

Local Board
<b>Row Labels</b>
<b>1.1 Q1a Rates increases - Agree with 2.5%</b>
A 2.5% increase will still allow the Auckland Council everything as planned.
Cameras over inter-sections- AT Buses included
Eliminate the 'fat allowance factor' hold people to account
I am concerned that 'rates' are supporting 170 elected representatives - does this include CCO boards. 170 is an excessive number
Improve public transport, extend opening hours of library on Saturday.
Keep at 2.5%
Look internally for more savings within council. There is a lot of wastage within council.
My husband and I are retired so are not wealthy
rates should be kept low and other sources of finance be explored
Reasonable balance between excessively high rates and providing services.
Ripping up roads and kerbing often appears to be an unnecessary task .
The council should trim their costs. The ratepayers see much that looks like waste. Council should also look for other sources of income.
The mayor was elected on the promise of no more than 2.5% increase
You need to lower overheads and unnecessary costs to get
<b>1.2 Q1a Rates increases - Higher rates</b>
3.5%
3.5% more public transport infrastructure.
All available options to ease the housing crisis, namely for first home buyers and those left without homes at all.
Average indicate that some areas will have higher than 2.5%. If it is to be 2.5% it has to be across the boards not the average - I'd be happy with 3.5% if it was across the board
extend the living wage to contract workers on council contracts.
Give you the right to hike, means you'll up the rates even more next year.
I think a small increase would be acceptable if additional funding used to address issues that people care about eg. wages, living housing - affordable rent. Transport - that meets purpose.
Transport improvements, specifically prioritizing buses, bikes and trains. We cannot have everything for free - people like the idea of it, but in the end we need higher rates for a better
<b>1.3 Q1a Rates increases - Lower rates</b>
Auckland transport is the problem. 38% of our rates! Abolish commuter parking in inner city places like Parnell and Mt Eden so these people (comment cut off by scan).
tax rates should be reduced
The present rate is reasonable
The rate increase is higher than the business wages increase this year. Most companies only have 1-2% wages increased for their staff.
<b>1.4 Q1a Rates increases - Not sure</b>
<b>1.5 Q1a Rates increases - Other comment</b>
City council should provide the public with a detailed report to elaborate the future expenditure of the increased rates rather than taking the soaring costs as and excuse to impose higher rates on ratepayers.

I think the rise should be 2% for the houses occupied by one family for about 30 years. if the possession of the house is much shorter than we may assume, apart from unavoidable movements than the rates should be about 4%. I feel this would be a much fairer distribution of rates. I am loss to know what I have gained from the increase of my rates during the last few years. We need to cut out local boards. I am not at all sure they are needed and as someone who has done voluntary work for the good of the community all my life for no financial gain I think these people on the local boards, if they want to serve the community can do it on a voluntary basis. perhaps they could be paid for transport costs and lunch money if needed

**1.6 Q1a Rates increases - No response**

**1.7 Q1b Do more of**

**1.7.1 Q1b Do more of Transport**

accelerate light rail town centre enhancements infrastructure to enhance inner-Auckland development near transport nodes including quality of public space cycleways,

basic infrastructure including transport

Better roading

Bicycle lanes and other safe transport option to encourage physical activity.

Build more cycle and walking infrastructure.

Building and maintaining roads and footpaths

Cycleways, walkways, pedestrian improvements.

faster rail plan implementation airport rail

Funding infrastructure projects like public transport, light rail, cycleways and high quality footpaths so that we can get around the city easier.

Funding transport projects

Improve public transport Improve cycling/active mode transport Improve stormwater infrastructure

Improve roading for private vehicles

Improve transport- buses, trains, ferries so we have good access and use of public transport

Improve transport connections. Increase bus frequency, expand the rail network, find ways to discourage single car use to minimise congestion.

Improved pedestrian, cycling and public transport infrastructure

infrastructure

Infrastructure - roading

Invest in public transport, and good quality cycling infrastructure

Invest in seperated cycle lanes, footpath upgrades, junction improvements to increase safety for all users, and improvements to utility infrastructure.

Make public transport better and cheaper to attract more passengers to improve traffic in Auckland which is terrible.

make the changes needed so that people really do have transport choices (PT, walking, cycling, as well as cars) high quality public spaces that celebrate the city

Meeting growing transport needs.

More cycle-friendly streets. More and better public transport Improve Tamaki Drive for pedestrians and cyclists

More cycleways, train to airport

More cycling and walking infrastructure and recreational facilities.

More investment in transport (more trains, bus lanes)

More public transport and infrastructure.

More tolls for motorways

more train lines

More Transport/bus lanes.

Protection cycleways

Public transport

Public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure
Public transport on dedicated roads/tracks between panmure train station and East Tamaki (Highbrook Business Park)
Public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure
Public transport. I know a rates increase is hard but we need to make a step change!
Public transport; maintenance; gridlocked improvement
train to the airport
Transport improvements, specifically prioritizing buses, bikes and trains. We cannot have everything for free - people like the idea of it, but in the end we need higher rates for a better
Walking/cycling facilities & public transport
Walking/cycling.
Widen residential roads (particularly whilst replacing curbs) in residential stretch where parking allows only one way traffic
<b>1.7.2 Q1b Do more of Water supply/waste water</b>
Improve public transport Improve cycling/active mode transport Improve stormwater infrastructure
<b>1.7.3 Q1b Do more of Parks, community &amp; lifestyle</b>
Community facilities for recreation, culture, learning.
Community facilities, sportfield development
Improve parks and public space.
Library services
More cycling and walking infrastructure and recreational facilities.
More funding for local libraries. Staff cuts and the move away from printed books should be reversed. Library staff provide crucial community services in additional to library services.
placemaking in community centres
Should not cut library staff. Libraries are a vital public amenity that are in constant use, and especially needed by less privileged members of our society.
SW and SS Sports fields
<b>1.7.4 Q1b Do more of Economic &amp; cultural development</b>
More investment in green space development
social housing/homelessness
<b>1.7.5 Q1b Do more of Auckland development</b>
basic infrastructure including transport
Building facilities in growing areas
Council housing
focus on core council functions - make sure development of the city enables good, sustainable growth with open space, good access, and good amenities.
Housing
I think a small increase would be acceptable if additional funding is used to address issues that people care about, wages, living housing - affordable rent. Transport if meets purpose.
increase rates to get on top of the infrastructure shortage. If not borrow more and take a hit on the rating. We need to do something its only holding back economic growth and the future of the city. Holding rates to 2.5% increase with the current infrastructure crisis is irresponsible
infrastructre and services in poorer areas
infrastructure
Infrastructure and public housing
Infrastructure development
Infrastructure upgrades and repairs for example sewage and wastewater
infrastructure,
Invest in seperated cycle lanes, footpath upgrades, junction improvements to increase safety for all users, and improvements to utility infrastructure.
Meeting growing housing needs.

More accelerated infrastructure across whole city. Without relying on user chargers, levys, etc. But still carry out identified savings of at least #15m
More infrastructure.
Provision of long-term rental housing near town centres/transport hubs.
sustainable mobility plan and urban planning need more investment to catch up with other cities around the world.
<b>1.7.6 Q1b Do more of Environmental management &amp; regulation</b>
environmental restoration
green urban living and minimising plastic and oil
stormwater
<b>1.7.7 Q1b Do more of Governance &amp; support</b>
focus on core council functions - make sure development of the city enables good, sustainable growth with open space, good access, and good amenities.
More commercial research on how to equitably provide services between business and consumers. How these should be paid, Encourage business to spread work hours to reduce
Put more money into libraries
<b>1.7.8 Q1b Do more of Other</b>
Have more specialist doctors available in hospitals in Auckland.
Homelessness Housing for Older Adults. Supporting MoTAT Living Wage (those unhappy on the Minimum Wage should upskill into a higher-paid job)
Improve business services.
Improve housing affordability.
Keeping owners in there homes is important
No. We need ot have a decent plan the government help
reduce pressure on cost of providing core services - focus on effectiveness, not cost
<b>1.8 Q1b Do less of</b>
Auckland Council should reduce number of council cars in the fleet.sometimes 3 different cars with 3 different drivers are in our area at the same time of day. Should have co ordinated trips,maybe use a computer to co ordinate visits
There is likely to be more savings available to Council than \$15M, especially at ATEED. A slight increase in UAGC would cover the difference and be more equitable.
<b>1.8.1 Q1b Do less of Transport</b>
central rail circuit is reason we cant do more, spending too much here.
Council staff to a minimum. Council wages to an 'average' wage. Stop wastage eg spending on street bbq's! Unnecessary roading e.g. St Heliers badly needs footpaths re-doing and overhead cables putting underground, whilst roads are re-done unnecessarily. Less interference in housing issues and more concentration on basic services.
Cyclists
Giving millions to JFC to rip up perfectly good footpaths and gutters. Absolute waste of ratepayers money.
Less footpath upgrades
Less road works where not necessary
No more cycleways.
Public art, public transport, cultural events, tree planting, libraries, tourism promotion
Spend less on local regional parks as sports events generate more traffic and rubbish.
Stop excessive money on new footpath
Wasting money on cycleways on busy streets.
<b>1.8.3 Q1b Do less of Parks, community &amp; lifestyle</b>
Cinemas in the park in eastern suburbs

Council staff to a minimum. Council wages to an 'average' wage. Stop wastage eg spending on street bbq's! Unnecessary roading e.g. St Heliers badly needs footpaths re-doing and overhead cables putting underground, whilst roads are re-done unnecessarily. Less interference in housing issues and more concentration on basic services.
Get out of social housing - that is a central government issue not local Council matter
Major event sponsorship decorations etc, funding bureaucracy top heavy and employee heavy council departments
non-crucial event sponsorship
Parades
Parks - landscaping needed so that it requires less maintenance to keep the running cost down. Environmental - transparency of where the money is going would be good.
Promote events etc through Ateed
Public art, public transport, cultural events, tree planting, libraries, tourism promotion
Spend less on local regional parks as sports events generate more traffic and rubbish
The focus should be on core council services for ratepayers, and not on events, parties, and
Tourism promotion. Let those who's business benefit pay for this.
<b>1.8.4 Q1b Do less of Economic &amp; cultural development</b>
3. Stop the gay pride and ethnic festival stuff - this is not essential service
Abolish ATEED. We do not need to bring events to Auckland when we have no hotels for visitors to stay in
Arts are not a council function.
ATEED, State House Sculptures, Bee Ark
Less of overly fancy artwork, we need heart work
less spent on ATEED
Lower priorities
Promoting Auckland- getting rid of Ateed
Promotion of tourism; events
Providing events and sponsoring parades
Public art, public transport, cultural events, tree planting, libraries, tourism promotion
Slow investment in community facilities, ATEED,
Spend less on attracting visitors as Auckland is already a popular destination and there are already more visitors than can be accommodated
Tourism and events.
<b>1.8.5 Q1b Do less of Auckland development</b>
Allow fire brigades to burn down million dollar homes in spite of a serious housing and homelessness crisis
Building costs - some very, very expensive fancy railings and buildings around. We aren't a rich city, please keep architectural luxury features to an absolute minimum. Arts support - the private sector is thriving, they can fund more of this.
economic development spending
Providing houses
Public art, public transport, cultural events, tree planting, libraries, tourism promotion
<b>1.8.6 Q1b Do less of Environmental management &amp; regulation</b>
Planting natives especially Nikau palms, that just die, an incredible waste of money and looks
<b>1.8.7 Q1b Do less of Governance &amp; support</b>
1. Avoid paying Council employees a living wage
All rate payers should pay the same, council should only do basic service. Cut costs
All you're doing is cutting services ie. inorganic rubbish and cutting staff in libraries.
anti-democratic panels
Ateed
ATEED.

Auckland Council should reduce number of council cars in the fleet.sometimes 3 different cars with 3 different drivers are in our area at the same time of day. Should have co ordinated trips,maybe use a computer to co ordinate visits
Council needs to look at it's own structure, entities such as ATEED need to be subject to independent review. Lack of business focus.
Council staff to a minimum. Council wages to an 'average' wage. Stop wastage eg spending on street bbq's! Unnecessary roading e.g. St Heliers badly needs footpaths re-doing and overhead cables putting underground, whilst roads are re-done unnecessarily. Less interference in housing issues and more concentration on basic services.
Eliminate the expensive salaries of highly paid staff which the council has an abundance of
Employ less staff and consultants.
focus on core competencies- reduce headcount and reduce salarys
Get rid of all the staff in excess of the number employed by the constituent councils
Get rid of useless engineers that authorise extending footpaths halfway across roads then have to cancel them for buses and trucks
Given Auckland lacks housing supply and requires significant investment in mass transit, the solution is a greater proportion of central government funding or effective migration and population growth/relocation. The setting should reflect supply-side economic interventions. Council should cut its own burgeoning costs, improve governance and reduce unnecessary costs. This is imperative, services such as cycleway funding, libraries, pools, should not be cut. All plan outcomes should be monitored for success including streamlining and productivity improvements.
Governance and support needs a thorough review before we can look at other areas that impact on the ratepayers
Governance and support, too many people working for the council yet things don't seem to be handled effectively. Less people, more efficiency needed there
Government spending should be reduced. Discharge inefficient officers and reduce administrative work so as to enhance the efficiency of the council.
Have the council complete a zero based budget exercise.
improve the efficiency of council operations, contract out services to more efficient operators
It's not about doing less, it is about doing more with the rates take using less money. The Council needs to run more like a private entity and have a total focus on how it can achieve more with less. For example, if Auckland Council need to contract consultants for a period of time, the question should be asked, why have our management employees not got the answers. Either get rid of senior managers and don't use consultants, or employ senior managers who can fulfil the remit of their role without having to sub-contract part of their job out to consultants.
Less communications staff and marketing spend. I get so many emails/tweets etc from the council - is it all necessary?
Look to more cost savings within council. too many departments doing non-productive work. too many staff members are paid to much!
Marketing - you are a monopoly, don't waste our money telling us in detailed expensive colour mailouts how helpful you are. ATEED - really don't need this at all and its benefits are minor, leave this to central government.
Non core council activities
non-core activiities
Not sure, less councillors perhaps? Our rates are too high for most ordinary people
Please cut all the costs on non-essential services e.g. ATEED and sponsoring any events. Leave those to the private sectors.
Prioritise the projects/tasks and work out what fits in the available budget. other items get deferred until there are funds
Public art, public transport, cultural events, tree planting, libraries, tourism promotion
Rates have skyrocketed in the last year, we need to first get used to the much higher increase in incremental raises from here on in

Reduce administrative work, for example, the surveys on various projects and approval at various levels, so as to enhance the efficiency of the council.
Reduce ATEED and similar auckland economic development spending.
Reduce costs Staff for Phil Goff vs Ateed & travel costs
Reduce PR and publicity
Reduce staff
Social work should be left to the government
Spending money. Review your costs. Review the providers you use, Save.
squandering ratepayers funds on over inflated salaries and bungling bureaucracy which is rife.
staff costs, wasting money on non core council activities. council should do roads, water, sewerage, parks, museums, libraries. housing, marares, some fancy art piece, these are not council responsibilities.
Stick to the core services: waste, water and roads. Lower rates.
Stop alcoholism any way, shape or form you can! That means less alcohol licences
Streamline council
Trim council staff numbers
We have a 40% uplift in rates over the last 5 years, time to cut back , it's an enormous and noticeable cost each month now.
<b>1.8.8 Q1b Do less of Other</b>
A more focussed approach is needed with the nice to do options eliminated our pared back
Civic events and the council itself. Focus on getting the basic needs of the city met before you throw parties, festivals, parades etc. Focus on essentials such as excellent refuse collection, parks, swimming pools, homeless people, transport, facilities.
Cut down on local board members - employ professionals on local boards.
cut fringe activities and focus on govt responsibilities
don't waste money on pamphlets that just get thrown in the bin
employment promotion
Firstly, get rid of bloated staff. The super city was supposed to be less costly yet staff has increase by several thousand. Now a living wage is suggested. Great, spending the hard earned money and savings of others. Mr Goff was supposed to be a reformer. His 30 years plus at the public trough has conditioned him to spending other peoples money
I don't think it is a case or doing less, but saving more and making more efficiencies. I do it in my business, and so I am not sure why you could not do it in yours.
I just need basic services from the council.
I object to the wording of this question. You should keep rates to 2% as was promised by the mayor and many of the Councillors in their election campaigns and do more with funding provided by eliminating the waste in current Council expenditure.
Introduce a "Point of Sale" fee on property transactions, paid by all parties - the buyer(45%), the seller(50%) and the real estate company(5%) - set at a percentage of the purchase price - say 3%. Apply this to all transactions, including residential and commercial. Use the new revenue to avoid rate increases and to pay for infrastructure investment required to support growth.
Leisure/non-essential things
Less printed communication, less on marketing/ publication costs for a start.
Lower value policy and monitoring
More targeted rates towards funding services which benefit business, let business pay- user pays
My rates have gone up over 100% over the last 10 years and I have received no extra service.
No more as my rates have increased 10% and 11% over past 3 years
Nothing. We should raise the difference via accommodation providers
Observe the waste of time energy and materials and reduce that wastage
Stop panicking about the 130,000 coming in to Auckland every three years. Accommodation can't be that unaffordable if that many people are coming here.

Sustainability
the rate is high enough and another 2.5% is not affordable.
Try to do more with less. There is a greater population in Auckland now compared to 10-15 years ago, the fixed overheads are spread across more fiely with the per head central dubdgets. Get more private sector sponsors
Un-necessary stuff, such as higher wages rises than the national average for staff, & better control of discretionary expenses.
Wrong question. The recently adopted Auckland Unitary Plan has enabled significant intensification of the existing areas. Properties previously zoned Single House are now sub divisible and therefore more valuable, so from next year we have to pay MUCH higher rates just based on the higher value. That should give the council enough revenue to do what they have planned, even without further increasing the rate percentage.
<b>17.1 Q6 OR Local priorities</b>
Local boards should be funded on a percentage of rate income taken from that boards area
<b>17.1.1 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Priorities - yes</b>
: Future planning has also got to take into consideration the massive increase in the numbers of people using the beaches in the area. As the population increases so have the visitor numbers and the problems with traffic and rubbish.
Completely agree with the prioities regarding the Orakei Spine. Need to make sure that when stage 2 is built that the addition of a feeder from Gowing Drive is easily able to be carried out, after its completion, if an exact location for the feeder has not been determined in time.
Consideration how to support local businesses- St Helliens is at risk of becoming another Mission
Enhance efficiency, reduce cost.
especially like Gouing drive purchase.
I absolutely think that the funding of a link to the Orakei Shared Path should be a priority - the link between Gowing Drive and the local schools for the safety of our children is paramount. Getting cars off St Johns Rd and allowing kids a safe trip to school should be important to the local board and maximise the use of a shared path.
I am very supportive or development of the Orakei Spine shared path.
I think people in this area have pretty much given up expecting the main Council to listen, the local Board do a good job and work hard on our behalf.
I think that the importance of feeder routes into the Orakei spine through Gowing Drive is of major importance and massively impacts on the useability of the route. I very strongly suggest that funding is allocated to maximise the use of this fantastic asset and allow kids to cross the valley to
Looking forward to progress on the Orakei Spine through the Pourewa Valley
Money spent on the links to the new cycle path will give great returns in the future - well done!
More emphasis needs to be given to Remuera e.g. the flooding issues in lower Portland Rd need to be addressed and resolved.
Outstanding work by local board.
Prioritizing the links into the GI to Tamaki drive cycleway is important. I believe when we do this, we should also provide a link to the Orakei basin form the Meadowbank end so boaters can access the basin.
Residents will benefit from further investment in the walkways in Orakei.
resolving conflicting use of Tamaki Drive is critical
Shared path links are vital. This benefits most of the local board area for local bicycle transport options and leisure.

<p>The Ellerslie Business Association supports the priorities that the OLB have put forward. We note that the OLB receives only approx 20% of the money raised by rates in funding to return to the local area and that there are many more desirable projects than funds. We support the advocacy the board is prioritizing on funding alternative transport options for suburban connections and the investments being made in local recreation facilities. We also support the board in prioritising local contestable grants to support local initiatives.</p>
<p>The link from Gowing Drive into Glenn Innes - Tamaki Drive shared path needs access along route so kids can get to school easily etc.</p>
<p>Though it would be better to have a higher level of Board funding via a higher overall rates rise so that more can be done at a community level.</p>
<p>We can make this area even more fantastic if we resolve congestion issues by doing much more to encourage people out of their cars. The plans to fund feeder-links to the Orakei Spine (Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive) path are fantastic and get my full support. I particularly support links to Selwyn College and Gowing Drive - these are essential to the shared path being a success. More needs to be done to improve non-car modes in suburban areas, and I hope that the board will lobby AT hard for traffic calming measures and cycle lanes to schools.</p>
<p><b>17.1.10 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Discontinue Winter Splash event- do not support</b></p>
<p>: Why just in Ellerslie only? or why Ellerslie?</p>
<p>Again, local government should not be in the business of entertainment</p>
<p>how is showing movies a council function?</p>
<p>I think movies in parks may have run its course too</p>
<p>It is a luxury expense which shouldn't come from councils</p>
<p>Stop the Winter Splash but don't waste a single \$\$ of ratepayers money another scheme like movies in parks There are plenty of commercial theatres in Auckland - the Council has no place in this sort of entertainment.</p>
<p>The council should stick to essential services</p>
<p>There are enough movie theatres in the area or close to that provide enough content and are under utilised anyway.</p>
<p>There are pretty minimal costs in running this event for those who have supported it for many years and better advertising of it would increase participation. I can't see any reason to cancel it other than concerns about water quality. I would prefer to see the water quality issue confirmed</p>
<p>We need more sport things on the waterfront . Bike racing triathlon running events. Restraunts are taking over mission bay. Restraunts are placing tables on the footpath they need to be removed ant the footpaths given back to pedestrians</p>
<p>Why not do something in a suburb that has no events run by the Board?</p>
<p>Winter splash is essential for Mission Bay; MIP has a low support in this Local Board</p>
<p><b>17.1.11 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Discontinue Winter Splash event- not sure</b></p>
<p>We seem to have enough movies in parks events around the city. I'd like to see money spent small projects that bring communities together.</p>
<p>Why is this a priority of any sort? Auckland City is in collapse and we worry about movies or a winter splash? No wonder we are in the pickle we are.</p>
<p>why?</p>
<p><b>17.1.12 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Discontinue Winter Splash event- comments</b></p>
<p>Movie in the Park would be best served somewhere scenic like Parnell Cricket ground. Understanding parking is an issue but is some what the equivalent to Little Shore Bay.</p>
<p><b>17.1.2 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Priorities - no</b></p>
<p>All of the campaigning I saw from the local board candidates was for rates cuts/freezes. This won't allow us to fund infrastructure that our City needs.</p>

<p>Clean up whakataka beach with self seeded mangroves It is the stage for the dress circle of Auckland It is also the last ugly part of Hobson bay to be completed</p>
<p>Cut down on number of local board members. Employ professionals with KPI's and a recruitment process including reference criminal and credit checks.</p>
<p>I disagree with the board who complain all the time about their rates not being spent in their area- what is wrong with giving a bit to help others out instead of spending on useless things like the sculpture at Orakei basin which detracts from the natural environment.</p>
<p>I think it was a huge waste of money widening the footpath in Mission Bay. There are plans to completely redevelop that precinct and this work will end up being ripped up. BTW the tiling should never have been a light colour in a food and beverage area. It always looks dirty now.</p>
<p>It seems you are offering extremely little by way of what you are doing in the Orakei area where this is the area which, I would argue, provides Council with the lion's share of income via rates. It is also an area which attracts thousands of visitors for events held on our waterfront. I live in Mission Bay and the only priority listed for my local area is to cancel an event which has been held annually for years. I am guessing the reason being that the water quality in our bay is of such poor quality in winter that you fear making the Winter Splash participants sick. My suggestion is that you add making a plan for Tamaki Drive and improving the water quality in Mission Bay a</p>
<p>Leave Chamberlain park as it is. Have been playing there since 1970, leave Western Springs as it is, it's been there over 70 years.</p>
<p>Orakei rates contribute greater than most other areas, yet very little is being done for this area.</p>
<p>Scrap local boards and CCOs</p>
<p>Support for things such as sports fields improvements are well funded but support for local people in particular library staff is poorly supported. Library staff provide important community services in addition to library services.</p>
<p>Tamaki Drive is one of only 2 routes between city and suburbs; treating it as a recreational amenity rather than a transport route prioritises everybody else over the residents</p>
<p>When on when are you going to fund underground cables instead of the mess and potential blackouts associated with overhead cables in our area. Millions of dollars of cycle lanes are no problem for you, but antiquated overhead powerlines are.</p>
<p>You are letting far too much housing intensification into this area. The streeys are impassable at night due to off-street parking and commuting is a nightmare at normal commute times.</p>
<p>You need to promote these consultations more actively</p>
<p><b>17.1.3 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Priorities - partial</b></p>
<p>A "don't know" would have been a more honest answer but it is not available. Infrastructure - especially transport - has reached collapse point in Auckland city. There needs to be urgent attention to the big issues. Congestion tolling. Removing early bird parking. Incentivising employers to shift the working day. Major investment in Park and Rides. (Albany is a joke) More</p>
<p>Agree with Colin Maiden Park, partly agree on spine path but need more info</p>
<p>All of the listed items are good, but please invite Orakei residents to add new items. My suggestions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add NEW community-purposes facilities in line with population growth by converting land allocated for sale via Panuku Development back into Local Board control for lease to community groups. Measure and report both population growth and community-purpose land allocation growth to residents.</li> <li>2. Open a design and consultation process for a new elevated transport system along Tamaki</li> </ol>

An urgency for a link (by purchasing a property) to the Oeraki cycle pedestrian way . Which will be a white elephant unless access can be gained from the South Side of the railway line and the huge catchment area of Meadowbank and St Johns Park . Also the speed at which these projects in PEDESTRIAN .I cant believe it took a year to complete the StJohns rd to Glenn Innes pathway . The number of times i saw workers sitting on their bums doing nothing.
As a resident of Glendowie, I would like to see a percentage of our rates going back into the area.
As usual no allowance made for providing any form of a community centre for Remuera who is the cash cow for Auckland but has no community centre and only a dilapidated CAB building that Panuku are wanting to sell to a developer and the suburb will get no benefit
Continued and further focus on Tamaki drive in addition to the GI-town link
Could also do with improvements to the bathrooms in waiatarua reserve
Cycle paths = agree. Intensification = disagree The use of parks for housing (e.g. Pt England) = VERY strongly disagree. We need more parks not less.
Don't know what the priorities are.
Focus on Parks and reserves
Haven't had enough time to think about it. This is the first time I have seen a list of LB priorities.
How does the council intend to reduce its massive debt. Auckland's failing infrastructure should be a priority, not building new facilities.
I think the cycleway is a top priority but I also think that the board should consider a budget for small community grants for street parties and the like as done by other boards.
I'm not enthusiastic about spending on things like movies in the parks. Stick to core business
I'm sick of the bullshit from the previous council. I'm not sure yet a lot has changed. Here's hoping and I guess time will tell
Local boards should be funded on a percentage of rate income taken from that boards area
Make venue hire charges in Orakei affordable. Discontinue Pt England housing proposed development. please have kerbing swept more often of Sand along Tamaki Drive.
More focus on supporting and improving public transport.
More money for infrastructure. This is a priority along with transport.
Need a ramp or lift for equal access for those with disabilities and prams at the Orakei park and
No need to spend money buying a house to provide a feeder link.
Orakei provides council with much higher rate income. Council should provide a better service. The uniform portion of rates should be raised and reduce the burden on higher ratepayers
Please advocate to AT to implement calming devices on Meadowbank Rd, it's a very busy road where cars drive excessively fast. Support local businesses associations to improve the appeal of the Mission Bay, Kohi and St Heliers area. It's such a lovely area but food establishments are so poor... The toilets on Kohi beach could do with an upgrade. Great work on widening the path on Mission Bay. Would be good to see more of this.
Selwyn railway Station needed, Park n Rides, leave Quay St for motorists travelling to work, obsession with cycling yet traffic lights poorly sequenced.
AT seems to be overstaffed with so much promotion of cycling and walking and traffic safety.
Support cycleway priorities. Make Orakei Basin and Waiatarua all weather walking tracks - not currently funded. Support tree/park initiatives. Need more council/Auckland transport coordination e.g. congestion roading/bus/train services.
The board doesn't seem to have any teeth - the approval for the commercial development above the Post Office etc in Remuera Rd/Victoria Ave completely ran roughshod over the expressed concerns of the rate Payers association.
Toilet at Upland RD Park. w

<p>Unfortunately, I'm seeing how graffiti is taking over parts of the CBD and Orakei. We're not doing enough to keep our city clean and beautiful. I don't know if you cut on funding for the graffiti teams but you can tell the difference this year from last.</p> <p>I hope you're using the money to properly fund this teams or even increment their budget, because we can't afford to have a messy city and suburbs.</p> <p>We also need to think proactively and start funding programs to keep kids/teenagers/adults away from this litter/graffiti activities.</p>
<p>We need more outdoor and park areas. With infil and intensification, which I agree with, we need to offset that with open spaces for people. Parks, playgrounds, fields etc. well done on the Badley Ave playground. Need to do more around the community.</p>
<p>Why should the Orakei local board be involved with the winter splash event?</p> <p>Orakei local board should be pushing for major improvements on the outflow into the Waitemata Harbour, as well as pushing for more work on the separation of separate and storm water!!! The Orakei system is ancient and cannot cope with the extra volumes of outflow caused by the huge increases of the population here!!!</p>
<p>Would like to see more investment back into community services. The Unitary Plan is putting pressure on central suburbs, &amp; with an increased ratepayer base more funding needs to be put into community services such as libraries, CABs, community placemaking. The Orakei area pays a disproportionate share of the rates for the city and not enough is invested back into</p>
<p>Would like to see swimming pool at Michaels Ave and a library in Ellerslie. Lessening of congestion on Marua Rd and Ladies Mile. At moment, re-doing footpaths but not widening Marua Rd at Ladies Mile end, which seems a lost opportunity especially as Stone field traffic is</p>
<p>You should not be undertaking additional priorities to what was already planned</p>
<p><b>17.1.4 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Priorities - other comments</b></p>
<p>Hard to say as no comparison or participation in prioritisation possible</p>
<p>Keep the issues/ solutions simple and clear.</p> <p>Keep the public/local taxpayers informed in a nice, respectable way</p> <p>Do keep passible future plans in mind</p>
<p>more consideration to cycleways- even if allowed on footpaths</p>
<p>Return more ratepayer taxes to Orakei Ward in order for the board to be able to do more for the community.</p>
<p>Roads are funded by road user charges, Cycleway are not funded in this way so why should ratepayers fund them?</p>
<p>The local board needs to have more of a profile and engage the community more.</p>
<p><b>17.1.5 Q6 OR Local priorities OR End subsidisation for community groups- support</b></p>
<p>All groups should be treated equally</p>
<p>As long as the grants are big enough.</p>
<p>Council should not subsidise anything like this.</p>
<p>Don't see need for Orakei based groups to be sheltered from increases in venue charges. If they are struggling, then they go through the grants round.</p>
<p>fairness</p>
<p>Keep it fair and open.</p>
<p>Stop their freeloading.</p>
<p>This seems trivial and irrelevant, and I would expect the Orakei Local Board to be working on more important things like the unitary plan, density, height and view controls, local developments, town centres, parks, libraries, mowing berms, ...</p>
<p>Well the statement of what you have done is not clear. But I support more user pays.</p>
<p><b>17.1.6 Q6 OR Local priorities OR End subsidisation for community groups- do not support</b></p>
<p>community grants are limited, this will create hardship for smaller groups</p>

Everyone has had such huge rates increases, surely venue hire fees can remain cheap in recognition of the volunteer work people do at these meetings.
It is OK if the venues are suitable for purpose. However until the likes of CAB are provided with suitable facilities (for both employees and clients) then the subsidies should remain where
Keep it as it is. It is working well, so why change it?
Not sure which ones were subsidised but think it can be appropriate in some cases to help some groups
Small community groups have already been hit by removal of govt funding. Don't pick on the small fries. Community groups serve a wider group of people and play a very important role in peoples lives. Reduce budget from Orakei feeder spine.
<b>17.1.7 Q6 OR Local priorities OR End subsidisation for community groups- not sure</b>
As long as none of these groups are forced to close because of the increases
Can the Community groups afford to swallow the increase? Have you asked them? If not, you need to make sure that the community grants program is easily applied for to support local community initiatives.
In principle this sounds fine, but some groups have hugely more resources than others and will grant scheme be sufficient?
should local events and local venues be for locals? Not sure that St.Heliers is being used by locals and the pressure put onto our community for round the bays etc. seems unnecessarily high as it disrupts our whole community several times a year. I guess we all use Mt Smart stadium and Eden Park but maybe the funding model is different - maybe we need government assistance too.
Small community initiatives will suffer as a consequence of this change and many do not have the resources to be administering funding applications etc.. flexibility to assess on case by case basis and according to the council vision for supporting community priorities.
The EBA understands the the Ellerslie Theatre is one of the groups that receives support from the OLB and a venue hire subsidy. The Ellerslie Theatre is a great asset to Ellerslie and brings the arts, culture and local community involvement to Ellerslie. The Theatre also supports and works with other community groups such as Probus and ourselves as event support. We note the push to increase charges for venue hire is as a revenue raising initiative by Council as a whole. The hall is now rented out by private citizens who often leave it in a terrible state and cause damage and increased costs for council in terms of repairs, maintenance and clean up costs. It is often the Theatre who deal with the damage and report the issues. We feel greater savings and therefore great earning for the venue could be made if the hall was only available to rent for community public activities or community groups rather than 21st birthday parties and other private events. If the board wishes to change this level of support plenty of time needs to be given for the Theatre
<b>17.1.8 Q6 OR Local priorities OR End subsidisation for community groups- comments</b>
This is not enough infor for me to make an informed decision (I'd like to know on what basis have these groups been subsidised), but in general I would support maintaining subsidies to community groups in need
<b>17.1.9 Q6 OR Local priorities OR Discontinue Winter Splash event- support</b>
Could the money be better spent on something other than additional movies in Ellerslie?
Focus money on community priorities and engagement
Good idea to stop Winter Splash no one wants to swim in the middle of winter it is a waste of time. Movies in the Park another waste of time. Movies are watched on Netflix and Lightbox, how 70s, waste of money and time.
Good idea. Please support an original, artistic, creative and inspiring movie programme! Very hard to see alternative/independent movies in Auckland!
It has been poorly supported in the past few years
I've lived in St Heliers for many years and can't say that I have attended this event.
No really a core event - quite right to scrap

Support ending Winter Splash, but need to find better use of money than movies in the park.
When an event ceases to be popular, it isn't needed. Unless there is some other reason for this why the justification
Winter Splash has done its dash I think. Spend the money on something that Aucklanders need
Yes please. I think people are more likely to go to movies in parks event in Ellerslie than having a winter splash and get sick.
<b>17.10 OR Local governance &amp; support</b>
All of the campaigning I saw from the local board candidates was for rates cuts/freezes. This won't allow us to fund infrastructure that our City needs.
From a local board meeting it seemed that Orakei wasn't getting services according to its
I think budgets and funding needs to be capped. Stop planning on increased rates As housing intensifies there are more rates and rateable properties anyway
I think people in this area have pretty much given up expecting the main Council to listen, the local Board do a good job and work hard on our behalf.
Movies in the park are run in the evenings when our young family cannot attend. I thin kthere are better events that you could run that everyone can enjoy
Take on board feedback and take all circumstances into account. Show us how work output is improving and make big business keep honest by delivering what they promise.
The Ellerslie Business Association supports the priorities that the OLB have put forward. We note that the OLB receives only approx 20% of the money raised by rates in funding to return to the local area and that there are many more desirable projects than funds. We support the advocacy the board is prioritizing on funding alternative transport options for suburban connections and the investments being made in local recreation facilities. We also support the board in prioritising local contestable grants to support local initiatives.
The local board needs to have more of a profile and engage the community more.
We are impressed with the local boards direction
<b>17.11 OR Other comment</b>
As I have no idea what the existing projects are I cant comment other than it appears nothing is being spent in the St Heliers area
Fix clock at Mission Bay
Greater recognition of benefits for all Aucklanders provided by Orakei e.g. Tamaki Waterfront and beaches
I would support buying a property on Gowing Drive or getting an easement on a currently property for a walkway. Could we not buy a property and still have some form of housing on it so that the cost is not too expensive?
Some key signage in the Orakei region urgently needs upgrading, particularly the sign at the bottom of Bastion Point/ Takaparawhau and the one on the point Kelly Tartlon's
The toilets on Kohi beach could do with an upgrade. Great work on widening the path on Mission Bay. Would be good to see more of this.
<b>17.12 OR update email</b>
Tamaki drive @ Ngapipi needs looking at as road has slumped and gets inundated at high tides; some simple measures would fix this such as raising the seawall on the affected stretch.
The Ellerslie Business Association supports the targeted rates proposed for BIDs in the Auckland Council budget.
<b>17.2 Q6 OR What we plan to do</b>
<b>17.2.1 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Feeder-links to Orakei Spine- support</b>

An urgency for a link (by purchasing a property) to the Oeraki cycle pedestrian way . Which will be a white elephant unless access can be gained from the South Side of the railway line and the huge catchment area of Meadowbank and St Johns Park . Also the speed at which these projects in PEDESTRIAN .I cant believe it took a year to complete the StJohns rd to Glenn Innes pathway . The number of times i saw workers sitting on their bums doing nothing.
Believe the connection of the Orakei Spine to Gowing Drive is crucial and would allow vastly improved access to the schools - St Thomas' and Selwyn. Both my children will go to St Thomas' and currently can't easily get to school and across/along major roads. I think this access point would enable them to travel to school without drop off and help relieve school traffic from around
Completely agree with the priorities regarding the Orakei Spine. Need to make sure that when stage 2 is built that the addition of a feeder from Gowing Drive is easily able to be carried out, after its completion, if an exact location for the feeder has not been determined in time.
I am very supportive of development of the Orakei Spine shared path.
I think that the importance of feeder routes into the Orakei spine through Gowing Drive is of major importance and massively impacts on the useability of the route. I very strongly suggest that funding is allocated to maximise the use of this fantastic asset and allow kids to cross the valley to
Shared path links are vital. This benefits most of the local board area for local bicycle transport options and leisure.
Strong support adding the additional links to the Orakei Spine of the Tamaki Drive shared path. Making it easier for students to get from Meadowbank to Selwyn / St Thomas's is critical
We can make this area even more fantastic if we resolve congestion issues by doing much more to encourage people out of their cars. The plans to fund feeder-links to the Orakei Spine (Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive) path are fantastic and get my full support. I particularly support links to Selwyn College and Gowing Drive - these are essential to the shared path being a success. More needs to be done to improve non-car modes in suburban areas, and I hope that the board will lobby AT hard for traffic calming measures and cycle lanes to schools.
<b>17.2.13 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Colin Maiden Masterplan- support</b>
<b>17.2.16 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Standardise venue hire charges- support</b>
Make venue hire charges in orakei affordable.
<b>17.2.18 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Standardise venue hire charges- comments</b>
The EBA understands the the Ellerslie Theatre is one of the groups that receives support from the OLB and a venue hire subsidy. The Ellerslie Theatre is a great asset to Ellerslie and brings the arts, culture and local community involvement to Ellerslie. The Theatre also supports and works with other community groups such as Probus and ourselves as event support. We note the push to increase charges for venue hire is as a revenue raising initiative by Council as a whole. The hall is now rented out by private citizens who often leave it in a terrible state and cause damage and increased costs for council in terms of repairs, maintenance and clean up costs. It is often the Theatre who deal with the damage and report the issues. We feel greater savings and therefore great earning for the venue could be made if the hall was only available to rent for community public activities or community groups rather than 21st birthday parties and other private events. If the board wishes to change this level of support plenty of time needs to be given for the Theatre
<b>17.2.2 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Feeder-links to Orakei Spine- do not support</b>
<b>17.2.3 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Feeder-links to Orakei Spine- comments</b>
Not sure how the Orakei Spine will work and do we need to purchase a property in Gowing Drive?
<b>support</b>
<b>17.2.5 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Changing rooms at Michaels Avenue Reserve- do not support</b>
Should develop a modern new playground in the area
<b>17.2.7 Q6 OR What we plan to do OR Eco improvements programme- support</b>

<b>17.3 OR Local libraries</b>
library/ community centre for Ellerslie
Support for things such as sports fields improvements are well funded but support for local people in particular library staff is poorly supported. Library staff provide important community services in addition to library services.
<b>17.4 OR Local community services</b>
All of the listed items are good, but please invite Orakei residents to add new items. My suggestions are:
1. Add NEW community-purposes facilities in line with population growth by converting land allocated for sale via Panuku Development back into Local Board control for lease to community
Mission bay and Koh beach changing rooms need an upgrade
More funds for community facility development- particularly in the Remuera suburb/ shopping area
movies in parks in Mission Bay would be great
Provide more support by providing community programmes. What about an even in Stonefield - there is hardly any community event or facility here
Put in some security cameras at the Meadowbank Train Station so our cars and cycles don't get vandalised
The EBA understands the the Ellerslie Theatre is one of the groups that receives support from the OLB and a venue hire subsidy. The Ellerslie Theatre is a great asset to Ellerslie and brings the arts, culture and local community involvement to Ellerslie. The Theatre also supports and works with other community groups such as Probus and ourselves as event support. We note the push to increase charges for venue hire is as a revenue raising initiative by Council as a whole. The hall is now rented out by private citizens who often leave it in a terrible state and cause damage and increased costs for council in terms of repairs, maintenance and clean up costs. It is often the Theatre who deal with the damage and report the issues. We feel greater savings and therefore great earning for the venue could be made if the hall was only available to rent for community public activities or community groups rather than 21st birthday parties and other private events. If the board wishes to change this level of support plenty of time needs to be given for the Theatre
Use community services more - support them where they are making a difference.
Would like to see more investment back into community services. The Unitary Plan is putting pressure on central suburbs, & with an increased ratepayer base more funding needs to be put into community services such as libraries, CABs, community placemaking. The Orakei area pays a disproportionate share of the rates for the city and not enough is invested back into
<b>17.5 OR Local parks, sport &amp; recreation</b>
access on the East side of the Orakei Basin to the water I have seen many kayakers and paddle boarders but they have to drive all the way around through Remuera to the west side boat launch . A small jetty or gate would be amazing !
Clean up whakataka beach with self seeded mangroves It is the stage for the dress circle of Auckland It is also the last ugly part of Hobson bay to be completed
Focus on Parks and reserves
I don't support the Stonefields Heritage trail, it seems a huge amount of money for a not very scenic or historic walk. There are already walks around the ponds in Stonefields and Colin Maiden park adjacent. This money would be better prioritized elsewhere on spaces such as town centres
Increase number of green spcaes
Mt Hobson management is poor- more capital and revenue funding required
Not happy with the planned development of a local park.
Other parts of the board area have had major playground enhancements, but Tahapa Reserve West looks like a wasteland. This needs something great- mix of play and exercise equipment as it will be right on the new track up Pourewa Valley
Provide fitness centres and facilities for the growing older population living in the local area.
Should develop a modern, new playground for children in the area.

Support tree/park initiatives.
The link from Gowing Drive into Glenn Innes - Tamaki Drive shared path needs access along route so kids can get to school easily etc.
The priorities appear to be only sports-related and the GI-Tamaki Drive spine, but what about the rest of the Board area, and everything other than sport?
We need more outdoor and park areas. With infill and intensification, which I agree with, we need to offset that with open spaces for people. Parks, playgrounds, fields etc. well done on the Badley Ave playground. Need to do more around the community.
<b>17.6 OR Local arts, culture &amp; events</b>
Cultural events are really important for the city and bringing others in.
Good idea. Please support an original, artistic, creative and inspiring movie programme! Very hard to see alternative/independent movies in Auckland!
I also feel events such as the fairy parade and Santa parade could use more funding so they could become all day events with stalls, rides and interactive events for children etc. They are already good events for the community but they could be much better with more support from
<b>17.7 OR Local economic development</b>
Support local businesses associations to improve the appeal of the Mission Bay, Kohi and St Heliers area. It's such a lovely area but food establishments are so poor...
<b>17.8 OR Local planning</b>
Discontinue Pt England housing proposed development. please have kerbing swept more often of Sand along tamaki drive.
Doesn't seem much in plan/proposal for work in Remuera area - where much of rates payments comes from. Path to Tamaki drive should prioritise link from Orakei station to Tamaki drive, rather than leave this until last
Enhance Meadowbank Town Centre- slow traffic, make it better connected with itself. Absolutely right about other investment to make the most of that new track enhancing access and linkages.
Hobson Bay redevelopment - no real progress. In the short term, completion of Hobson Bay
I absolutely think that the funding of a link to the Orakei Shared Path should be a priority - the link between Gowing Drive and the local schools for the safety of our children is paramount. Getting cars off St Johns Rd and allowing kids a safe trip to school should be important to the local board and maximise the use of a shared path.
I think it was a huge waste of money widening the footpath in Mission Bay. There are plans to completely redevelop that precinct and this work will end up being ripped up. BTW the tiling should never have been a light colour in a food and beverage area. It always looks dirty now.
i think this council has gone feral. the brand new walkways in the orakei area about to be ripped out because they where not build big enough. no prioritization of rail station at gowing drive no solution to the meadowbank and orakei train station parking problems. social housing and banning cars from parks seam to be priorities. how are you meant to get to the domain if not by car, there is no train or bus service and even then it costs are exorbitant especially when you have to have backup taxi money for when the service is cancelled. one tree hill is going to be the next one to be closed, how do you get to the top, and when this council bans all cars from the
It is crucial to continue the bicycle and walking path along Hobson Bay (beside the train) to intersect with Tamaki Drive. Why is the National MP Simon O'Connor lobbying against this
It is very disappointing to see St.Heliers assets and attractions e.g. beach, village, are looking very run down. The village would like to attract international visitors but is hard to market it
More public toilets in places like Lunn Avenue
Not enjoying seeing so many new houses going in near where I live. Traffic is appalling and congestion is just getting worse.
Orakei local board should be pushing for major improvements on the outflow into the Waitemata Harbour. The Orakei system is ancient and cannot cope with the extra volumes of outflow caused by the huge increases of the population here!!!

Please prioritise links to the Orakei spine so that students from Remuera and Meadowbank attending Selwyn College can have more options for accessing the school by active means ie walking and cycling.
Prioritise funding by rate payer, cancel low priority projects to save fund and transfer to higher priority services
Should be focussing an improved traffic flow rather than cycleways which are primarily recreational. Also parking at the railway stations - lots of vacant level near Glen Innes station.
Spending a huge amount on shared path - what is the usage of the GI to St. Johns Path - cost per
The Colen Innes to Tamaki drive shared path (and feeders) is a great project and should continue to have high priority
Upgrade footpaths, remove overhead power lines
When on when are you going to fund underground cables instead of the mess and potential blackouts associated with overhead cables in our area. Millions of dollars of cycle lanes are no problem for you, but antiquated overhead powerlines are.
Would like to see separated cycleway along the eastern bays (st heilers - remuera) similar to one proposed for Mount Maunganui
You allow more houses to be built but do not provide enough infrastructure to support this. Roads in particular. In Orakei Kepa road is an example. If you are not going to build the Banks motorway, then for Christ sake - make Kepa Road 4 lanes!!!!!! Go on, you know you could! Keeping on sending the traffic along the waterfront is madness and destroys this amenity for so
<b>17.9 OR Local environmental management</b>
Better management of the environment inch: Mt Hobson, Orakei Basin and with other boards, the quality of swimming water in the Waitemata harbour.  Water problems in area not being addressed by Watercare. Before intensification takes place the drainage infrastructure must be upgraded.  Overflows into the harbour not acceptable.
I know nothing about any of this. What about cleaning up Auckland harbour in the storms recently it was like an open sewer
It seems you are offering extremely little by way of what you are doing in the Orakei area where this is the area which, I would argue, provides Council with the lion's share of income via rates. It is also an area which attracts thousands of visitors for events held on our waterfront. I live in Mission Bay and the only priority listed for my local area is to cancel an event which has been held annually for years. I am guessing the reason being that the water quality in our bay is of such poor quality in winter that you fear making the Winter Splash participants sick. My suggestion is that you add making a plan for Tamaki Drive and improving the water quality in Mission Bay a
More emphasis needs to be given to Remuera e.g. the flooding issues in lower Portland Rd need to be addressed and resolved.
Need to clean up Hobson Bay - kill off the 'everglade swamp'
Orakei local board should be pushing for more work on the separation of separate and storm
Street Trees
Unfortunately, I'm seeing how graffitis are taking over parts of the CBD and Orakei. We're not doing enough to keep our city clean and beautiful. I don't know if you cut on funding for the graffiti teams but you can tell the difference this year from last. I hope you're using the money to properly fund this teams or even increment their budget, because we can't afford to have a messy city and suburbs. We also need to think proactively and start funding programs to keep kids/teenagers/adults away from this litter/graffiti activities.
<b>2.1 Q2 Rating stability - Agree</b>
: Business increases should be higher this year to catch up with the inequity of the previous

: but as long as the businesses are assessed according to their income- less for the corner dairy than the bigger companies.
: Fairer. Both uses services. Not all businesses are flush with monthly.
A rate is really based on the land thereby sharing fairly with th the community
All should pay according to services received.
As business is making all the money, I think that they should pay more to help run the city.
As businesses can claim rates as a tax reduction they should pay much more than residential ratepayers
Both parties should have the same increases
Business ratepayers should pay the same as residential.
Business rates are already excessive and affordable
Businesses are profit generating and should bear a greater burden than salary and wage earners
Businesses benefit as much as residents from Council activities, & should have the same
Businesses can pass on any rates whereas residents can't
Businesses go into business to make money. They could choose to work for others
Businesses should pay pro rata increases to residential owners
Businesses should pay their way as well. Families are struggling.
Businesses use facilities and services especially with the emphasis this days on work/life balance.
But I strongly feel landlords who add extra rooms and structures to their properties have a pecuniary advantage over the normal three bedroom dwelling with a 3 or 4 person family unit. An example is 6 Ripon Crescent that has two dwellings (rented separately) with eight people, 8 cars, 8x sewage, stormwater etc. Yet is rated the same as surrounding properties with 3 BR and 4
Cut down on number of local board members. Employ professionals with KPI's and a recruitment process including reference criminal and credit checks.
Differential must be stable for at least 5 years.
fail to see why businesses should have their rates share reduced over time. They benefit by being able to treat rates as a deduction against income for tax purposes and the ratepayers support them by paying for the goods and services which their businesses provide.
I agree with the idea of stability and working towards a beneficial long term goal.
I disagree with basing rates on the so called value of a home. This makes rates a social tax not a 'fee for service'. Since rates ARE obviously a tax, then why do we pay GST on them? Councils should lobby the Govt seriously to remove the GST. Councils would get their money and rates
I probably agree but really user pays should be the criteria - waste, water, transport, etc. should be taken as far as deeply as possible and then business should be rated as residents.
I think there's insufficient supervision of work that is done and it's being implemented poorly by the workmen you're using, so currently a lot of waste of money. Also the people in charge inspectors and the like don't know what they are doing and are not competent in their areas of so called expertise. Hopeless Starts at the top.
Improvement to infrastructure, roading and amenities, public space etc makes the area more desirable therefore attracts more people which is beneficial on a commercial front for business.
In general I feel businesses should carry a higher rates obligation but increases between residents and businesses should be kept in line.
Minority groups tend to own small private businesses. Therefore the rate increase should reflect actual revenue or profit and raised accordingly
More on business and less on residential
My rates as a former Auckland City ratepayer have gone up enormously to subsidise West and South Auckland ratepayers (with no improvement in services). It's long past time to keep rates
Or business should have a higher increase than residential ratepayers
Residential rates have risen too high. Our home increased 500% over 16 years. Where is the supercity dividend we were to benefit from?
The business community can write it off perhaps not the non business rate payers. It should have been done long ago.
The events organised for the city mainly benefit businesses. Also businesses can claim tax

The rate payer cant keep on subsidising business especially sports and functions. The ratepayer pays and the hotels motels pubs /restraunts get rich.
There could be many cuts in council spending I am sure that would allow a smaller increase. Many times one reads of incredible amounts of money seemingly wasted
There is big business in Auckland and they use services just like the residents of Auckland, but they also use trucks and that puts a load on our roads.
There needs to be equity when the same service is being paid for
This sounds sensible if the business rates have variable income or status such as chartable etc.
use more of council functions, so share
users pay- we all use the same services funded by rates so we should all pay the same rates for these services
We should stop the move to reduce business rates. It is contributing to (perhaps causing) the residential ratepayer backlash against rates rises which starves the Council of adequate funding to deliver the quality city we want. Perhaps in the future, if residents accept the value of properly funding the city, the business/residential split can be revisited.
Why should businesses be made to pay a higher percentage on their rates increase than residential ratepayers. It should be equal.
<b>2.2 Q2 Rating stability - Disagree</b>
As we have no accommodation providers in our BID we do not wish to comment on this proposal.
Business should pay more
Business uses more roads, water and power. Should pay more
Businesses take larger share than residents
For too long businesses have not paid their fair share
<b>2.2.1 Q2 Rating stability - Disagree Q2 Disagree - No reason</b>
<b>2.2.2 Q2 Rating stability - Disagree Q2 Disagree - Business rates are too high</b>
Businesses pay a disproportionately high share of the rates
Have a smaller increase for businesses so their rating comes in line with residential
<b>rates</b>
A lot of businesses are struggling to survive, this would only make it harder.
Be pro business and let free economy thrive. Even in other higher tax countries such as America, they are awaken to lower taxes and loweing costs of doing business.
Businesses should pay less than residential. The people who work and invest in these businesses are paying for council services twice
Council should continue to work towards a reduction in business rates. Small businesses predominate in Auckland and they do not make more use of, or place more demands on, council services like transport and stormwater compared with residents. The present share of rates paid by businesses is currently 2.73 times higher and should be reduced.
If business' rates increase too high they may not be able to stay in business
<b>2.2.4 Q2 Rating stability - Disagree Q2 Disagree - Other</b>
: it's not just the accommodation providers that benefit, shops, restaurants, uber drivers, taxi's etc. all benefit
A tiered structure could be implemented. Larger business, based on revenue, should face the largest increase
Against any rates increase, especially one that is justified on 'parity' with residential increase. No increase is preference
Business should be paying more than residential ratepayer.
business should increase more than residential
Business should pay greater rates share, especially those that benefit from overseas visitors
Business should pay higher increase for funding which benefit them, user-pays, not general rate

Business should pay more
Businesses continue to benefit from a greater population, thus resulting in more throughput of traffic. Residential ratepayers, on the other hand, see their services deteriorate whilst paying more. Businesses should continue to pay proportionately more rates than residential rates until such time that Auckland's population growth stagnates.
Businesses generally have greater demand on waste etc they should have a larger increase
Businesses need supporting.
Businesses need to pay more for rates as they can pass it on to customers including tourists - residential ratepayers are sick of the burden of Council largesse.
businesses should be higher
Businesses should have a bigger increase than residential
Businesses should have a lower increase as they use less council services. Business to not get rubbish pr recycle services. Businesses are often only occupied for 40-50 hours per weeks
Businesses should have a higher increase. They can claim so many expenses back on their business. Poor old homeowners on a salary have to pay for everything after tax.
Businesses should pay higher rates as they bring in 'outsider' customers that are adding to the wear and tear of the community. They should have the profitability to pay the extra otherwise they shouldn't be in business.
businesses should pay more
Businesses should pay more as they benefit more
Businesses should pay more rates as it is a tax deductible expense
Businesses should pay more, they can claim back the GST and rates re deductible for businesses
Could have an adverse effect on small businesses, which could result their closure. This could potentially result in a decrease in competition between businesses for competitive prices and increase costs for Aucklanders.
Council should follow through with its plans and commitments- plus businesses don't use more additional services that council provides such as sports fields, public transport..etc
I think business rates should rise at a higher percentage as the premises are used to generate
I think businesses have more resources and capacity to adsorb the increasae than your average household, this would also drive Auckland rents up even higher.
If businesses are paying a disproportionate share of the rates then this should be corrected. After all is it not businesses that pay the wages that fund rates.
Increases should be proportionate
Please treat Business and Residential equally. Businesses should not receive less rates increase.
Rate charges based on the GV is already not fair because the residential GV increased dramatically for the last 10 years. Look at the GV for Commercial properties, they rise reasonably and acceptable by the Business. Don't do extra to favor the business while most of the home owner residents are living on wages!
Rates are a tax deductible expense for businesses. This should be reflected in the rates businesses pay
Rates on businesses should be increased but residential stay the same
The rates for businesses should be higher.
The system should be user pays and charges should reflect that not ability to pay
There should be rate cuts.
Those of us on fixed incomes do not have the ability to generate income, like a business. There is too big a burden on residential ratepayers.
We either think businesses are paying too much or not. The policy is to reduce the differential. This should be maintained.
What council need to be providing is rating stability. Changing plans that have been made is not what businesses need and again shows businesses that council does not deliver on its promises. We don't accept that small business should pay significantly more rates overall as they do not make more use of or place more demand on council services such as transport or stormwater compared to residents. As Auckland Council itself admits, the present share of rates paid by

why?
<b>2.3 Q2 Rating stability - Not sure</b>
Business should not make profit at the expense of the resident. Without any hard facts it is impossible to answer this.
Businesses are struggling particularly retail. I am not sure they can cope with a significant increase. It would be counter productive if some business close
Don't know how you classify private and business. With so many people working from home it seems easier to have one classification.
In order to survive, smaller businesses need promotion - it's the bigger businesses creating greater waste that should pay more.
In principle agree, but concerned on impact on SMEs
Need more information about why businesses pay less and what they would get if their rates
Rate increase should be <1% for both.
The share of rates should depend on the public resources consumed by the individuals rather than the different jobs that individuals do. There should be no difference in rates between employers and employees.
There is no point in cramming more people into Auckland - we do not have the infrastructure to support it and not enough room to do so without wrecking the city still further
This could have an adverse effect a ratepayers in the long term
<b>2.4 Q2 Rating stability - Other option</b>
2.5 average increase is a laugh. We have been paying the capped 10% for years. Get more
Business should pay the same or more. They actually make money from the city whereas residential ratepayers have to be able to afford to live in the city to work. Without workers there will be no businesses.
Businesses should be paying higher rates, in particular property investors. The rate structure should differentiate between residents living in their own home, and owners of multiple properties. People who just happen to live here shouldn't be penalized with rates increases that reflect the ridiculous house prices due to property speculation.
Depends on relative affordability- since most businesses seem to be doing well but many people are not on living wage, increase business rates & give a discount to those who pay living wage. When everyone pays living wage, residential rates can go up a bit.
I think it is unfair that residential property be rated the same as businesses. Businesses can claim back both the GST and the rates. Rental properties are businesses, and should pay rates at the same level as other businesses
increase rate on commercial properties not residential properties
It is unreasonable to generalise the rates on all businesses. More rates should be imposed on larger and profitable businesses while less rates are imposed onto those which are smaller
No increase justified
Once again perhaps we need to look at businesses which have enormous profits, like Fletcher Challenge and rate them higher accordingly. There must be many other examples of such firms.
Residential should get a smaller increase equal to cost of living index only.
zero increase
<b>2.5 Q2 Rating stability - Other comment</b>
There are numerous small businesses around Auckland who may be disadvantaged by this, I like that there are local shops and businesses near to where I live, I would hate to see Auckland be like other cities where big shops and companies are pretty much the only option to consumers.
What kind of businesses? Large businesses should pay more, small businesses should pay the same as ratepayers.
why is \$ collection only the backs of some "Aucklanders" and not all Aucklanders
<b>2.6 Q2 Rating stability - No response</b>

<b>3.1 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Agree</b>
: I travel overseas regularly and there is often a bed or city tax. Despite this not being a tax, rather an increase in rates for hotels, I think the suggested \$6-\$10 a night seems too large. I would expect an increase of about \$3-5 a night.
: It seems reasonable that those that most directly benefit should pay.
: It's the businesses & get benefits of increased tourism, not residents.
: Needs to be a mix. We all benefit. But good to put more on those who benefit most.
A great deal of countries have a bed tax which is not regarded by tourists as onerous
Absolutely. That money should be spent on the people who earn and live in the city. Visitors should pay a tax via hotels.
Accommodation providers are charging top dollar and making big money because hotels are full, and should be contributing to the city in this way. There is no benefit to the ordinary Aucklanders suffers when the city is full of tourists.
Accommodation providers benefit from public money spent on major events and the promotion of those events. They should pay a rate to help fund this so we can continue to have, attract and host world-leading events in our city.
Agree with a hotel rate, but it could be used on better things than funding ATEED. For example, the hotel rate could be used to fund transport improvements around Auckland Airport, RFA facilities and other tourist destinations
and further if not funded by those that benefit, cut ATEED out altogether and save \$20-30million
Auckland is becoming too crowded. More and more people are choosing to leave to avoid the congestion. We should be spending money to make Auckland nice for the people who already live here, and NOT be spending public money encouraging more people to come.
Bad. Tourism is great for the local economy. We should support it as a city, not one tax sector of providers. This is short sighted and can lead to less bed nights and therefore less money on other operators.
Bed tax through government would be a better way rather than targeted rate
Business should pay greater rates share, especially those that benefit from overseas visitors
Community-trust owned organisations should be exempted
Couldn't agree more. Why should rate payers line the pockets of those service providers who benefit from increased tourism!
Council should be far less involved in this - concentrate on the core functions
Cultural events are really important for the city and bringing others in.
Cut down on number of local board members. Employ professionals with KPI's and a recruitment process including reference criminal and credit checks.
Define accommodation providers - do they include Airbnb hosts as well?
Excellent initiative. This is in practice in many overseas cities, & the impact on tourists is minimal.
good idea and added to it what about a small amount-\$1 to save the kiwi at the same time- I hear you groaning but this is our national icon- us Kiwis and the bird is about to be extinct in the wild very soon. More tax on visitors to this country- its that way in other places such as Venice Italy.
Good idea.
Hold to \$20 million
Hotel taxes are common overseas, fair here too.
I see little benefit to residential ratepayers from tourism promotion and major events. If accommodation providers do not wish to pay this, then close these activities down. We are suffering from excessive growth, so why try to encourage more people to come here
In theory this makes sense however concern is the accommodation sector may just pass on these charges, making event again exclusive for the wealthy or demo-graphs who have disposable
It is being used successfully in other cities. This is a great initiative.
It should be easy to collect development levy from tourists.
Let those who's business benefit pay for this.
might need to do it in stages

Must include Air BnB aswell
Not all who use hotels are tourists. Business people need them to help make their income so accommodation should be seen as a business expense.
Only if done with meaningful consultation with tourism stake holder
Other countries do this
Relevant industries who will benefit from the tourism promotion should be responsible for the cost.
Should be across all types of accommodation (not just hotels) and expenditure audited to demonstrate how its being spent
Stick to the core services: waste, water and roads. Lower rates.
The amount og \$6-10 is too much. Maybe \$2 maximum, but need to include all accommodation establishments BBs, Air BnB, Bookabach, Motels & hotels etc.
The Council through Ateed spends far to much on tourism promotion - it is not a core Council
The hotel/motel businesses are able to be flexible with their charges. I do not want my rates subsidising their events that are unprofitable as some have been in the past.
The people that directly benefit should pay a slice.
There is a clear connection between increased tourism/events and benefit to accommodation providers specifically, so I think it makes logical sense to target them with a rate.
There should be a cap on what we spend in this area. I think facilities owned by community trusts should be exempted
They do this in the UK and people still go there
They should pay their way.
this is a drop in the bucket in the 1.5 billion dollar wage bill. what are these staff doing, everything is contracted out, roads, footpaths, parks, everything is contracted out. so what are the 10000
Those who stand to can the most should also proportionally contribute the most. Accommodation and tourism providers are the most obvious qualifiers here.
Totally
Tourism is important to Auckland but there are multiple well funded organisations already promoting these tourism. If these organisations are unwilling to cover this funding then a targeted hotel charge would be a good alternative.
Until residents agree to properly fund through general rates, this is a good option.
User (benefit recipient) pays. We have to do something and Central Govt seem loath to introduce fees and costs that are just standard for travellers all over the world.
User pays
User pays. We have to when we travel to other countries
users pay- also this is common practice overseas and working well in Queenstown
We can achieve that without negative consequences
We should build a model of living that is sustainable without tourism as it won't always exist. Focus on that infrastructure and plan. The tourists are a bonus and the industry that benefits from it should support more of it.
We should target airbnb providers and airbnb themselves - they do not pay a fair share
Why should those of us who live here fund promotions to tourists? Auckland is packed full of enough people already.
Why whould ratepayers pay for hotels motels pubs and restraunts to get rich.
With adjustments at the margin to ensure small operators are not unduly harmed by this targeted rate. It should be commensurate with their ability to absorb. Certainly for large operators in the central business district.
Yes but it should be a uniform national levy and therefore it becomes a central government issue.
Yes I agree with this user-pay approach. Those who are directly involved in tourism e.g. hotels and motels, even Air BnB should pay up, otherwise it is not fair for the rate-payers.
YES YES YES ! Absolutely do this - why has this taken so long to suggest when so many other countries having been doing this so successfully for years?
Yes, let the hoteliers fund promotions and major events as I am not at all happy with paying for advertising for thins I would never go to or enjoy

Yes, tourism promotion to the extent providers are not already paying Council indirectly. Events benefit all.
<b>3.2 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Disagree</b>
Because it will be reflected in the overnight rates which already are too high
DEFINITELY NOT. There's over 2,000 council employees earning over \$100,000 so it's about time this extravagance was addressed. The council also needs to look at the cost of social media. Why are they using this? What are they trying to sell? There's nothing to sell.
No Sure a levy on accomodation is fair , but as a frequent international traveller raccomodation costs in Auckland compared to similar cities around the world are the same. There is a shortage of accomodation in Auckland It is dire and some sort of incentive NOT penalty should be given to companies wanting to build hotels here. ATEED do a superb job but are stymied by accomodation . They should have the same funding for the superb job they do , It is recognised
Not just accommodation gets benefits. Caterers, transport, pubs, restaurants all benefit too. Ratepayers get an event to go to too.
The tourists are our assets, they will know that they are being 'milked' or feel that way. Find alternative means to fund this rather than simply choice 1 (general rates) or 2 (accomodatin). What about a Joint Venture with other countries tourist board? Forming a 'Star Alliance' equivalent whereby citizens from member countries are encouraged to
unfair to target only hotels
<b>3.2.1 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Disagree Q3 Disagree - No reason</b>
<b>3.2.2 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Disagree Q3 Disagree - Expenditure doesn't benefit me</b>
get rid of ATEED, if tourism and major events are important let those who benefit pay for them . ATEED is a waste of money , I never go to the Events . If there is a really major event like World Cup, Common Wealth Games happy for a targeted rate. 2017 Master Games NRL 9's V8 SuperCars absolutely not interested in funding from my rates.
<b>tax</b>
Charge a bed tax - not a targeted rate on accommodation. Provider to pay a bed tax per visitor night - not a special rate on the property so only pays for the visitors who stay
<b>3.2.4 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Disagree Q3 Disagree - Other</b>
1. Local shopping malls, public transportations, restaurants etc., all benefit from the tourism promotion project.
2. General citizens also benefit from visitors through cultural interactions and communications.
3. On the other hand, the rates collected from the accomodation providers will be passed on to the visitors, which will offset the stimulating effects of the tourism promotion program in the end of the day.
A lot of money is spent on tourism and major events. We should be more concerned about the poorest and most unfortunate in society
A per head charge is what is needed to achieve equitable results (cost pass through). Push for legislation change to allow these forms of charges
Accommodation rates are high enough. We are known as an expensive city. This could make it
ATEED are duplicating a number of tourism services that are already being provided by other tourism related organisations. ATEED is out of control and needs to be downsized considerably.
Because it will be reflected in the overnight rates which already are too high
Cut back on this budget - spend far too much

Do we need more tourism? Our facilities are barely coping at times as it is
For Auckland to be an attractive destination, why would you penalise those people wanting to come and visit ? Where does \$27m GO ? Show us what it is spent on. This is just another revenue grab at the expense of our Tourists who are vital to keeping Auckland abuzz and an attractive destination. Every country that has introduced such a tax has ultimately back tracked. This is typical short sighted thinking by local politicians who continue to grab money anyways possible as opposed to cutting the bureaucracy and crap that is spent on projects and that are white elephants I..e tram around Britomart. So before we hand a free gift to all other centres around NZ, who aren't so crazy maybe some hard work and logical thinking about Costs/Revenue would be far more productive than picking easy low hanging fruit that won't sprout again.
I don't think we need more tourists in Auckland, I'd rather that they don't come and pay less tax than they com earned pay more tax. I don't know how effective this promotion is happening either. I've attended some seminars organised by AT and I didn't think that our money was being spent in the right way in terms of tourism, rather than promoting more ppl to come, I'd rather see better services being offered to current tourists, for example, they struggled with transport fee and terrible employment conditions, no amount of promotion is going to fix that.
It sends the wrong signal about Auckland as a place to visit
Its not the councils job to promote Auckland
Just another rort to fund bureaucracy.
Not sure a levy on accommodation is fair, but as a frequent international traveller accommodation costs in Auckland compared to similar cities around the world are the same. There is a shortage of accommodation in Auckland. it is dire and sort some of incentive NOT penalty should be given to companies wanting to build hotels here. ATEED do a superb job but are stymied by accommodation. They should have the same funding for the superb job they do, it is recognised
NZ is an expensive country to travel and spend time. We need to encourage travellers to visit NZ not turn them away by increasing accommodation costs.
Phil's true colours showing through- a tax and spend socialist. What happened to all the savings he was going to make by increased efficiency in council?
Private business can do this
Stop spending the money. Auckland has insufficient number of beds so why spend money to bring even more people?
The council has no business in tourism. It should stick to essential services. No council funds should be targeted specifically on accommodation providers.
The increase should be funded (user pay/business benefit) more widely across business rate payers. Look at the multiple benefiteres. Tourism benefits many more businesses than just accommodation providers. Events benefit residential ratepayers too.
The spend is too high. People know where Auckland is and I fear much of the money is wasted. Also, we have enough tourists and migrants already. Tourism promotion should be a Central Govt
The targeted rate should be imposed not only on accommodation providers but any businesses who would benefit from the investments.
these are not core activities
This is a commercial benefit that should be left to commercial operators - no involvement by
This is a stupid idea -we want to encourage investment in tourism
This is putting pressure on a few some of whom my not be able to continue in business. You are also assuming that tourism is going to stay at a high level. You should then target rate all the tourist attractions as well, reataurants where they eat etc
This is to discriminate against one sector of the tourism dollar , which only receives less than 10% of the tourism spend.
This should be done by central government
To only target formal accommodation establishment is unfair. All establishments should be targeted, including airbnb. Rate to be kept t no more than 10% of nightly rate. Transport/tour operators should also have to pay into this as beneficiaries of the tourism industry.
Too many others benefit financially from tourism activities

tough on business.
We have too much tourism
We need tourism. we shouldn't be penalising this sector
What "major events" are included? Do not agree that accommodation providers should be
When it is intended to increase Freedom camping sites in Auckland which suggests we are providing and encouraging tourists to stay free and the wanting to charge those staying in hotel need to subsidise all of Auckland and ATEED services for tourism is totally flawed I sat through all of the submissions and was surprised that some Councillors and mayor could not understand that the targeted rate on land owners could not be passed on to hotel operators. There are many effective business models around the world including Wellington and Queenstown where all businesses pay something to promote their city. There is excellent examples of governance. To suggest a sector that gets the least visitor spend should pick up 100% of the cost is just not commercial. It is also untrue to suggest Auckland accommodation have been engaged and consulted in a meaningful way on this proposal. It is misguided. As a residential ratepayer and an investor, I have no objection to pay a sensible share of rate that is equitable and is well researched that will have significant governance in place by ratepayers and council. I personally believe that all Councillors need to carefully consider if they have willingly been party to gross
<b>3.3 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Not sure</b>
: Not sure that we need to even be spending this amount on promotion as Auckland is struggling to accommodate those tourists that are already here. Events seem able to proceed without council funding, like the boxing last year. A targeted rate would badly affect the smaller operators who already have their prices influenced by the large online search engines (Trivago and the likes who all take their cut of the price paid and probably manage to avoid NZ tax). I think a general tourist tax, paid at entry would be fairer. This would mean that the cruise ship passengers pay towards NZ infrastructure as well. This of course would then be a government issue.
A tax on anything. Is inhibiting., a burden Does the industry deserve the burden
Can see the advantages but I thought we were also trying to get tourists to see Auckland as a destination as opposed to a place to pass through, or have their last night at before popping on a plane. Increased prices might stop that.
Depending on the event, the type of tourist may differ. This could mean that, for instance, 5* hoteliers may or may not be the winners of a promotion. A % of revenue looks clumsy (as above) but may be the only way to go. Neither am I convinced that this is a role of the city although it is common around the world. A different model required?
Depends surely on what kind of accommodation providers is meant. (small operators with only small-medium incomes might not afford a rates increase for this)
isnt this a central govt issue?
It should be more than accommodation such as Airbnb. camper vans and day trippers exempt. Ideally should be on all accommodation and food providers.
It should target all businesses who profit from tourists
Many Auckland businesses benefit from tourism, not only the accommodation sector. Tourists also use our free recreational facilities, parks, roads etc. Therefore an airport tax on all tourists might be better and easier to administer.
Not sure if this is the best way to do it but if the Government continues to bring immigrants into NZ, most of whom come to Auckland, they should pay for the costs generated. WE ARE ADAMANT about this!
Perhaps we need to be more prudent in our marketing budget and business event attraction - how is this \$20-30 mill spent. Cut down in these areas

<p>The principle seems valid, but the proposed rate will cause accommodation costs to rise for all who use the targeted accommodation. I see no good information on the effect of this increase. Also, the statements being made about the proposed rate by the spokespeople for the accommodation providers suggest that the increase in their rates will be substantial. A substantial increase would make the adjustment process a problem. The answer appears to me to be to start with a smaller new rate and, if it is free of unintended consequences, increase the</p>
<p>Think tourism is important so unsure this the best solution</p>
<p>what about an entry or exit tax at the airport on visitors?</p>
<p>Why just accommodation? What about the actual operators? How would small places compare to large?</p>
<p><b>3.4 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other option</b></p>
<p>The council should neither be funding directly nor indirectly to tourism</p>
<p><b>3.4.11 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other option Q3 Other - Governance</b></p>
<p>Council should have limited input - let the tourism industry i.e beneficiaries fund a lot more themselves. Reduce the number of staff in ATEED they appear to achieve little</p>
<p>I don't see what business it is of council to spend such huge amounts on tourism. We have a govt dept for that</p>
<p><b>3.4.12 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other option Q3 Other - Other</b></p>
<p>Promoters should promote their own events as should tourism businesses</p>
<p>This discussion is more appropriate for the Long Term Plan. It is questionable whether some of ATEED's activities and headcount show a return on investment, and while Auckland is 'full' spending millions to promote it doesn't make sense. Cleaning up the Waitemata Harbour would</p>
<p>You need to stop wasting any money at all on these grandiose promotions, and close down ATEED asap.</p>
<p><b>3.4.3 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other option Q3 Other - Invest less</b></p>
<p>Forget about the Council promoting tourism. It isn't the councils job. The government is doing a good job for tourism and tourism isn't the responsibility of local government.</p>
<p>Stop wasting our money on this, leave it to the businesses that will benefit</p>
<p>Too much money is being spent on promoting tourism. \$2million should be plenty</p>
<p><b>3.4.5 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other option Q3 Other - Targeted rate on business sector</b></p>
<p>Living in Remuera, I fail to see the need to spend on tourism as it has no impact in our area. Tourism promotion should be funded by business as they are the ones that benefit - normal rate payers are left with the added resulting congestion.</p>
<p><b>3.4.7 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other option Q3 Other - Targeted rate on tourism sector</b></p>
<p>In both cases user pay should apply to decrease the burden of rate rises, in order to support such activities, on retired people who have questionable benefits from such activities. Tourists need to pay to enjoy our facilities after all when we are overseas we have to pay for many many activities.</p>
<p><b>3.5 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - Other comment</b></p>
<p>I don't disagree but if you make this cost too high it is passed on to tourist by the providers and Auckland will be too expensive to stay at</p>
<p><b>3.6 Q3 Paying for tourism promotion - No response</b></p>
<p><b>4.1 Q4 Paying for housing infrastructure - Agree</b></p>
<p>Again the developers should pony up for the infrastructure costs for new housing developments and recoup through the price of section sales.</p>
<p>Again, the general public should not be paying for initiatives which help outsiders come here</p>
<p>Agree. Would like to also see additional rates charged on undeveloped land to discourage land banking. Realise it may be difficult to implement but worth looking at</p>

and please make sure that the housing is for those struggling right now with over crowding and no roof over head at all.. this is not investment housing development.
And should include financial penalties for land banking or not developing land
As above, I believe that targeting those in the industry who most benefit from this infrastructure makes logical sense.
As long as those targeted will benefit from the development, not impact those nearby.
Businesses & residents in new housing areas should pay for infrastructure costs associated with the increases population & new housing area.
But pursue option c - lobby and work with central government to develop other tools to better align costs and values
But there must be a caveat that insists developers provide bullet proof infrastructure with regard to stormwater runoff sewage costs and transport links.
COncerned to hear that targeted rates would/could mean a reduction in deveopment contributions. Development contribution should not be watered down.
levy the landowners sitting on empty sections and landlords with empty/unrented houses/.
Cut down on number of local board members. Employ professionals with KPI's and a recruitment process including reference criminal and credit checks.
Danger that it will increase cost of new housing further
Details of proposal need to be addressed
Developers and occupiers of new development need to pay for their impact on existing infrastructure capacity. Ratepayers should only be paying maintenance and capital replacement at end of life, not capacity from developers and new housing impacts.
Developers often make large capital gains on new housing. Applying user pays, they , and the new home owners, should therefore pay for all associated new infrastructure. The current situation means that long term ratepayers in older suburbs get charged again and again.
Established rate paying areas should not be paying for newly developments. Needs to be funded by the new developments
Established suburbs should not have to pay for development
Existing housing does not benefit from new housing developments. Rather them suffer - more crowded street, take over parking on streets. Larger homes means more parking on the roads etc
Fair enough given the large expansion in greenfield areas and the pressures on the rating base for public transport network improvements.
First the water and sewage infrastructure in each ward should be assessed to determine whether any new houses can be added without extra capital cost for water and sewage. These figures should be made public in this booklet and the website. The residents of wards with existing capacity should then vote on whether to accept more housing.
Greenfields development could have an opportunity for innovation - cost council using a combined approach to install services
Growth costs should fall on the those driving demands
Have to stop subsidising expensive sprawl. Also need to look at targeted rates for those benefiting most from major transport investments.
However this is going to price new builds out of the market. Suggest a levy on empty houses be introduced this can also go towards infrastructure.
I agree, as this will help reduce the incentive to sprawl
I agree. Ratepayers from existing dwellings should not have to fund new and/or greenfields developments. More money should come from the developers to help fund the burden of the cost of infrastructure.
I fully support your suggested option. Ratepayers across Auckland should not be expected to help fund residential developments in other words.
I think you should monitor that it does encourage developers to build more houses sooner and that costs are not passed onto home buyers, further increasing housing unaffordability. Target developers, not house buyers and investors

If someone is actively developing properties for profit then they should pay
Infrastructure should be paid by the developers. Our existing water, sewerage and transport systems are not coping, all new developments should be assessed by the burden they put on existing rate-payers.
Land banking should be discouraged. Those investing in homes that are left empty reduces available properties for rent.
Need to have tight control on developers. As someone who has had to suffer the development down the right of way by my house since 2012, it is sad that the developer holds all the cards, and the people suffering from the development have no say
Need to reduce the burden on residential ratepayers - Council has been making them pay over and over for stuff they have already paid for in their own areas. So a targeted rate for infrastructure in new developments is appropriate.
New development/sections should pay larger proportion towards new infrastructure required to support increased housing supply.
New developments add to the pressure on infrastructure. If we can make the cost stick at the developer level rather than the house buyer that would be great.
New developments continue to put stress on their surrounding infrastructure that they were never originally designed to cope with, thus, new developments should pay a proportionate targeted rate towards the cost of improving surrounding infrastructure.
New developments should not be a burden on existing ratepayers or existing infrastructure
only if these targeted rates were also used to update the infrastructure beyond the targeted area, for example the sewage system across the city cannot cope so even in established areas updating is needed.
Onus on AC to show rates gathered are spent on new development
Providing it doesn't negatively affect this area.
Quick and recommended by an expensive and thorough study, would be a shame to ignore that since we bothered to do it.
Seems a fair compromise between the choices.
Social housing should also have families given a home- for 10 years only and then hand it over to another family or pay full rent
Target new housing, new commercial - all new property. Require the developer to pay a targeted fee. In addition, on all property transactions - both new and existing property - require the buyer, seller and real estate firm to pay a "Point of Sale" fee - as in Q1 above. This will channel some of the booming profits into public funds and allow rates to be kept stable, without increases.
Targeted rates make sense as the owners of new properties benefit from the investment in new infrastructure.
The charging on the apartments development should be higher for the development involves a big issue of infrastructure in the City. One day I sat in a car passing the motorways towards Uni, passing by high rises apartments. I saw so much rubbish lying on the slopes of the apartments, I felt so sorry that no matter how much money we put in tourism, there is no compare with the impression of the issues the fast development of the apartments had brought.
The cost for upgrading the infrastructure should be funded by the developers, not existing
The cost of the additional infrastructure for that development should be paid by that development. Happy for it to be paid off over time, with interest, but it should be paid for by the development. If it is for several developments or suburbs, the cost should be shared.
The costs need to be paid by those benefiting / developing / growing Auckland
The people who benefit enormously from land banking and rezoning should contribute all of the costs of new infrastructure for housing developments. It would best be taken as a tax on their capital gains, but a targeted rate is a good second choice.
The preferred option which is to act now to change council's funding policy to allow for growth infrastructure targeted rates so those who benefit from the infrastructure, including those who get the resulting increase in their land values, help to pay for it, rather than the ratepayers across

The unitary plan is making room for a larger population but at the same time is degrading what makes Auckland a nice city to live in. The plan has many flaws including a lack of infrastructure support for the increased population. Targeted developer charges would be a small step in the
There are so many higher costs for existing homeowners - constant rate increases etc - most of us are on relatively low incomes yet perceived as rich because we're not renting
There is no definition of "targeted rates". Central government should be called on to provide more funding for infrastructure.
They should also be targeted at a premium - at the moment the restrictions are non-existent (council allows anything to go through the consent process and without any consideration of traffic/parking for the new entities).
This is similar to the problem of immigrants being able to use the full national & local government infrastructure without any contribution to historic capital cost. However, this is much easier to calculate as a "user pays".
Totally agree for developments & developers to be paying for infrastructure.
User pays
We shouldn't be saddled with subsidising developers.
Without trying to sound like Robin Hood, some of the salary levels at the other end of the scale appear generous. As a public body accountable to ratepayers, perhaps AC could show some leadership in re-balancing pay scales
Yes, agree to have this funded by targeted rates. I feel that rate-payers are paying way too much already.
Yes, parts of Auckland are booming and it is fair to let those new residents pay. And generally speaking, there needs to be more funding mechanisms for those growing areas (keeping in mind, infrastructure is not only limited to roads/pipes, but also things like parks and community facilities)
<b>4.2 Q4 Paying for housing infrastructure - Disagree</b>
Be clear about what infrastructure you mean. This statement does not recognise here are different funding models for different infrastructure and not all is funded through rates
Each new resident pays rates already and that's enough. Council should be encouraging building, not working out how to make it more expensive. It should NOT cost \$75,000 to subdivide your own property either. Rip off!
I disagree because residents of previously single house occupancy areas, whose properties have been made sub-divisible without their input "out of scope", shouldn't be forced to pay targeted rates on top of the already higher rates they are facing. Instead, why don't you impose a Vacant House Levy for those land owners who neither live in their houses nor rent them out.
Increasing the rates on new developments will only increase the profit margin for the developer. Incentives should be provided for developments to occur where there are public transport nodes, or where public transport can be extended to the new development
It is government policy to allow crazy levels of immigration therefore the government should pay all infrastructure charges, not ratepayers
New housing developers, new rates should be self-funding and shortfalls to be paid by developers/government funds.
New housing is unaffordable enough due to decades of stupid metro politician urban limits. The last thing we want to do is make it more unaffordable.
Not sure how this will work. I am a bit worried part of our housing problem is driven by people in the areas that might not have to pay up for it. If the people living in the affluent central areas benefit from investment properties driving up the shortage and housing developments are only funded by a group outside of downtown, it seems the people driving the shortage might not have to pay for the problem they caused. I could have misunderstood the point though.
Reserve contribution costs and developers in place, adjust that if necessary rather than adding
The Council already gets rates from the land and again from when houses are built. No more new rates.

The preferred option would make the additional taxes fall on the buyers of new house (mostly young people) when the current situation is actually everyone's responsibility. Those who have benefited from cheaper housing so far can share the funding for the infrastructure to be built.
The targeted rate might fall unfairly on some ratepayers. It is debatable whether some of these infrastructure improvements will add to property values as they may be viewed as a negative e.g. by choice who wants to live next to the noise and congestion of a major public transport route.
This will discourage new developments and result in fewer houses being built
Too complex to administer this proposal in long term. It may lead to separating ratings for every new subdivision
Why should some pay and not others? This should be central government, not local government
<b>4.3 Q4 Paying for housing infrastructure - Not sure</b>
Because I do not have adequate info to make an informed choice
If a person buys a property who is NOT A NZer, then they should be levied much higher - in fact they should not be allowed to buy our property at all. It is a serious situation when overseas people who do not live here are holding properties that sit empty. THEY MUST BE TAXED heavily if the house is empty. There is already a development contribution on all new houses on new sites.
Development levies have been put into consolidated funds in the past - they should be set aside for drainage, roading and services specifically. Infrastructure should be paid for by the Government if they continue to foist foreign immigrants onto Auckland residents and ratepayers.
I'm not sure what you mean, I believe it should be dealt with the developer not the rate payer
Im not sure who the target is
Logically it's part of the developers costs since they create the demand- tho' this won't help the housing price situation! Is it possible for houses to go "off grid" for water etc in the city, with composting toilets etc? (probably not?)
Not sure why the council should target ratepayers across Auckland for any new housing developments. The developers should pay for the essential services and the cost passed on to
Rates will rise anyway as valuations rise consequent on the provision of infrastructure.
Some overview based on equity needs to be put into this type of thinking if you are going to localise developments like this. More affluent and established suburbs need to contribute to new developments as well as poorer ones.
Spreading the costs of new infrastructure over just the people who benefit from it, if they can be accurately identified, is an improvement over passing the cost to people who cannot benefit and have not benefited from recent new infrastructure. But infrastructure is a long-life, capital investment and recovering its cost must be spread over a substantial part of its life.
Surely everyone benefits from more housing so does that mean you will target everyone anyway?
Those rates are targeted?
we need to get these houses going up by whatever means
We should not destroy Auckland with more residential development
What do developers pay for? They are paying a lot of money to the Council for what?
Who covers those targeted rates
Would need a lot more detail on how the targeted rates are decided and who is in the zone to be targeted - for example many areas would benefit from NOT being a place for new housing so perhaps they should pay more than the area that has it.
Your information is not clear, who is targeted?, the developer? the purchaser?
<b>4.4 Q4 Paying for housing infrastructure - Other option</b>
Not sure targeted rates is the only answer. Agree ratepayers across Auckland may not be the right
Targeted rates should be used by city council.
This discussion is more appropriate for the Long Term Plan.

<p>This is a very large issue which has not been adequately explained in the councils documents. We cannot provide well reasoned feedback as we do not know what the specific rate would be or impact on. This is an issue for the Long Term Plan rather than an annual budget consultation.</p>
<p>This may have a negative affect as it will inevitably increase the cost of new houses that are greatly overpriced.</p>
<p><b>4.5 Q4 Paying for housing infrastructure - Other comment</b></p>
<p>Auckland is full we need to stop building. We are giving up our lifestyle to satisfy people that are not even from Auckland</p>
<p>Does this mean that the land owners who either well or want to develop the land are the one to</p>
<p>It would be better to tax the apportioned increase in land value on the sale of any property over last say 5 years</p>
<p><b>4.6 Q4 Paying for housing infrastructure - No response</b></p>
<p>Better investments do get better returns</p>
<p><b>5.1 Q5 Living wage - Agree</b></p>
<p>: But is this also for the contractors. The council could easily say that they have reached targets for wages by making roles contract and then that worker is no longer a direct employee of the council and does not have to be paid the living wage. This policy would only work if a wage cap policy were also introduced.</p>
<p>: I agree, but would prefer that Auckland Council gives better benefits instead. A flat increase is a crude measure; an 18 year old living with their parents doesn't need the same salary as a 30 year old with kids. I'd rather see you giving benefits like free childcare, free public transport, help with accommodation etc. These are targeted at the people who need help the most which means you</p>
<p>: I think this should be funded by reducing the high salaries paid to senior council staff (only a small percentage reduction or zero annual increases would be required), rather than increasing rates or cutting other budgets.</p>
<p>: I would have thought this was already the case!!!</p>
<p>A living wage is essential for those on lower incomes</p>
<p>Agree coucil should pay a living wage and offset that by a reduction in middle management jobs and a freeze on executive salries</p>
<p>As long as NO increase in any charges, rates</p>
<p>At the same time I would like to see the number of Auckland Council large salaries justified</p>
<p>Auckland is a special case. Accommodation costs are skyrocketing. Schools are struggling to keep teachers because of the cost of living in Auckland. Their is a real issue here about being seen to lead in the gender wage gap reduction.</p>
<p>Auckland is very expensive to live in now. They should be on atleast \$20 an hour</p>
<p>But I also am aware that many employees are overpaid.</p>
<p>But worried that we need to get efficiencies within council as rates keep climbing.</p>
<p>cannot believe anybody can think of paying any less than that</p>
<p>Could also be funded by cutting down on the million dollar plus salaries being paid to some staff for doing very little.</p>
<p>Council staff should not be subsidising my rates</p>
<p>Cut down on number of local board members. Employ professionals with KPI's and a recruitment process including reference criminal and credit checks.</p>
<p>Cut top salaries to even things out</p>
<p>Do from existing wages budget</p>
<p>Hard one... I personally strongly agree with a living wage, but I think it should be a national thing rather than local bodies. Personally I think every citizen should have a basic income.</p>
<p>hopefully this would encourage other companies to follow</p>
<p>I agree but needs to be down in careful stages, not in one sweep. But needs done within 18months - 2years, not 10 years time.</p>

I agree, and cessation of the glossy and wasteful Our Auckland magazine would help pay for it. Most, like mine, get thrown in the recycle bin without being read. If you must provide the information, why not put it on a website and let people know by an insert with the next rates notice they can choose to sign up to get it by email, rather like you do with the People's Panel? I estimate dropping the hard-copy could save say up \$20 per ratepayer, say over \$2m in total per
I think it is great that the City Council is looking after their employees and leading by example.
I think this is essential the council should be at the forefront of demonstrating that people need a wage that allows them a decent quality of life. The living wage should be implemented for council staff and contracted staff.
If you have to increase rates to do it then you should.
Implement immediately. These people need it now and should be a priority.
implement quickly
Library staff who earn less than living wage and would be eligible for a payrise are being made redundant, which puts paid to this ambition. Can we insure workers of the city's contractors are also paid a living wage
MUST BE IN EXISTING BUDGETS. An external review re salaries would be good too. Too many high paid staff is my guess.
Must come out of current wage budget - look at waste reduction
No brainer
No brainer- not just fairness
Less than living wage=need to either steal or get 2 jobs to live = more cars on road going from one job to another, more congestion. Less sleep & free time = overeating & poor diet =more cars on road going to see doctor, more congestion. Also more cost for health budget etc etc....
no just Council
On condition you manager your staff performance, You need to get rid of the poor performers, which means the Council has to run its own employment and will have to get unions to understand this is not their prerogative. I would put up with a few strikes if it achieved this.
On the proviso that the living wage does not apply to executive staff who are very well paid. The living wage must only apply to staff who's salary is below a certain level.
Only agree if there is a general lift on productivity
only fair bit staff numbers are way overboard
Only if the living wage is achieved with the same wage budget - curb number of council staff on wages over \$100,000
Particularly important in Auckland where housing costs are very high.
Please pay a living wage to all, however do NOT do the Walmart thing of paying a living wage and then cut hours because you cannot pay a living wage to all those people. I have worked for council for 20 years and have just now gotten slightly above a living wage.
Poverty is a real issue across the Country, particularly in Auckland. Auckland Council should be leading businesses in paying their employees a decent wage/salary to live off.
Proposing living wage policy should limited to the low-pay staff only. Auckland City already have a big different in wages range, so don't use a universal ratio for all staff.
Ridiculously, council use agencies to supply staff such as call centres even though many have worked full time for years. Take the agency fees away and trim the wastage throughout council and there would be plenty for a living wage.
Savings should come from existing budgets. Cap top salary bands
Should also be extended to employees providing services that have been subcontracted out of
Should be done in stages across three years. Outcome needs to be assessed.
Should be the law for all NZ employers
Staff salaries are part of legitimate Council expenditure. However - do we need so many staff?
Staffing levels should be reviewed at the same time and staff numbers trimmed
Strongly agree, it is essential that council sets a good example for others in the city and supports all its staff.

Suggestion: this (and other expenditures) could be funded from increased income taxes on those who earn far more than needed to live well (since the living wage aims to allow people to not only survive, but to live well). Even a small increase to income taxes on those who earn \$400,000+ per
The living wage is incredibly important and if the Auckland Council, as a local authority can lead this in the region, hopefully others will follow.
The preferred option which is to introduce a living wage for staff of council and the CCOs
This is essential. It will help to kick start a wider move to paying decent wages. It should be achieved wholly or in large part by re-balancing the total payroll to ensure that rises at the top are moderated in order to fund rises at the bottom.
This should be done as soon as possible and if, gradual, start with the most vulnerable workers. The gender inequality when it comes to salary and career opportunities should be a thing of the
This would be great - it would be good to talk about extending to contracted workers aswell.
Though other things might also be helpful such as subsidised childcare for employees. Auckland Council could lead on what all Auckland businesses should be looking at. Also, will this apply to staff such as cleaners who work in council offices but may be employed by a contractor?
Wages & salaries should be frozen and the living wage for lower income people funded from those earning \$100,000 or more
We want them to do a good job
Well done
Why haven't they had a living wage until now?
With the proviso that you do something to reduce the number of employees on over \$100k a year! I hear there are over 1800 now. Bloody outrageous. Ratepayers are sick and tired of all these overpaid bureaucrats and freeloaders and want them trimmed NOW.
Yeah, but what about everyone else that doesn't earn a living wage? I used to be a Teacher Aide - who can afford to live on \$14.75 per hour with limited working hours due to school terms?
Yes- not only morally right thing to do but increasing cost of living will make it hard for council to attract some types of staff
<b>5.2 Q5 Living wage - Disagree</b>
\$2.5million PA, no.
: This "living wage" is another marketing concept
: totally disagree - Council staff already enjoy privileges that others don't and higher wages than the average.
1. Many on the Minimum Wage will be young people without high living costs. 2. Those unhappy on the Minimum Wage should upskill into a higher paid job.
Any savings should be used for other items
Auckland Council has stakes in the property market and thus benefits from property speculation - a massive conflict of interest. So people are faced with rates reflecting inflated house prices, or rents reflecting the same. Now you say that we should help pay for council staff's living costs in a city whose housing bubble you helped create
Council has the ability to offer better life balance through subsidised transport & parking, and also gym membership. The wages for council staff should be based on market rates only
Council is already paying excessive wages to staff who are inefficient and slowing up progress. Get rid of the useless staff-many of which cannot speak English properly and are unable to communicate with businesses or the public.Cut management wages by 50% at least.The management wage bill is a disgrace
Council should pay its staff Auckland market rates for the various skills involved.
Council staff are not a special case and should be treated the same. Staff levels need to be reduced by reducing bureaucracy as the mayor promised to do. Pay should be based on merit.
Council staff is no different from general public and the wages are now above the average. Evaluations of performance and control of cost on human resources should be implemented.
Council's obligation is to provide infrastructure not engage in social engineering of wage levels based on flawed data. There already exists a national, legislated minimum wage.

Cut salaries at the top and trim staffing levels like all businesses have to do then look at lower wage earners. Why is the statement "66% of these staff are females" relevant?
Employees should be paid according to the value of the work they do. Some produce greater results than others doing the same job.
Existing employment legislation is adequate - wage rates determined by skill level required and supply/demand in market place
How could you cap the number of 2200 employees relativity will increase the numbers. Reduce the huge number of grossly overpaid staff.
How is living wage determined? Who marks the decision on formula for same?
However the number of staff should be reduced and signed up as self employed contractors
I can't see how this is going to benefit the services we receive as rate payers. i am also concerned that it will cost much more than expected as supervisors not be impressed at only earning slightly more than their staff, this will then flow on and up through the employment chain. It will also make it much harder for small businesses to attracted good staff and it is small businesses that generate much of the success of Auckland
I earn less than the living wage i cant affordto subsidise this
I think if you're working for the council you would be already paid typical living costs.
I work with mostly vulnerable children with learning disabilities in our local school and would certainly love the living wage but that won't be happening as a Govt employee so would rather see the extra money coming from overpaid people working in the council.
If savings can be made to existing budgets do this and cut rates. If council staff want to earn more they should develop skills and change employers.
If you can have savings from existing budgets, reduce rates
its the government's role to establish a minimum wage
Low wage staff already have access to other (??) and subsidies. It will be too costly to maintain relativity - let the market dictate!
many are overpaid at the council already
Many ratepayers pay their staff a normal wage or earn a normal wage. Council staff should be no different to the ratepayers who support them
My issues with this are several. For one my rates are not an act of charity or a welfare system, I am paying for service. It is the role of central government to provide welfare. My expectation is that this will be a lowest cost service without waste or patronage. It is easy to see this as patronage from Phil Goff for his low income constituency. The living wage is a completely arbitrary amount that has no relation to individual circumstance. It does not reflect that some roles
Nice to spend other peoples money. Refer Wellington where people lost their jobs, is this helping
No need to, we already have a minimum wage policy from the government, why should council staff get more than normal people?
Not before the living wage is offered to essential occupations- police, teachers, health workers
Please send them back if they can't afford the costs.
Put pressure on other employers to follow suit and to the general inflation
Remuneration should reflect role/capability/skills/experience and desired outcomes. Pay for performance as minimum wage already exists and is more targeted and fair!. Living wage not necessary - adds unnecessary compliance.
Roles should be based on skills and the market. By advocating living wages - the flow on effect in the economy as a whole will lead to higher unemployment - less business and forcing people with less skills the opportunity of working. I
Savings from existing budgets can be put to better use. Council is not a social welfare agency with unlimited rate payer funding
Should be a national, not regional, government decision.
Staff are employed, as in any organisation on wages offered. If they do not like then they do not take the job savings within existing buck should be made any how used to reduce rates.
Staff should be paid what they are worth - the living wage is a distortion

Strongly disagree. Where does this stop? What about the council contractors? Do you then start to demand that any contractors get paid a living wage. Pay for the role and skill set. If that demands a higher wage, then pay it, but don't start arbitrarily having a "living wage".
Support the concept but ridiculous to say it can be funded through savings. To say there are savings is not true and misleading to the public
The Council should first reduce staffing levels , which are far too high.
The living wage is wrong - the impact on the targeted employees is minimal as most of the increase will be offset by increases in their tax/reductions in associated benefits. Futhermore, it creates a moral hazard as those on slightly higher wages and higher skills will be disadvantaged because their lower skilled colleagues will have their wages artificially inflated.
There are other ways to motivate staff so the turnover isn't great. Private sectors cant afford to pay living wage. Who sets the living wage. If you can guarantee 100% that you will find within existing budget great but why not look at doing this across all budgets so that rate increases
There is a minimum wage in place. Other organizations work within "what the job is worth". Any increase to many for no reason will have an "elevator effect". The next level up will still want their skill margin, and the next level and so on. Also if there are savings to be made in the existing budgets why have they not already been made
They are taxing everyone on everything proposing new taxes and then paying out millions for menial jobs ? Who gives Goff the right to spend our money on his pet projects ? He didn't run with that policy when elected ? There have been no savings so why would I have confidence they could save money to pay this. Instead of taxing our tourists maybe we could save some money and not require such a tax ? Typically we are seeing Tax more and spend more !!
They should not be charged, or simply get discounts with special cards, we have the technology to do this, why having to use ratepayers money to do it? those savings should go in direct benefit of supporting the areas where not enough money was allocated.
Think you need to get rid of council staff who are inefficient and pay the good ones more. This would solve the problem
This is a social policy that all New Zealanders should contribute to, not just Auckland ratepayers.
This is a socialist proposal from a Labour party mayor
This is more socialist political crap trap - the employees need to be getting very minor cost of living adjustments to their base at most.
This is not an issue for Council rather its an issue for central government. If remuneration and employment conditions are an issue then this should be dealt with by the CEO not elected members. Finally to say that it would come from efficiencies and not raising rates is disingenuous as these savings could be passed on so that rates didn't need to rise as much.
This is not the best way to remunerate low income employees. Council needs to review it's current wage structure.
Those on a low wage have an incentive to work to better themselves
to ensure efficiency council should meet the market and pay whatever is the market rate for any job. Wages should only increase where commensurate productivity increases occur
Typical lefty philosophical spending of other people's money. Let wages rise naturally. If the low paid cannot afford to live and work in Auckland then workers will become unavailable unless pay is increased to attract them
Very strongly disagree. The gap between rich and poor in this country is getting too wide which I think is very bad. But unfortunately that can only be fixed at government level, not by council. The living wage concept is well-intended but wrong. All it does is drive up rates for everyone, including those on that so called living wage and others who can't afford it. It will also cause inefficiency... what incentive is there for people to work harder and get educated?

<p>Wages are largely set by supply and demand and I have not heard of Council havng difficulty in attracting employees. There is no good reason why Council employees should be paid a higher rate than people in the private sector for performing the same task nor that this should be funded by ratepayers. Further regards employees and rates, Council should cease immediately employing people who reside in cities other than Auckland, for which it is known that Council provide weekday accommodation at some of the most expensive hotels in Auckland City - and all at ratepayers expense. Auckland is the largest city in NZ and as such has people with all the skills wages for council staff should be minimum wage</p>
<p>Wages need to be market based and commercial relative to the other Auckland business</p>
<p>What is a living wage? It is not for Council to create a precedent with ratepayers money. Central government sets a minimum wage, which is too low, and council should adhere to that. I fully agree with increasing lower income earners wages by increasing the minimum wage nationally. Not through some misguided bureaucrats sense of guilt. Any such increase but this must come from efficiency within Council. Something Counsel is not renowned for.</p>
<p>Where is the fiscal responsibility? You wouldn't be so generous with your own money. Funding from existing budget savings has to be a joke. Given the multitude of jobs available. If staff don't like what they are paid, go and get another job. What mandate has the council for social</p>
<p>While this is a moral topic, this is NOT really the responsibility of the council. Rate-payers shouldn't be burdened with staff living costs. This is an ethical issue for EVERYONE not just the council. Most businesses don't do it anyway. Stop using rates money to implement living wage</p>
<p>While this is laudable many of the populace do not have a living wage, or are on fixed incomes. It is unfair for council staff to benefit from savings, when ratepayers do not.</p>
<p>Why are we singling out Council staff here? Everyone who lives in Auckland deserves the right to be able to afford typical living costs, especially all infrastructure service providers such as hospital staff, emergency services staff etc.</p>
<p>WHy should their life be more important than anybody else's who is not employed by the council? if you are going to implement something, shouldn't it be across all sectors?</p>
<p>Would only agree if the savings came from pay decreases for other staff</p>
<p><b>5.3 Q5 Living wage - Not sure</b></p>
<p>Councils are not social service agencies. Market forces should determine pay rates rather than an a unilaterally applied rate.</p>
<p>Disagree if starting wages for new staff are automatically at living wage level.</p>
<p>Every person in New Zealand should be entitled to this - not just one branch of the government. This would be asking taxpayers to pay for other to receive what they cannot.</p>
<p>In principle I think the living wage is a positive idea. My concern is that while wages are increased, staff will be cut to reduce the cost of the living wage. This is already occurring with undesirable cuts to library staff.</p>
<p>Likely to end up with more pressure on staff numbers if staff costs go up - not clear from consultation what changes will fund the LW</p>
<p>Not sure I can agree you will do as you say.</p>
<p>Only if any increases came from better efficiency</p>
<p>This should be funded from savings within the existing budget. Are you sure the council can do it and no return!! Poor rates payers salaes again?</p>
<p>This will put up costs for private sector, if it occurs total Council salary bill to fund it through reduced staff numbers. Too easy to spend rate payers money.</p>
<p>We do have to start somewhere - if its funded from existing budgets means council has been collecting too much money; and if its funded by rate payers then you would have trouble on your</p>
<p>Why not add savings to the future budget, the budget for council staff should be dealt with</p>
<p>yes NZ wide living wage needs to be increased so is this a way of leading by example?</p>
<p><b>5.4 Q5 Living wage - Other option</b></p>

I would only support this policy if those earning outrages salaries at the top end of the scale would voluntarily reduce their salaries to fund this. Otherwise if those at the top get market rates those at the bottom should too.
Reduce the number of highly paid (over \$250,00) staff and/or limit the salary increases for this group to pay for those earning less than a living wage.
This is an issue for Central Government. In addition, the overall employee headcount and use of contractors at Auckland Council needs scrutiny and reduction. There are likely to be significant efficiency gains to be made.
When is a menial job, worth less than other jobs, elevated above its competitive level just because the employer is the Auckland rate payer? I disagree that wages should be elevated
<b>5.5 Q5 Living wage - Other comment</b>
Do teachers and nurses get this? why should you? Staff maybe, councillors definitely not
Sincere economics in time energy and materials will enable the staff to be paid market rates
<b>5.6 Q5 Living wage - No response</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>