi a Tāmaki Makaurau Marae Collective Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)		Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi	Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.		Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)	Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Te Kotahi a Tāmaki Makaurau Marae Collective		Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Te Kotahi a Tāmaki Makaurau Marae Collective	Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi	Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action	Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)

Proposal	Support	Do not support	Other	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>Mad Ave Community Trust – Rangatahi Ora Te Kotahi a Tāmaki Makaurau Marae Collective</p>		<p>Te Kaha O Te Rangatahi Whanau Hauā CCS Disability Action</p>	<p>Wāhine Relative Limited (Wāhine Māori)</p>

ATTACHMENT SIX: Organisations that attended the Organisation / Interest Group Have Your Say Events

Attended an event
Aktive
All Aboard Transport Decarbonisation Trust
Auckland Branch, New Zealand Educational Institute
Auckland Citizens Advice Bureau
Auckland City of Music
Auckland Conservation Board
Auckland Philharmonic
Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance
Bike Auckland
Business East Tamaki
Business North Harbour
Campaign for Better Transport Incorporated
Chartwell Trust
Creative NZ
Employers and Manufacturers Association
Fire and Emergency New Zealand
Generation Zero
Hapua Thrive
Hotel Council Auckland
Newmarket Business Association
Parnell Business Association
Pest Free Waitākere Ranges
Property Council New Zealand
PSA
Q Theatre

Attended an event
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society
Show Me Shorts Film Festival Trust
Stop Auckland Sewerage Overflows Coalition
Surf Life Saving Northern Region
Surface Light Rail
Tamaki Makaurau Community Climate Action Networks
Te Pou Theatre
Tennis Northern (with Northern Region Football and North Harbour Rugby Union)
The Sustainable North Trust. T/A Hibiscus Coast Zero Waste
The Tree Council
Toimata Foundation
Urban Auckland
Visionwest Community Trust

ATTACHMENT SEVEN: Results by local board

1.1 Overall direction for the long-term plan

Q1A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	Proceed	Do more	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1430	31%	31%	30%	4%	4%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	27%	27%	42%	4%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	665	32%	32%	29%	4%	3%
Franklin	492	36%	36%	16%	7%	4%
Henderson-Massey	1307	42%	42%	9%	3%	3%
Hibiscus and Bays	1190	36%	36%	19%	5%	4%
Howick	1393	42%	42%	8%	3%	4%
Kaipātiki	822	35%	32%	25%	4%	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	364	32%	32%	24%	6%	5%
Manurewa	508	36%	37%	13%	4%	9%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	728	35%	36%	19%	4%	5%
Ōrākei	788	36%	36%	21%	5%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	408	38%	38%	11%	3%	11%
Papakura	493	41%	39%	9%	4%	6%
Puketāpapa	317	34%	34%	23%	4%	4%
Rodney	888	39%	39%	12%	6%	5%
Upper Harbour	1227	38%	38%	15%	4%	4%
Waiheke	251	26%	26%	39%	9%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	560	34%	34%	24%	4%	4%
Waitematā	770	26%	26%	43%	4%	2%
Whau	736	35%	35%	25%	3%	3%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	Proceed	Do more	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	24	4	10	8	0	2
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	0	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	12	2	6	3	1	0
Franklin	7	1	2	2	1	1
Henderson-Massey	18	5	7	3	2	1
Hibiscus and Bays	9	2	4	3	0	0
Howick	11	5	3	0	2	1
Kaipātiki	10	1	5	2	2	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	4	3	2	0	1
Manurewa	10	4	3	3	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	3	4	1	2	0
Ōrākei	12	1	6	1	3	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	5	2	1	1	0	1
Papakura	4	1	2	1	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	1	1	2	0	0
Rodney	12	6	4	0	0	2
Upper Harbour	7	1	2	2	0	2
Waiheke	6	1	2	1	2	0
Waitākere Ranges	9	3	4	1	1	0
Waitematā	23	1	8	8	4	2
Whau	13	3	5	5	0	0

1.2 What should Auckland Council to do more or less of

1.2.1 Transport

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1452	31%	46%	23%
Aotea/Great Barrier	25	28%	56%	16%
Devonport-Takapuna	669	33%	49%	18%
Franklin	477	36%	47%	16%
Henderson-Massey	1250	40%	31%	29%
Hibiscus and Bays	1131	38%	40%	22%
Howick	1213	38%	39%	23%
Kaipātiki	817	35%	42%	23%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	501	42%	45%	13%
Manurewa	595	40%	42%	18%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	706	32%	43%	25%
Ōrākei	771	32%	43%	24%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	565	50%	36%	15%
Papakura	526	37%	38%	25%
Puketāpapa	353	33%	47%	20%
Rodney	786	36%	46%	17%
Upper Harbour	1103	37%	40%	23%
Waiheke	325	43%	44%	13%
Waitākere Ranges	542	36%	47%	17%
Waitematā	804	29%	54%	17%
Whau	670	29%	41%	30%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	20	3	8	9
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	2	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	12	7	3	2
Franklin	8	2	6	0
Henderson-Massey	17	6	8	3
Hibiscus and Bays	8	3	5	0
Howick	13	3	8	2
Kaipātiki	9	3	5	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	12	9	3	0
Manurewa	10	2	5	3
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	3	6	1
Ōrākei	8	2	4	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	1	3	2
Papakura	4	3	1	0
Puketāpapa	5	1	4	0
Rodney	9	3	3	3
Upper Harbour	4	2	2	0
Waiheke	6	3	3	0
Waitākere Ranges	7	2	3	2
Waitematā	19	6	11	2
Whau	13	2	10	1

1.2.2 Water

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1416	41%	48%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	35%	50%	15%
Devonport-Takapuna	668	39%	52%	9%
Franklin	476	49%	40%	12%
Henderson-Massey	1253	60%	27%	12%
Hibiscus and Bays	1120	46%	41%	13%
Howick	1209	52%	33%	15%
Kaipātiki	821	43%	45%	12%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	500	44%	51%	6%
Manurewa	589	46%	43%	10%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	716	39%	44%	17%
Ōrākei	770	48%	44%	8%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	560	54%	37%	9%
Papakura	518	42%	37%	21%
Puketāpapa	351	42%	44%	14%
Rodney	784	52%	35%	13%
Upper Harbour	1103	47%	35%	17%
Waiheke	324	50%	41%	9%
Waitākere Ranges	542	45%	46%	9%
Waitematā	804	40%	54%	5%
Whau	670	49%	42%	9%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	20	3	8	9
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	2	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	12	7	3	2
Franklin	8	2	6	0
Henderson-Massey	17	6	8	3
Hibiscus and Bays	8	3	5	0
Howick	13	3	8	2
Kaipātiki	9	3	5	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	12	9	3	0
Manurewa	10	2	5	3
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	3	6	1
Ōrākei	8	2	4	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	1	3	2
Papakura	4	3	1	0
Puketāpapa	5	1	4	0
Rodney	9	3	3	3
Upper Harbour	4	2	2	0
Waiheke	6	3	3	0
Waitākere Ranges	7	2	3	2
Waitematā	19	6	11	2
Whau	13	2	10	1

1.2.3 City and local development

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1394	36%	30%	35%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	54%	19%	27%
Devonport-Takapuna	661	40%	21%	38%
Franklin	474	34%	16%	51%
Henderson-Massey	1236	38%	12%	50%
Hibiscus and Bays	1107	37%	14%	49%
Howick	1209	39%	16%	45%
Kaipātiki	797	40%	20%	40%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	500	46%	29%	25%
Manurewa	575	45%	22%	33%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	698	33%	23%	43%
Ōrākei	764	36%	20%	45%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	563	51%	25%	24%
Papakura	502	40%	19%	41%
Puketāpapa	344	43%	28%	30%
Rodney	778	32%	13%	55%
Upper Harbour	1104	37%	18%	46%
Waiheke	321	40%	18%	41%
Waitākere Ranges	543	37%	17%	45%
Waitematā	800	37%	36%	27%
Whau	665	33%	24%	42%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	18	1	6	11
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	11	8	3	0
Franklin	6	2	4	0
Henderson-Massey	18	9	9	0
Hibiscus and Bays	10	4	6	0
Howick	12	5	7	0
Kaipātiki	8	4	4	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	12	4	7	1
Manurewa	10	3	4	3
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	4	5	1
Ōrākei	7	4	3	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	2	4	0
Papakura	4	2	2	0
Puketāpapa	5	1	4	0
Rodney	9	5	3	1
Upper Harbour	4	2	2	0
Waiheke	6	4	2	0
Waitākere Ranges	6	1	4	1
Waitematā	20	6	12	2
Whau	13	6	7	0

1.2.4 Environment and regulation

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1435	34%	41%	25%
Aotea/Great Barrier	33	15%	70%	15%
Devonport-Takapuna	666	38%	38%	24%
Franklin	475	42%	30%	28%
Henderson-Massey	1247	34%	22%	45%
Hibiscus and Bays	1123	41%	33%	26%
Howick	1206	46%	21%	32%
Kaipātiki	804	41%	37%	22%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	497	42%	47%	11%
Manurewa	587	40%	41%	19%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	690	37%	33%	31%
Ōrākei	771	42%	30%	28%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	561	48%	41%	11%
Papakura	510	36%	35%	30%
Puketāpapa	350	41%	38%	21%
Rodney	786	38%	27%	35%
Upper Harbour	1105	40%	29%	31%
Waiheke	327	33%	54%	13%
Waitākere Ranges	545	36%	44%	20%
Waitematā	802	37%	48%	16%
Whau	668	35%	35%	30%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	20	4	10	6
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	0	1	1
Devonport-Takapuna	12	6	3	3
Franklin	6	3	0	3
Henderson-Massey	18	5	5	8
Hibiscus and Bays	8	3	3	2
Howick	11	4	1	6
Kaipātiki	7	3	2	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	12	8	2	2
Manurewa	10	4	2	4
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	4	2	4
Ōrākei	7	2	3	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	3	3	0
Papakura	4	3	0	1
Puketāpapa	5	3	1	1
Rodney	9	3	1	5
Upper Harbour	3	2	0	1
Waiheke	6	3	2	1
Waitākere Ranges	8	1	3	4
Waitematā	18	4	9	5
Whau	12	4	7	1

1.2.5 Parks and community

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1438	36%	37%	27%
Aotea/Great Barrier	27	70%	19%	11%
Devonport-Takapuna	682	40%	36%	24%
Franklin	474	39%	26%	35%
Henderson-Massey	1253	40%	23%	36%
Hibiscus and Bays	1184	38%	34%	28%
Howick	1209	42%	22%	36%
Kaipātiki	824	44%	35%	21%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	503	39%	46%	16%
Manurewa	596	38%	39%	23%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	717	37%	30%	34%
Ōrākei	773	45%	27%	29%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	565	42%	42%	16%
Papakura	530	32%	33%	35%
Puketāpapa	350	43%	35%	23%
Rodney	825	37%	32%	31%
Upper Harbour	1121	40%	27%	33%
Waiheke	327	40%	43%	17%
Waitākere Ranges	558	41%	34%	26%
Waitematā	806	38%	43%	19%
Whau	670	43%	33%	24%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	18	3	6	9
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	12	5	2	5
Franklin	7	3	3	1
Henderson-Massey	18	7	8	3
Hibiscus and Bays	8	3	4	1
Howick	11	3	4	4
Kaipātiki	8	7	1	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	12	4	6	2
Manurewa	10	3	5	2
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	5	3	2
Ōrākei	7	2	4	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	0	6	0
Papakura	4	2	0	2
Puketāpapa	5	1	3	1
Rodney	9	4	1	4
Upper Harbour	4	1	2	1
Waiheke	6	4	2	0
Waitākere Ranges	6	1	3	2
Waitematā	19	8	10	1
Whau	13	5	7	1

1.2.6 Economic and cultural environment

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1395	39%	25%	36%
Aotea/Great Barrier	25	68%	8%	24%
Devonport-Takapuna	660	38%	18%	44%
Franklin	477	36%	10%	53%
Henderson-Massey	1253	28%	19%	53%
Hibiscus and Bays	1106	34%	15%	52%
Howick	1215	37%	16%	47%
Kaipātiki	797	43%	18%	40%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	502	38%	40%	23%
Manurewa	590	40%	30%	30%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	690	34%	20%	46%
Ōrākei	770	37%	15%	48%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	563	48%	34%	19%
Papakura	514	31%	24%	45%
Puketāpapa	348	41%	28%	30%
Rodney	782	29%	12%	59%
Upper Harbour	1108	38%	16%	46%
Waiheke	322	37%	16%	47%
Waitākere Ranges	546	42%	18%	40%
Waitematā	806	39%	28%	34%
Whau	666	32%	22%	46%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	21	1	5	15
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	1
Devonport-Takapuna	13	4	6	3
Franklin	7	1	5	1
Henderson-Massey	19	5	12	2
Hibiscus and Bays	9	0	9	0
Howick	12	4	3	5
Kaipātiki	9	5	4	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	12	3	7	2
Manurewa	10	3	6	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	3	4	3
Ōrākei	8	2	6	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	0	6	0
Papakura	3	1	1	1
Puketāpapa	5	2	3	0
Rodney	10	2	4	4
Upper Harbour	6	1	5	0
Waiheke	6	2	3	1
Waitākere Ranges	8	1	4	3
Waitematā	21	7	11	3
Whau	12	4	8	0

1.2.7 Council support

Q1B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	1402	46%	27%	27%
Aotea/Great Barrier	29	76%	14%	10%
Devonport-Takapuna	668	50%	19%	31%
Franklin	474	52%	16%	31%
Henderson-Massey	1247	43%	16%	42%
Hibiscus and Bays	1171	46%	24%	30%
Howick	1207	46%	17%	37%
Kaipātiki	794	47%	23%	29%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	501	50%	35%	15%
Manurewa	581	46%	31%	23%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	682	47%	21%	32%
Ōrākei	761	50%	16%	33%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	560	52%	31%	17%
Papakura	505	46%	22%	32%
Puketāpapa	341	52%	27%	21%
Rodney	809	46%	22%	32%
Upper Harbour	1114	47%	19%	34%
Waiheke	325	52%	25%	23%
Waitākere Ranges	550	51%	24%	25%
Waitematā	802	51%	28%	21%
Whau	670	41%	22%	37%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q1B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Albert-Eden	22	4	9	9
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	1
Devonport-Takapuna	12	2	5	5
Franklin	6	3	1	2
Henderson-Massey	18	5	11	2
Hibiscus and Bays	8	3	3	2
Howick	12	6	2	4
Kaipātiki	8	1	4	3
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	11	5	5	1
Manurewa	10	3	4	3
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	4	3	3
Ōrākei	7	5	1	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	1	4	1
Papakura	4	2	1	1
Puketāpapa	5	2	2	1
Rodney	10	3	3	4
Upper Harbour	3	3	0	0
Waiheke	6	2	1	3
Waitākere Ranges	8	1	3	4
Waitematā	20	6	10	4
Whau	12	2	9	1

2.1 Proposed transport plan

Q2. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support all	Support most	Do not support most	Do not support any	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1390	27%	49%	13%	6%	5%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	19%	62%	12%	4%	4%
Devonport-Takapuna	668	25%	54%	13%	5%	3%
Franklin	467	27%	46%	14%	9%	4%
Henderson-Massey	1344	33%	34%	10%	19%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	1124	29%	46%	13%	6%	7%
Howick	1239	27%	41%	15%	9%	9%
Kaipātiki	767	23%	52%	12%	6%	6%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	786	49%	29%	15%	4%	3%
Manurewa	738	40%	35%	12%	8%	5%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	732	32%	42%	14%	7%	6%
Ōrākei	768	26%	51%	16%	5%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	571	49%	28%	9%	10%	5%
Papakura	522	36%	33%	13%	12%	6%
Puketāpapa	344	41%	38%	12%	5%	4%
Rodney	789	23%	48%	16%	8%	5%
Upper Harbour	1119	33%	43%	12%	6%	6%
Waiheke	325	18%	52%	18%	7%	5%
Waitākere Ranges	560	26%	47%	14%	8%	6%
Waitematā	797	23%	54%	13%	4%	5%
Whau	702	29%	37%	11%	19%	4%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q2. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support all	Support most	Do not support most	Do not support any	I don't know
Albert-Eden	19	6	6	4	1	2
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	0	2	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	3	6	1	0	0
Franklin	7	2	4	0	0	1
Henderson-Massey	19	3	10	4	0	2
Hibiscus and Bays	9	3	5	0	0	1
Howick	13	2	5	5	0	1
Kaipātiki	8	3	3	0	1	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	3	3	0	2	2
Manurewa	9	3	4	1	1	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	10	4	3	2	0	1
Ōrākei	10	3	6	0	0	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	2	3	0	0	1
Papakura	4	1	2	1	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	2	2	0	0	0
Rodney	9	1	6	2	0	0
Upper Harbour	6	0	4	0	0	2
Waiheke	6	1	5	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	6	0	3	2	0	1
Waitematā	22	5	11	2	0	4
Whau	12	2	6	3	1	0

3.1 North Harbour Stadium

Q3. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Keep the stadium	Consider redevelopment	Change operational management	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1338	25%	37%	24%	4%	23%
Aotea/Great Barrier	27	33%	30%	30%	4%	22%
Devonport-Takapuna	685	27%	44%	32%	5%	11%
Franklin	455	28%	33%	24%	7%	22%
Henderson-Massey	1210	44%	32%	15%	3%	13%
Hibiscus and Bays	1145	38%	36%	40%	3%	9%
Howick	1172	32%	29%	21%	4%	23%
Kaipātiki	809	28%	43%	33%	5%	11%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	336	28%	32%	19%	7%	23%
Manurewa	454	38%	24%	19%	5%	22%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	625	25%	39%	24%	4%	21%
Ōrākei	764	25%	39%	24%	5%	21%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	332	33%	30%	16%	4%	23%
Papakura	428	31%	31%	23%	7%	16%
Puketāpapa	312	34%	33%	21%	5%	16%
Rodney	811	33%	35%	37%	4%	11%
Upper Harbour	1127	45%	28%	29%	3%	12%
Waiheke	323	23%	28%	22%	6%	32%
Waitākere Ranges	537	28%	32%	26%	5%	23%
Waitematā	778	24%	37%	25%	5%	24%
Whau	629	35%	31%	22%	4%	19%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q3. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Keep the stadium	Consider redevelopment	Change operational management	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	22	6	6	3	0	7
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	2	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	15	4	4	6	0	1
Franklin	7	1	3	1	0	2
Henderson-Massey	18	7	6	4	0	1
Hibiscus and Bays	12	1	2	7	0	2
Howick	12	3	3	3	1	2
Kaipātiki	8	3	2	1	1	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	9	2	1	1	2	3
Manurewa	9	3	0	6	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	11	3	4	3	0	1
Ōrākei	11	0	6	2	1	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	6	2	0	2	1	1
Papakura	4	1	1	0	0	2
Puketāpapa	6	0	4	1	0	1
Rodney	10	4	2	3	0	1
Upper Harbour	9	1	5	2	0	1
Waiheke	5	2	1	1	0	1
Waitākere Ranges	5	0	1	0	1	3
Waitematā	24	7	3	5	3	6
Whau	14	1	4	6	0	3

4.0 Major investments

4.1 Proposal to establish Auckland Future Fund (AFF)

Q4A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Proceed	Don't proceed	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1349	41%	39%	4%	17%
Aotea/Great Barrier	30	47%	40%	3%	10%
Devonport-Takapuna	661	42%	37%	6%	15%
Franklin	452	45%	33%	5%	18%
Henderson-Massey	1210	48%	36%	2%	14%
Hibiscus and Bays	1116	45%	35%	3%	16%
Howick	1188	46%	30%	4%	20%
Kaipātiki	780	44%	32%	6%	18%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	365	40%	35%	6%	19%
Manurewa	466	42%	36%	3%	19%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	640	42%	36%	5%	17%
Ōrākei	768	50%	30%	4%	15%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	374	51%	30%	3%	16%
Papakura	445	44%	36%	3%	17%
Puketāpapa	336	46%	31%	6%	16%
Rodney	785	44%	35%	4%	16%
Upper Harbour	1116	47%	33%	3%	17%
Waiheke	325	27%	54%	6%	13%
Waitākere Ranges	533	35%	41%	4%	19%
Waitematā	786	40%	41%	4%	15%
Whau	638	42%	40%	3%	15%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q4A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Proceed	Don't proceed	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	19	7	8	1	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	11	3	5	3	0
Franklin	7	3	1	1	2
Henderson-Massey	14	3	3	3	5
Hibiscus and Bays	9	4	2	0	3
Howick	12	5	2	1	4
Kaipātiki	7	1	3	0	3
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	8	6	0	0	2
Manurewa	8	4	4	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	3	3	0	2
Ōrākei	8	5	0	1	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	3	0	2	0	1
Papakura	3	0	2	0	1
Puketāpapa	4	2	2	0	0
Rodney	8	2	5	0	1
Upper Harbour	6	3	0	0	3
Waiheke	6	4	2	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	7	3	1	1	2
Waitematā	20	3	6	3	8
Whau	9	6	1	0	2

4.2 Future of Port of Auckland

Q4B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Continue Council operation	Lease the operation	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1389	45%	37%	6%	13%
Aotea/Great Barrier	28	54%	25%	0%	21%
Devonport-Takapuna	684	41%	39%	8%	11%
Franklin	459	35%	43%	8%	14%
Henderson-Massey	1280	45%	40%	4%	11%
Hibiscus and Bays	1155	37%	44%	7%	12%
Howick	1197	36%	43%	5%	16%
Kaipātiki	788	41%	39%	7%	13%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	350	45%	33%	8%	14%
Manurewa	444	45%	34%	5%	16%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	654	41%	41%	5%	13%
Ōrākei	783	38%	42%	9%	10%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	357	41%	34%	3%	23%
Papakura	436	42%	40%	5%	14%
Puketāpapa	341	47%	36%	4%	13%
Rodney	801	36%	45%	7%	12%
Upper Harbour	1115	40%	42%	4%	14%
Waiheke	329	55%	27%	10%	8%
Waitākere Ranges	566	46%	34%	4%	15%
Waitematā	828	47%	32%	10%	11%
Whau	662	53%	31%	3%	13%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q4B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Continue Council operation	Lease the operation	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	20	6	8	1	5
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	5	3	1	1
Franklin	7	1	3	1	2
Henderson-Massey	15	4	4	2	5
Hibiscus and Bays	9	0	6	0	3
Howick	13	6	5	1	1
Kaipātiki	6	2	2	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	6	1	3	1	1
Manurewa	8	2	5	1	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	9	4	2	2	1
Ōrākei	7	1	4	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	2	2	0	0	0
Papakura	3	2	1	0	0
Puketāpapa	5	1	2	1	1
Rodney	9	3	3	2	1
Upper Harbour	5	1	1	0	3
Waiheke	6	4	1	0	1
Waitākere Ranges	8	4	1	1	2
Waitematā	21	8	3	5	5
Whau	9	8	1	0	0

4.3 Port of Auckland profits and dividends

Q4C. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Fund Council services	Invest in AFF	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1369	51%	34%	4%	12%
Aotea/Great Barrier	27	52%	30%	7%	11%
Devonport-Takapuna	667	45%	39%	7%	10%
Franklin	451	50%	32%	8%	10%
Henderson-Massey	1280	52%	35%	4%	9%
Hibiscus and Bays	1134	48%	35%	5%	11%
Howick	1185	47%	33%	6%	14%
Kaipātiki	766	50%	32%	6%	12%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	354	54%	23%	9%	13%
Manurewa	433	51%	30%	7%	12%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	644	50%	32%	7%	11%
Ōrākei	772	45%	37%	8%	10%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	351	57%	25%	3%	15%
Papakura	423	51%	33%	8%	9%
Puketāpapa	330	52%	33%	5%	10%
Rodney	787	50%	32%	6%	12%
Upper Harbour	1114	43%	38%	4%	14%
Waiheke	324	64%	25%	6%	5%
Waitākere Ranges	559	51%	31%	6%	12%
Waitematā	817	52%	30%	8%	10%
Whau	654	60%	27%	4%	9%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q4C. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Fund Council services	Invest in AFF	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	19	8	7	1	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	9	3	4	1	1
Franklin	7	3	1	1	2
Henderson-Massey	13	3	5	2	3
Hibiscus and Bays	9	3	3	0	3
Howick	12	4	6	1	1
Kaipātiki	6	2	0	1	3
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	6	1	2	1	2
Manurewa	8	4	4	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	9	1	3	4	1
Ōrākei	7	0	5	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	2	1	1	0	0
Papakura	3	2	0	1	0
Puketāpapa	4	2	2	0	0
Rodney	9	5	3	0	1
Upper Harbour	4	0	1	0	3
Waiheke	6	5	0	0	1
Waitākere Ranges	5	0	3	1	1
Waitematā	20	9	2	5	4
Whau	9	4	3	0	2

5.0 Port land

5.1 Captain Cook and Marsden wharves

Q5A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Proceed	No change	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1320	55%	29%	2%	14%
Aotea/Great Barrier	27	63%	26%	4%	7%
Devonport-Takapuna	651	58%	28%	3%	12%
Franklin	452	46%	35%	3%	15%
Henderson-Massey	1197	54%	35%	1%	10%
Hibiscus and Bays	1116	57%	28%	2%	12%
Howick	1164	47%	34%	2%	17%
Kaipātiki	753	55%	29%	2%	14%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	333	44%	34%	3%	19%
Manurewa	425	49%	35%	2%	14%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	619	52%	31%	2%	16%
Ōrākei	771	56%	30%	3%	11%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	343	45%	32%	1%	21%
Papakura	418	44%	40%	4%	12%
Puketāpapa	317	54%	33%	2%	12%
Rodney	774	50%	33%	3%	14%
Upper Harbour	1110	55%	28%	2%	15%
Waiheke	330	61%	26%	4%	8%
Waitākere Ranges	530	46%	36%	2%	15%
Waitematā	780	62%	23%	4%	11%
Whau	624	60%	25%	3%	13%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q5A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Proceed	No change	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	18	9	1	1	7
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	0	1	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	5	4	0	1
Franklin	7	4	0	1	2
Henderson-Massey	14	5	5	0	4
Hibiscus and Bays	9	3	3	0	3
Howick	13	5	3	2	3
Kaipātiki	6	3	1	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	8	5	0	0	3
Manurewa	8	4	3	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	3	3	0	2
Ōrākei	7	4	1	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	2	1	1	0	0
Papakura	3	2	1	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	3	1	0	0
Rodney	8	4	2	1	1
Upper Harbour	4	0	1	0	3
Waiheke	6	3	3	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	6	1	3	1	1
Waitematā	19	9	2	3	5
Whau	9	8	1	0	0

5.2 Bledisloe Terminal

Q5B. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Keep as PoA area	Transfer to Council	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1308	42%	38%	2%	17%
Aotea/Great Barrier	25	44%	36%	0%	20%
Devonport-Takapuna	646	41%	40%	2%	17%
Franklin	450	47%	31%	4%	18%
Henderson-Massey	1189	57%	28%	2%	13%
Hibiscus and Bays	1107	44%	37%	2%	17%
Howick	1155	43%	34%	2%	20%
Kaipātiki	750	43%	38%	2%	17%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	327	46%	28%	4%	22%
Manurewa	418	51%	29%	2%	18%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	619	43%	37%	2%	18%
Ōrākei	766	42%	41%	3%	13%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	335	51%	28%	0%	20%
Papakura	414	54%	29%	3%	14%
Puketāpapa	316	52%	31%	3%	15%
Rodney	767	43%	36%	2%	19%
Upper Harbour	1101	48%	32%	2%	18%
Waiheke	320	42%	43%	3%	12%
Waitākere Ranges	526	47%	31%	2%	20%
Waitematā	775	35%	46%	5%	14%
Whau	622	47%	35%	1%	16%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q5B. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Keep as PoA area	Transfer to Council	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	19	7	4	0	8
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	1	0	1	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	3	5	1	1
Franklin	7	2	2	1	2
Henderson-Massey	12	3	5	0	4
Hibiscus and Bays	9	1	5	0	3
Howick	12	5	5	0	2
Kaipātiki	5	2	1	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	8	3	1	0	4
Manurewa	8	1	6	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	4	3	0	1
Ōrākei	7	4	1	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	2	1	0	0	1
Papakura	3	1	1	0	1
Puketāpapa	4	2	2	0	0
Rodney	9	4	3	1	1
Upper Harbour	4	1	0	0	3
Waiheke	6	3	3	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	6	2	0	1	3
Waitematā	19	6	5	3	5
Whau	9	2	7	0	0

6.0 Proposed changes to other rates, fees and charges

6.1 Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1337	63%	28%	1%	8%
Aotea/Great Barrier	33	76%	18%	0%	6%
Devonport-Takapuna	660	60%	30%	2%	8%
Franklin	444	49%	42%	2%	8%
Henderson-Massey	1174	42%	48%	2%	7%
Hibiscus and Bays	1097	52%	38%	1%	9%
Howick	1157	41%	47%	2%	10%
Kaipātiki	765	61%	29%	2%	9%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	330	57%	27%	2%	14%
Manurewa	406	52%	37%	2%	9%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	622	54%	33%	2%	11%
Ōrākei	757	58%	34%	2%	6%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	338	44%	43%	2%	11%
Papakura	411	49%	39%	2%	10%
Puketāpapa	312	63%	27%	2%	8%
Rodney	783	48%	43%	1%	9%
Upper Harbour	1104	44%	44%	2%	10%
Waiheke	320	79%	16%	1%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	524	60%	30%	2%	8%
Waitematā	775	70%	22%	1%	7%
Whau	625	64%	28%	1%	8%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	10	4	0	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	2	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	11	4	4	0	3
Franklin	8	4	4	0	0
Henderson-Massey	11	4	4	1	2
Hibiscus and Bays	8	5	2	0	1
Howick	11	4	4	0	3
Kaipātiki	8	5	1	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	5	1	0	1
Manurewa	8	3	3	0	2
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	4	1	0	3
Ōrākei	7	5	1	0	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	3	2	1	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	3	1	0	0
Rodney	8	3	4	0	1
Upper Harbour	4	2	1	0	1
Waiheke	6	4	1	1	0
Waitākere Ranges	8	4	3	1	0
Waitematā	17	12	1	1	3
Whau	10	8	2	0	0

6.2 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1326	75%	15%	2%	8%
Aotea/Great Barrier	27	74%	7%	7%	11%
Devonport-Takapuna	655	77%	15%	2%	6%
Franklin	439	71%	21%	2%	6%
Henderson-Massey	1171	57%	34%	2%	7%
Hibiscus and Bays	1094	73%	19%	2%	7%
Howick	1152	70%	22%	1%	7%
Kaipātiki	764	73%	16%	3%	8%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	328	74%	15%	2%	10%
Manurewa	405	70%	20%	4%	6%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	618	73%	17%	3%	7%
Ōrākei	747	79%	14%	2%	5%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	337	68%	20%	2%	9%
Papakura	406	68%	23%	2%	7%
Puketāpapa	312	79%	13%	2%	6%
Rodney	766	65%	25%	2%	8%
Upper Harbour	1101	66%	23%	2%	9%
Waiheke	317	75%	16%	3%	6%
Waitākere Ranges	523	72%	19%	2%	7%
Waitematā	769	78%	14%	2%	6%
Whau	623	74%	17%	2%	7%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	10	4	0	3
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	2	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	4	3	1	2
Franklin	7	4	1	1	1
Henderson-Massey	11	10	0	1	0
Hibiscus and Bays	9	7	1	0	1
Howick	11	7	2	1	1
Kaipātiki	6	5	0	0	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	6	0	0	1
Manurewa	7	3	3	1	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	5	1	0	2
Ōrākei	7	5	0	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	3	2	0	1	0
Puketāpapa	4	3	0	1	0
Rodney	8	4	3	0	1
Upper Harbour	4	3	0	0	1
Waiheke	6	4	0	2	0
Waitākere Ranges	8	5	2	1	0
Waitematā	17	11	3	1	2
Whau	9	6	2	1	0

6.3 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1312	63%	25%	1%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	77%	8%	0%	15%
Devonport-Takapuna	650	66%	20%	2%	12%
Franklin	434	49%	34%	3%	13%
Henderson-Massey	1161	49%	37%	2%	12%
Hibiscus and Bays	1087	57%	29%	2%	12%
Howick	1142	49%	37%	1%	14%
Kaipātiki	761	61%	22%	2%	15%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	325	58%	26%	2%	14%
Manurewa	399	56%	27%	5%	13%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	611	59%	27%	2%	12%
Ōrākei	742	59%	28%	1%	12%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	329	57%	27%	4%	13%
Papakura	404	54%	28%	2%	16%
Puketāpapa	311	66%	21%	3%	10%
Rodney	762	51%	35%	2%	12%
Upper Harbour	1096	54%	30%	2%	13%
Waiheke	314	63%	20%	1%	16%
Waitākere Ranges	512	57%	26%	3%	15%
Waitematā	767	68%	19%	2%	11%
Whau	619	56%	31%	1%	12%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	8	3	1	5
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	1	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	6	2	0	2
Franklin	7	3	2	1	1
Henderson-Massey	12	8	2	1	1
Hibiscus and Bays	8	5	1	0	2
Howick	11	6	3	0	2
Kaipātiki	6	5	0	0	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	3	1	0	3
Manurewa	7	3	3	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	3	2	0	3
Ōrākei	7	5	0	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	3	2	1	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	3	1	0	0
Rodney	8	3	3	0	2
Upper Harbour	4	2	1	0	1
Waiheke	6	5	1	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	7	2	4	1	0
Waitematā	17	10	2	1	4
Whau	8	7	1	0	0

6.4 Long Term Differential Strategy (LTDS)

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1319	49%	31%	1%	18%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	73%	4%	0%	23%
Devonport-Takapuna	650	52%	30%	2%	17%
Franklin	432	43%	36%	3%	18%
Henderson-Massey	1159	42%	41%	2%	16%
Hibiscus and Bays	1082	45%	35%	2%	18%
Howick	1131	44%	35%	2%	19%
Kaipātiki	750	47%	31%	3%	19%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	323	46%	30%	2%	23%
Manurewa	401	47%	33%	3%	16%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	609	47%	31%	3%	18%
Ōrākei	739	47%	34%	2%	18%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	331	49%	29%	4%	18%
Papakura	403	46%	36%	2%	16%
Puketāpapa	308	51%	27%	2%	21%
Rodney	757	45%	36%	1%	18%
Upper Harbour	1091	46%	34%	2%	17%
Waiheke	312	56%	32%	1%	11%
Waitākere Ranges	516	44%	34%	3%	20%
Waitematā	765	56%	25%	1%	17%
Whau	612	44%	39%	1%	17%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	19	4	6	1	8
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	1	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	6	3	0	1
Franklin	6	3	3	0	0
Henderson-Massey	11	5	3	1	2
Hibiscus and Bays	8	3	2	0	3
Howick	11	5	3	0	3
Kaipātiki	6	2	1	0	3
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	3	0	0	4
Manurewa	7	4	2	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	9	4	4	0	1
Ōrākei	7	3	2	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	3	1	2	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	2	2	0	0
Rodney	8	0	3	1	4
Upper Harbour	4	2	0	0	2
Waiheke	6	5	1	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	9	2	5	1	1
Waitematā	17	6	6	0	5
Whau	10	8	2	0	0

6.5 Recycling charges for schools

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1260	29%	54%	1%	16%
Aotea/Great Barrier	26	38%	50%	0%	12%
Devonport-Takapuna	615	31%	53%	2%	15%
Franklin	420	35%	54%	1%	10%
Henderson-Massey	1126	38%	51%	1%	9%
Hibiscus and Bays	1021	31%	53%	1%	15%
Howick	1100	36%	46%	1%	16%
Kaipātiki	735	29%	56%	3%	13%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	306	29%	58%	1%	12%
Manurewa	401	30%	57%	2%	11%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	584	30%	52%	2%	16%
Ōrākei	706	32%	51%	3%	15%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	321	30%	57%	3%	10%
Papakura	389	31%	55%	2%	12%
Puketāpapa	297	34%	55%	2%	9%
Rodney	719	30%	59%	1%	10%
Upper Harbour	1061	35%	51%	1%	13%
Waiheke	296	20%	64%	1%	15%
Waitākere Ranges	490	28%	55%	2%	15%
Waitematā	740	31%	50%	1%	17%
Whau	598	25%	59%	1%	15%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	6	7	0	4
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	0	2	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	9	3	6	0	0
Franklin	6	2	3	0	1
Henderson-Massey	12	3	8	1	0
Hibiscus and Bays	7	1	4	0	2
Howick	12	5	3	0	4
Kaipātiki	5	2	1	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	3	3	0	1
Manurewa	7	3	4	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	1	6	0	1
Ōrākei	6	2	3	0	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	0	1	0	0
Papakura	4	1	3	0	0
Puketāpapa	4	3	1	0	0
Rodney	9	3	3	0	3
Upper Harbour	2	0	0	0	2
Waiheke	6	2	3	0	1
Waitākere Ranges	6	1	4	1	0
Waitematā	16	3	6	1	6
Whau	9	2	7	0	0

6.6 Rates funded refuse collection

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1289	56%	21%	1%	22%
Aotea/Great Barrier	24	54%	13%	0%	33%
Devonport-Takapuna	645	50%	40%	2%	9%
Franklin	435	49%	37%	1%	12%
Henderson-Massey	1148	50%	36%	2%	11%
Hibiscus and Bays	1076	45%	45%	1%	9%
Howick	1127	46%	31%	2%	21%
Kaipātiki	766	48%	41%	2%	8%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	317	47%	27%	4%	22%
Manurewa	396	57%	23%	4%	16%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	601	56%	23%	2%	18%
Ōrākei	735	55%	21%	2%	22%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	327	46%	31%	4%	19%
Papakura	394	50%	33%	3%	14%
Puketāpapa	307	58%	21%	2%	19%
Rodney	744	41%	46%	1%	12%
Upper Harbour	1092	49%	37%	2%	13%
Waiheke	309	41%	22%	1%	37%
Waitākere Ranges	507	45%	42%	2%	11%
Waitematā	754	57%	20%	2%	21%
Whau	611	58%	26%	1%	15%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	10	2	0	5
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	1	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	6	4	0	0
Franklin	5	3	1	0	1
Henderson-Massey	11	6	3	1	1
Hibiscus and Bays	8	2	2	0	4
Howick	12	6	3	0	3
Kaipātiki	6	4	1	0	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	4	0	0	3
Manurewa	7	4	2	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	7	4	1	0	2
Ōrākei	6	3	1	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	0	1	0	0
Papakura	4	3	0	0	1
Puketāpapa	4	4	0	0	0
Rodney	8	4	2	1	1
Upper Harbour	2	0	0	0	2
Waiheke	6	4	1	0	1
Waitākere Ranges	6	2	3	1	0
Waitematā	17	9	4	1	3
Whau	10	8	1	0	1

6.7 Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	174	47%	24%	6%	23%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	45	31%	24%	7%	38%
Franklin	1149	71%	21%	2%	6%
Henderson-Massey	371	28%	54%	1%	17%
Hibiscus and Bays	201	48%	31%	1%	20%
Howick	420	31%	35%	1%	33%
Kaipātiki	119	36%	24%	11%	29%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	41	54%	17%	12%	17%
Manurewa	61	48%	31%	7%	15%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	88	28%	26%	3%	42%
Ōrākei	30	53%	27%	3%	17%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	86	33%	15%	5%	48%
Papakura	78	42%	26%	4%	28%
Puketāpapa	55	35%	29%	2%	35%
Rodney	19	21%	37%	5%	37%
Upper Harbour	343	54%	30%	1%	15%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	28	32%	18%	4%	46%
Waitematā	44	45%	25%	2%	27%
Whau	180	27%	63%	0%	11%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1	0	1	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	11	9	0	1	1
Henderson-Massey	2	2	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	1	0	1	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	0	0	0	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	1	0	0	0	1
Ōrākei	0	0	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	1	0	0	1	0
Rodney	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	2	0	0	0	2

6.8 Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1281	46%	12%	1%	41%
Aotea/Great Barrier	24	29%	13%	0%	58%
Devonport-Takapuna	634	41%	10%	2%	48%
Franklin	426	40%	12%	3%	46%
Henderson-Massey	1151	28%	28%	2%	42%
Hibiscus and Bays	1070	50%	14%	1%	35%
Howick	1127	46%	19%	2%	33%
Kaipātiki	727	36%	12%	3%	49%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	322	45%	15%	4%	36%
Manurewa	390	42%	22%	4%	32%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	599	41%	14%	3%	42%
Ōrākei	732	45%	10%	3%	42%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	332	41%	19%	4%	36%
Papakura	385	46%	18%	2%	33%
Puketāpapa	308	46%	16%	2%	37%
Rodney	749	58%	16%	2%	25%
Upper Harbour	1080	46%	19%	3%	33%
Waiheke	306	36%	7%	1%	56%
Waitākere Ranges	502	37%	14%	2%	47%
Waitematā	751	43%	9%	1%	46%
Whau	603	37%	25%	1%	37%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	8	1	0	8
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	1	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	2	0	0	8
Franklin	6	1	0	0	5
Henderson-Massey	11	7	0	1	3
Hibiscus and Bays	8	5	1	0	2
Howick	12	7	1	0	4
Kaipātiki	6	2	0	0	4
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	6	0	0	1
Manurewa	7	2	3	0	2
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	4	1	0	3
Ōrākei	5	2	0	0	3
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	3	1	0	1	1
Puketāpapa	4	3	0	0	1
Rodney	8	2	1	1	4
Upper Harbour	3	1	0	0	2
Waiheke	6	6	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	6	1	2	1	2
Waitematā	17	4	1	1	11
Whau	9	3	1	0	5

6.9 Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate

Q6A. Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1281	59%	13%	1%	26%
Aotea/Great Barrier	24	58%	0%	0%	42%
Devonport-Takapuna	635	54%	11%	2%	33%
Franklin	425	53%	12%	1%	33%
Henderson-Massey	1156	43%	38%	4%	15%
Hibiscus and Bays	1067	54%	15%	1%	30%
Howick	1137	52%	20%	2%	27%
Kaipātiki	731	50%	13%	2%	35%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	324	50%	18%	4%	29%
Manurewa	394	51%	21%	3%	25%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	604	53%	16%	3%	28%
Ōrākei	736	63%	9%	2%	26%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	332	47%	21%	4%	28%
Papakura	388	53%	18%	1%	28%
Puketāpapa	308	59%	15%	1%	24%
Rodney	742	47%	21%	1%	31%
Upper Harbour	1087	51%	24%	2%	23%
Waiheke	308	47%	6%	1%	46%
Waitākere Ranges	519	44%	38%	3%	15%
Waitematā	750	62%	8%	1%	29%
Whau	611	49%	30%	2%	19%

Note - this table only includes submissions where the local board area in which a submitter resides is known.

Q6A. Feedback from organisations by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	17	10	2	0	5
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	1	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	10	5	1	0	4
Franklin	6	2	0	0	4
Henderson-Massey	11	7	2	1	1
Hibiscus and Bays	7	2	3	0	2
Howick	12	7	1	0	4
Kaipātiki	6	2	0	0	4
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	7	5	0	0	2
Manurewa	7	2	3	0	2
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	8	4	2	0	2
Ōrākei	6	2	0	0	4
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	3	1	0	1	1
Puketāpapa	4	3	0	0	1
Rodney	8	3	2	1	2
Upper Harbour	2	0	0	0	2
Waiheke	6	6	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	7	0	6	1	0
Waitematā	17	7	0	1	9
Whau	9	7	1	0	1