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1 Welcome

2 Apologies
At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

3 Declaration of Interest
Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4 Confirmation of Minutes
That the Howick Local Board:
a) confirm the minutes of its ordinary meeting, held on Monday, 16 April 2018, as true and correct.

5 Leave of Absence
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Acknowledgements
At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

7 Petitions
At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

8 Deputations
Standing Order 3.20 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Howick Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

At the close of the agenda no requests for deputations had been received.

9 Public Forum
A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

10 Extraordinary Business
Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-
(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."

11 Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

File No.: CP2018/05909

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve local financial matters for the local board agreement 2018/2019, which need to be considered by the Governing Body in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 (the 10-year Budget) process.
2. To seek feedback on regional topics in the 10-year Budget, the draft Auckland Plan 2050 and the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. Auckland Council’s 10-year Budget contains 21 local board agreements which are the responsibility of local boards. These agreements set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures. This report seeks decisions on local financial matters for the local board agreement, including:
   a) advocacy on local priority projects
   b) any new/amended Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rates
   c) any new/amended local targeted rate proposals
   d) proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility
   e) release of local board specific reserve funds
   f) LDI opex projects for deferral to 2018/2019.
4. Auckland Council consulted with the public from 28 February – 28 March 2018 to seek community views on four plans. This report seeks local board views on three of these plans:
   • Regional 10-year Budget issues: including the key issues of transport, natural environment, rates and charges and other budget information
   • Draft Auckland Plan 2050: including six proposed outcome areas and the development strategy
   • Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018: including on the key proposals.
5. Decisions on the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan will be made later in the year. Local boards will have the opportunity to provide input into this plan before then.
6. Local board views on these regional plans will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the plans.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Howick Local Board:
   a) receive the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and draft Auckland Plan 2050 consultation feedback report.
   b) receive the submissions as tabled at the meeting.
   c) approve its advocacy initiatives, including its key advocacy project, for inclusion (as
an appendix) to its 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement.

d) recommend any new or amended Business Improvement District targeted rates to the Governing Body.

e) recommend any new or amended local targeted rate proposals to the Governing Body.

f) recommend that the Governing Body approves any proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects, which are outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility.

g) recommend the release of local board specific reserve funds to the Governing Body.

h) recommend $805,000 of 2017/2018 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) operating expenditure to be deferred to 2018/2019 to the Governing Body.

i) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and draft Auckland Plan 2050 from people or organisations based in the Howick local board area.

j) provide feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

k) provide feedback on the draft Auckland Plan 2050.

l) provide feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

Horopaki / Context

7. Local board agreements form part of the Auckland Council’s 10-year Budget and set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures. This report details local board decisions and recommendations that need to be made in early May to allow them to be considered by the Governing Body in the 10-year Budget process.

8. Each year local boards also advocate to the governing body for funding for projects that cannot be accommodated within their local budgets. These advocacy initiatives are attached to the local board agreement.

9. Local boards are responsible for providing local input into regional strategies, policies and plans. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements and input into regional plans.

10. Auckland Council publicly consulted on four plans from 28 February – 28 March 2018:

   • 10-year Budget (which includes both regional issues and local board key priorities)
   • Draft Auckland Plan 2050
   • Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018
   • Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan.

11. Across the region, 5,374 people attended 100 engagement events, including seven events in the local board area. Feedback was received through written, event and social media channels.

12. Consultation feedback on the Howick Local Board priorities for 2018/2019 and on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 from people or organisations based in the Howick local board area are set out in Attachment A. The feedback on local board priorities will be considered by the local board before they agree their local board agreement in early June. Redacted submissions will be made available through the Auckland Council website in May 2018, until then redacted submissions are available on request by emailing akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz.
Local financial matters for the local board agreement

13. This report allows the local board to agree its advocacy and recommend other local financial matters to the Governing Body in early May. This is to allow time for the Governing Body to consider these items in the 10-year Budget process (decisions made in June).

Local board advocacy

14. This triennium a three year approach is being taken to progress initiatives that are unable to be funded by local board budgets. The approach aims to better utilise the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and local board plan processes to progress and advise on a narrower range of local board initiatives, in a more comprehensive way.

15. As part of the Annual Budget 2017/2018 process, local boards began narrowing their priorities to one key advocacy project. Council departments provided local boards with information to help inform their position on these initiatives. Local boards then consulted their communities on their key advocacy project in the local board plan and/or the local board agreement process. Local boards will discuss their key advocacy project with the Finance and Performance Committee through the 10-year Budget process, supported by organisational advice.

16. Local boards are requested to approve their advocacy initiatives, including their key advocacy project, for consideration by the Governing body and inclusion (as an appendix) to the 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement.

Local targeted rate and Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rate proposals

17. Local boards are required to endorse any new locally targeted rate proposals or BID targeted rate proposals in their local board area (noting that any new local targeted rates and/or BIDs must have been consulted on before they can be implemented).

Funding for Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI)

18. Local boards are allocated funding annually to spend on local projects or programmes that are important to their communities. This funding is for ‘Locally Driven Initiatives’ or LDI. Local boards can approve LDI capital projects up to $1 million, projects over that amount need approval from the Governing Body.

19. Local boards can recommend to the Governing Body to convert LDI operational funding to capital expenditure for 2018/2019 if there is a specific need to do so. Or Governing Body approval may be needed for the release of local board specific reserve funds, which are funds being held by the council for a specific purpose.

20. Local boards can defer LDI projects where there was an agreed scope and cost but the project/s have not been delivered. The local board may wish to resolve 2017/2018 projects that meet the criteria for deferral to 2018/2019. Key information on the LDI funded projects that meet the criteria for deferral is provided in Attachment C.

Local board input on regional plans

21. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the context of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of Auckland Council. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to provide input on three plans, the 10-year Budget, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.
Regional issues in the 10-year Budget

22. The 10-year Budget sets out Auckland Council priorities and how we’re going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed 10-year Budget focused on four key issues:
   - Issue 1: Transport
   - Issue 2: Natural Environment
   - Issue 3: Rates and charges
   - Issue 4: Other changes and budget information.

23. The 10-year Budget also included key priorities for each local board area. Decisions on local board priorities will be made when local board agreements are considered in June.

24. The feedback form contained at least one question relating to each issue. Consultation feedback received from the Howick Local Board area on key regional issues in the 10-year Budget are summarised in Attachment A, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

25. Local boards may wish to provide feedback on these regional issues for consideration by the Governing Body.

Draft Auckland Plan 2050

26. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 sets Auckland Council’s long-term direction and considers how we will address our key challenges of high population growth, shared prosperity, and environmental degradation. It covers:
   - Outcome area 1: Belonging and participation
   - Outcome area 2: Māori identity and wellbeing
   - Outcome area 3: Homes and places
   - Outcome area 4: Transport and access
   - Outcome area 5: Environment and cultural heritage
   - Outcome area 6: Opportunity and prosperity
   - Development strategy – How Auckland will grow and change over the next 30 years.

27. The feedback form contained a question relating to each outcome area as well as a question on the development strategy. Consultation feedback received from the Howick Local Board area on the outcome areas in the draft Auckland Plan 2050 are summarised in Attachment A.

28. Local boards may wish to provide feedback on these outcome areas for consideration by the Planning Committee on 5 June 2018.

Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

29. The Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2012 has been reviewed. The new plan proposes to continue working towards Auckland Council’s vision of Zero Waste to landfill by 2040. Auckland Council will continue to deliver a range of services to households, and to work with mana whenua, communities, and industry to achieve waste reductions.

30. The new draft plan proposes to:
   - Work with the commercial sector to find ways to reduce and divert waste from landfill
   - Prioritise the three largest waste streams - construction and demolition, plastic and organic waste
   - Continue to establish community recycling centres
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- Ask central government to introduce container deposit schemes for plastic/glass bottles and cans and product stewardship schemes for hard to dispose products like tyres and e-waste
- Address the needs of the Hauraki Gulf islands through the Tikapa Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan.

31. This report asks for local board input to the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

32. Consultation feedback received from the Howick Local Board area on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is summarised in Attachment B.

33. Local boards may wish to provide feedback on this plan for consideration by the Environment and Community Committee.

Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

34. Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland’s Regional Pest Management Strategy (RPMS) was last reviewed in 2007. Significant changes have occurred since the strategy was last reviewed, both in terms of the pests themselves and changes to the Biosecurity Act. Auckland Council is now reviewing the existing RPMS and producing a new plan to align with the National Policy Direction for Pest Management 2015. The new plan will provide a statutory and strategic framework for the effective management of pests in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland.

35. Decisions on this plan are expected later in the year and local board input will be sought prior to decision-making.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

36. Local board decisions and feedback are being sought in this report. Local boards have a statutory role in providing local board feedback on regional plans.

37. Local boards play an important role in the development of the 10-year Budget. Local board agreements form part of the 10-year Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance committee workshop on key topics and special briefings have been arranged.

38. Local boards have also been involved in, and made a significant contribution to, the refresh of the Auckland Plan during 2017. This involvement included representation at Planning Committee workshops, local board cluster workshops and individual board business meetings and workshops. Local boards passed resolutions in August and October 2017 which helped to inform the draft plan.

39. Local boards provided input into the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan through formal resolutions to business meetings in November 2017. This feedback has been incorporated into the draft plan.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

40. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the 10-year Budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.

41. The Auckland Plan and its contribution to Māori well-being is of interest to Māori. Six hui with mana whenua were held during 2017, focusing on the key challenges and opportunities facing Auckland, and how the plan can best address these. Engagement with mataawaka was carried out through working with Māori organisations. These organisations used their networks to provide feedback to inform the draft plan. The Independent Māori Statutory Board provided formal feedback on early drafts of the plan including the proposed measures.
42. Local board plans, which were developed in 2017 through engagement with the community including Māori, form the basis of local priorities. There is a need to continue to build relationships between local boards and iwi, and where relevant the wider Māori community.

43. Attachment A includes analysis of submissions made by mana whenua and mataawaka entities who have interests in the rohe/local board area.

44. Ongoing conversations will assist local boards and Māori to understand each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

45. This report is asking for local board decisions on financial matters in local board agreements that need to then be considered by the Governing Body.

46. Local boards are also providing input to regional plans. There is information in the consultation material for each plan with the financial implications of different options.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

47. Local boards need to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the 10-year Budget by 10 May, in order for the Governing Body to be able to make decisions on them when considering the 10-year Budget in June.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

48. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes in June.

49. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant governing body committees for consideration during decision making as outlined in the table below.

Decision dates for regional plans

<table>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee</td>
<td>12 June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 consultation feedback report for Howick Local Board

1. Purpose

This report summarises feedback relating to the Howick Local Board received through the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 consultation. This includes:

- Feedback on the Howick Local Board priorities for 2018/19.
- Feedback on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 from people or organisations based in the Howick local board area.

The feedback received will inform the Howick Local Board decisions on allocation of their local budgets in their local board agreement for 2018/2019. It will also inform the Howick Local Board input and advocacy on regional budgets and proposals that will be agreed at their business meeting on 10th May and subsequently discussed with the Finance and Performance Committee on 17/18 May.
2. Executive Summary

This report summarises consultation feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 (including on local board priorities for 2018/19) and the Auckland Plan 2050.

Council received feedback in person at community engagement events, through written forms (including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters) and through social media.

Feedback on Howick Local Board priorities for 2018/2019

The local board consulted on the following 5 priorities:

- **Priority 1**: Provide additional shelters at Barry Curtis Park, including over the “stage” area near Chapel Road.
- **Priority 2**: Provide dog exercise parks in each of the local board subdivisions (Howick, Pakuranga, Botany).
- **Priority 3**: Develop an overarching pest management project incorporating our existing weed eradication programme and new ones to rid the area of rats and other pests. We also want to consider the concept of creating pest-free areas or “mainland islands” for example at the new park at the former Greenmount landfill or Mungemangeroa Reserve.
- **Priority 4**: Provide more all-weather sports fields and improve drainage on our parks to reduce the impact of wet weather.
- **Priority 5**: Continue sand replenishment and management of coastal erosion, including continued advocacy to the Governing Body for a regional fund.
- **Priority 6**: Undertake a stocktake of all council-owned and externally-managed community facilities in the area

1301 written submissions were received on Howick local board priorities for 2018/19, showing that the majority of people either partially support (45%) or support (32%) the local board’s priorities.

Your final consultation materials are here.

Key themes across all feedback received (through written, event and social media channels) were:

- Support for the AMETI project, including requesting the Board to advocate to bring the project forward and widen its scope to address additional concerns e.g. including Pakuranga Highway
- The need for action in relation to coastal management and develop a plan in this regard
- Mixed feedback re dog exercise parks – supported by some but seen by others as having low priority in relation to more pressing issues
- The need to review the bus network in the east and requests to the Board to advocate in this regard
- Requests for more (and better) playgrounds, and shade over existing playgrounds
- Requests for cycling infrastructure including to Half Moon Bay ferry and across Panmure Bridge, as well as off-road cycle networks
- Support for community facilities at Flat Bush, as soon as possible – including requests for the Board to advocate for the design of the aquatic centre to have a large deepwater pool suitable for water sports (swimming) and diving, as well as adequate parking for the library.
• Request for funding to support a multi-use indoor sports facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park
• The need for the Board to advocate to bring forward other roading projects also to support business in the Greater East Tamaki area
• Support for additional improvements to Barry Curtis Park – stage cover, lighting, concreting the paths
• Support for upgrading sports fields, however also recognition that the area already had great sports facilities and there may be higher priorities
• Significant concern about levels of maintenance of public spaces

Feedback on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 from the Howick local board area
Out of the 28,556 written submissions received on the regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, 1301 submissions were from people living in the Howick local board area.

Issue 1: Transport
Feedback shows local people do not support the regional fuel tax – 54% of written submitters were opposed to this proposal, with 39% in support. 7% preferred another option.

Issue 2: Natural Environment
Feedback shows local people support the targeted rate for water quality – 57% of written submitters support this proposal, while 37% are opposed. 7% preferred another option.
Feedback shows local people support the targeted rate for environmental initiatives – 31% of written submitters support Option A ($21 p.a.), 25% support Option B ($47 p.a.), while 44% do not support the rate. 15% of people prefer another option.

Issue 3: Rates and charges
Feedback shows local people do not support the proposed rates increase of 2.5% of the first two years and 3.5% for years three to ten – 50% of written submitters were opposed to this proposal, with 40% in support. 10% of preferred another option.

Issue 4: Other changes and budget information
Feedback shows local people support the proposals in relation to online accommodation providers – 67% of written submitters were support this proposal, while 26% are opposed. 7% preferred another option.

Feedback on the Auckland Plan 2050 from the Howick local board area
Out of the 28,556 submissions received on the Auckland Plan 2050, 1301 submissions were from people living in the Howick local board area.

Outcome area 1: Belonging and participation
Feedback shows 47% of local submitters believe the six focus areas identified in Belonging and Participation will achieve an inclusive Auckland. 36% do not support the focus areas, while 17% partially support the focus areas.

Outcome area 2: Māori identity and wellbeing
Feedback shows 38% of local submitters believe the seven focus areas identified in Maori Well-being and Identity will advance Maori well-being. 32% do not support the focus areas, while 30% partially support the focus areas.

Outcome area 3: Homes and places
Feedback shows 38% of local submitters believe the five focus areas identified in Homes and Places will lead to affordable housing. 24% do not support the focus areas, while 41% partially support the focus areas.

Outcome area 4: Transport and access
Feedback shows 45% of local submitters believe the seven focus areas identified in Transport and Access will make it easier to move around Auckland. 19% do not support the focus areas, while 37% partially support the focus areas.

Outcome area 5: Environment and cultural heritage
Feedback shows 55% of local submitters believe the six focus areas identified in Environment and Cultural Heritage will protect and enhance Auckland’s environment. 10% do not support the focus areas, while 35% partially support the focus areas.

Outcome area 6: Opportunity and prosperity
Feedback shows 46% of local submitters believe the five focus areas identified in Opportunity and Prosperity will contribute to opportunity and prosperity. 17% do not support the focus areas, while 37% partially support the focus areas.

Outcome area 7: Shaping our growth
Feedback shows 45% of local submitters believe the proposed approach for enabling growth will effectively provide for Auckland’s future. 18% do not support the proposed approach, while 37% partially support the focus areas.
3. Context


The 10-year Budget 2018-2028 sets out our priorities and how we’re going to pay for them. The Auckland Plan 2050 sets our long-term direction and looks at the important challenges we need to address.

The 10-year Budget also includes information on each local board’s priorities for 2018/19. These priorities have been informed by in the development of the Howick Local Board Plan 2017.

Auckland Council also consulted on the Regional Pest Management Strategy and the Waste Management and Minimisation Strategy at the same time. The feedback received on the Waste Management and Minimisation Strategy is presented in a separate report. The feedback received on the Regional Pest Management Strategy will be presented later in the year (following decisions on the 10-year Budget).

Types of feedback

Overall Auckland Council received feedback through the following channels:

- Written feedback – 26,558 hard copy and online forms, emails and letters.
- In person – council interacted with a total of 5,374 people through 39 have your say events and 61 community events.
- Social media – 114 comments were received through Facebook and Twitter.
3. Feedback received on Howick Local Board priorities for 2018/19

Howick Local Board received 1301 written submissions. The source of these submissions can be seen in the tables and graphs below. Online submissions and submissions from individuals made up the highest numbers of submitters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Online form</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. People’s Panel form</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Email form</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Email Our Auckland form</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Email non form</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Post form</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Post Our Auckland form</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Post non form</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of written submitters by ethnicity, age and gender can be seen in the graphs below. The majority of submissions were made by New Zealand Europeans (49%), 50% submissions were made by people aged 35-64 yrs and 51% of respondents were male.
Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018–2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018
The Howick Local Board held 3 have your say events and 4 community events. During these events 177 local residents were engaged with, resulting in 85 feedback points. Demographic data was not collected at these events.

Howick Local Board received no feedback from social media channels directly relating to local priorities.
The Howick local board consulted on the following 5 priorities:

- Priority 1: Provide additional shelters at Barry Curtis Park, including over the “stage” area near Chapel Road.
- Priority 2: Provide dog exercise parks in each of the local board subdivisions (Howick, Pakuranga, Botany).
- Priority 3: Develop an overarching pest management project incorporating our existing weed eradication programme and new ones to rid the area of rats and other pests. We also want to consider the concept of creating pest-free areas or “mainland islands” for example at the new park at the former Greenmount landfill or Mangemangeroa Reserve.
- Priority 4: Provide more all-weather sports fields and improve drainage on our parks to reduce the impact of wet weather.
- Priority 5: Continue sand replenishment and management of coastal erosion, including continued advocacy to the Governing Body for a regional fund.
- Priority 6: Undertake a stocktake of all council-owned and externally-managed community facilities in the area.

Your final consultation materials are here.

Key themes across all feedback received (through written, event and social media channels) were:

- Support for the AMETI project, including requesting the Board to advocate to bring the project forward and widen its scope to address additional concerns eg including Pakuranga Highway
- The need to take action in relation to coastal management and develop a plan in this regard
- Mixed feedback re dog exercise parks – supported by some but seen by others as having low priority in relation to more pressing issues
- The need to review the bus network in the east and requests to the Board to advocate in this regard
- Requests for more (and better) playgrounds, and shade over existing playgrounds
- Requests for cycling infrastructure including to Half Moon Bay ferry and across Panmure Bridge, as well as off road cycle networks
- Support for community facilities at Flat Bush, as soon as possible – including requests for the Board to advocate for the design of the aquatic centre to have a large deep water pool suitable for water sports (swimming) and diving, as well as adequate parking for the library.
- Request for funding to support a multi-use indoor sports facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park
- The need for the Board to advocate to bring forward other roading projects also to support business in the Greater East Tamaki area
- Support for additional improvements to Barry Curtis Park – stage cover, lighting, concreting the paths
- Support for upgrading sports fields, however also recognition that the area already had great sports facilities and there may be higher priorities
- Significant concern about levels of maintenance of public spaces
A summary of the feedback received through each channel is provided below.

**Feedback received through written submissions**

Of the 1301 written submissions received from residents in the Howick Local Board area, 1091 made feedback points in relation to the local priorities. The majority of submitters (500) partially supported the priorities, while 361 gave their full support. 222 did not support the local priorities. This is summarised in the graph below:

![Graph showing feedback distribution]

A selection of general verbatim comments from respondents are below:

“There appears to be a lack of clarity as to just what the Howick Local Board’s priorities are. For example, in the message from the Chair is that the Board’s priorities are to meet growth issues and ensure that transport, local service, infrastructure and community services are in place. BUT there is no mention of AMETI or transport under Board Proposals or key advocacy projects. We would also acknowledge that, while the multi-use facility at Flat Bush/Ormiston is important, fixing flooding and erosion is even more critical. We feel the Board needs to get out and drive this issue with funding proposals and key deadlines. Advocating is good for the warm and fuzzy but dodges accountability. The Board has also failed to address storm water and waste water issues, and the impact on over intensification in areas like Bucklands Beach”

“Coastline Management - there is not continuing management, there is no management worthy to say this, our council is very inactive and are not working hard enough to pull money out to help our coast! See Bucklands Beach Restoration project FB page for community ideas on this matter. Bring this project forward. We also need to encourage repopulation of young fish and cockles into the inlet which will help with water quality and beach replenishing. There are too many people fishing on Tamaki River - this needs to be controled, people are taking undersize fish and anything living on rocks. we saw someone killing a sting ray they caught then left it on the beach to die. Not Sustainable. Tamaki River replenishment please use the money for the festival to look after the River Dog Exercise Area? - How about Kids and Older People exercise areas, How about shade cloths over local playgrounds and play ground up keeping! How About public toilets for Little Bucklands Beach so people dont go in the sea and Eastern Beaches, these are crammed in summer! At lease [sic] Redo Grangers point toilets they are revolting and falling apart, no sink etc. Public Transport and Cycleways - Where are they? Prioritise this over Roads so more people will walk or ride, it is currently
dangerous in many areas or unpleasant. Wider foot paths and cycleways, Bikes dont belong on roads its far too dangerous”

“Priority should be for existing facilities like footpaths, and smooth roads in the already developed areas, plus keeping low rise housing only so that Howick can retain its beautiful views. We pay some of the highest rates and consequently the money should be spent in our area”

Priority 1: Barry Curtis Park stage covers

“I particularly support more shelters at Barry Curtis Park. The current one is only practical under good summer weather conditions but when it rains for example the shelter is of no use to anyone but nature. There must be shelter on the stage as described in the priorities”

Priority 2: Dog exercise areas – supported by many:

“ I am in full support of a dedicated dog exercise area, it is needed, especially in summer when our beach hours are restricted, and then further restricted by tidal fluctuations”

“Most objectives are things that the majority would want to see as improving our environment: however, such things as dedicated dog-walking areas would seem to be completely unnecessary. I walk in Loyd Elsmore Park every day as do dozens of dog-walkers. There is no conflict of interests and I have never seen dog-walkers not pick-up after their dogs defecate, so cannot think why they would travel to a special area when the park is right on their doorstep and is ideal for everyone. Why spend more money?”

“Dog exercise areas. It is great to see that the council are putting in purpose built dog exercise areas. I would hope that these take the form of the ones we saw in Christchurch, with good facilities and a high fence surrounding them”

Other submitters were not in support:

“Dog exercise areas should not be on the priorities list; if people want to have a dog and exercise with it, they can go to a beach or a park or along the road. Not a council task to provide dog owners with dedicated facilities”

“provide dedicated dog exercise areas...” SERIOUSLY!! This is a top 5 priority??!! There are far bigger issues to resolve. Get this one OFF the top 5 list!”

“Absolutely absurd you are putting Dog play areas ahead of footpaths and roading and even making people have to pay at their local swimming pool which is an essential skill”

Priority 3: Pest Management projects:

“No point in making an area pest free if the public can’t enjoy it - park maintenance needs to be part of the essential package too”

Priority 4: Improvements for sports fields had a general level of support:

“From a sport & Rec viewpoint we believe the priorities are right and that investment in sport and rec fields and facilities, along with the development of multi-use facility and aquatic [sic] centre in Flat Bush is much needed investment for the community. The Howick LB region continues to show
population growth and we know that the vehicle of sport and rec leads to social cohesion, healthy and active lifestyles. Sport and Rec helps address wellness issues and will lead to the overarching outcome of aspirational Auckland Plan where all Aucklanders can have a "Sense of Belonging and Participating".

"Working towards providing Clubs like ours with an artificial pitch will only improve our playing numbers and other sports associated with us" (Pakuranga United Rugby Club).

Others recognised that the area already has great facilities, although the availability of sports facilities across the entire Board area is not even:

"I like the inclusion of dog-friendly exercise areas, and I think improving drainage at parks around East Auckland will be appreciated, as they can get very water-logged. Not sure we need more dedicated sports areas though - what about a focus on cycle-ways? Moving people around naturally? So many of the other boards are looking at cycle-ways and infrastructure that doesn’t seem so frivolous, I think Howick should follow suit. We already have great sports fields”

"We need more sports facilities our [sic] Botany, right now, my kids have to go to Papakura for basketball games, there’s lots of soccer & rugby fields popping up but what about other sports, say a public swimming pool. Flat Bush area has grown up so rapidly. Loyd Elsmore facilities seems far & you struggle to find parking most of the time. Sir Barry Curtis Park also has less parking space, especially when there is [sic] special functions. We live walking distance to this park & sometimes people block our driveways when there are functions or block part of the road”

Priority 5: Coastal management was of significant concern for submitters, with more than one submitter identifying a lack of action in this regard:

"We are extremely disappointed and dissatisfied with the performance of the Howick Board. The proposed priorities continue to be about receiving reports, not getting on and remediing urgent failures, such as coastal erosion, which have been on the "required action" list for some years”

"There is far too much emphasis on inputs, not outputs and results. the Local Board is a huge disappointment, and has failed continuously to act on essential needs like prevention of coastal erosion. they have known about these issues for years, but are still only calling for reports, not funded remedies”

Other submitters emphasised the need for long term planning and questioned the validity of ongoing coastal management:

"Coastal erosion is going to increase so make this a managed retreat, not a futile attempt to hold back natural processes - that becomes a waste of money”

"Agree with most, but the coastal erosion needs to treat the cause and not just the symptoms. We cannot keep bringing in sand that then washes away in the following storm. We need to stabilise the coast with gabion baskets or similar, now that whatever is causing the current that strips the beaches is firmly in place”

"Waste of money working against nature”

Priority 6: Stocktake of council owned facilities
There was no feedback on this priority.

**Key Advocacy Item: Flat Bush Community Facilities & Aquatic Centre**

There was a high level of support for building the community facilities at Flat Bush, with more than one respondent also suggesting the projects be bought forward:

“"The facilities planned for Flat Bush sound like a great improvement for the area. To create a smaller township much like Howick & Pakuranga will form a sense of community and potentially reduce the strain on the facilities in the surrounding areas”

“2022 and 2023 is far too long. Bring forward as much as possible. It’s been disappointing to see the vacant land in Ormiston Township (next to Pak N Save) since 2015. Every single day vacant is a missed opportunity for a budding swimmer, a community event, or a retail business”

“I would want to see the aquatic centre built and ready by 2020 or sooner”

Submitters also made specific requests in relation to the design of the pool and parking facilities for the library:

“Please note when developing a aquatic centre at flat bush please don’t make the mistakes that the community has to live with at Lloyd Elsmore. I refer to the depth of the pool at Lloyd Elsmore and how some sports cannot be attend at that pool as it is too shallow. We can always make a deep pool shallow but we can never make a shallow pool deep. 2.2 Meters Plus”

“The growth in the Flat Bush area supports an aquatic centre and multi-use library for the growing number of families in the area and also considering the schools already established on Ormiston Road. Please ensure the site of both and relevant parking is well thought out, specifically accommodating short term parking for dropping off and collecting books. I find most of the time at Howick that the car park is full of patrons using the trail facilities or groups using the library and it is very frustrating when all I wish to do it return or collect book requests”

“Please consider a High Diving Well at the Barry Curtis Park Aquatic Centre. Please contact Auckland Diving Board, they have done a comprehensive study on the future of Deep Water Sports”

**Feedback received through events**

The Howick Local Board held three have your say events and four community events. These events resulted in engagement with 177 people and 85 feedback points were recorded in relation to the local priorities. 66% of local residents who attended an event supported the local priorities overall, while 32% gave their partial support. This can be seen in the graph below.
Local residents who gave their partial support emphasised areas that they would like to be prioritised by the local board including:

- management of coastal erosion including a plan of specific actions
- advocating for the local community in relation to AMETI
- shade over local playgrounds
- advocating for improvements to the east bus network
- supporting employment and mental health programmes for youth
- maintenance/improvements at Mangemangeroa Reserve

A summary of submitters verbatim comments is below:

“Coastal erosion is more important and timely than developing a new library/astroturf/dog parks etc - nature is taking its toll and the effects can be non-reversible so dealing with coastal issues needs to be prioritised over other developments - coastal erosion should be a high priority”

“Like to see additional funding to coastal managements to bring in additional funding from other sources”

“Coastal management - like to know why council is not engaging with community re plans for coastal repairs? - feel shut out - would like to know why local board is not making decisions about coastal management? - like to see better communication”

“Need to bring forward AT plan to fix sea wall at Little Bucklands Beach and AC funding to resand the beach”

“Like to see a management plan for coastal area that includes actions”

“Like to see a local focus on transport/AMETI in local priorities - concerned about the number of lanes on Panmure Bridge/Lagoon Drive, would like the LB to address the shortcomings of AMETI”

“Local Board should put shade over high use playgrounds”

“Would like Howick LB to prioritise: mental health for young people; better bus routes; better private transport infrastructure; youth employment; sports and leisure programmes and facilities, public transport options for Ormiston; support AMETI, fix up Mangemangeroa reserve”

“Better Auckland/ East Auckland bus routes. Less money on artificial turfs”

Feedback received through social media channels

No feedback was received through social media channels specifically relating to Howick, however the following comments are relevant to Howick:

One LRT Line, 16 stations, 16 Transit Orientated Developments between Airport and Botany Can the Airport to Manukau section of the Southern Airport Line be funded years 1-4 in the LTP and Manukau to Botany in years 5-10 please @AklCounciltakhaveyoursay #AucklandPlan2050
Feedback on other local

Local Planning
One submitter emphasised the need for planning at Half Moon Bay:
“The major priority for Howick local board is to sort out the shambles that is Half Moon bay, with the wide range of activities occurring in a small space”

Another requested a plan to address coastal management in the Bucklands Beach area:
“This is what we could have at the Northern end of Little Bucklands Beach. The break water of Grangers Point stops the NW quarter wave action “We request Local Council & Auckland City Council to 1. Advocate to Auckland Transport to bring forward repairs to the Little Bucklands Beach sea wall. 2. Advocate to Auckland Council to re sand Little & Big Bucklands Beach, covering all black rock walls and build a break waters off Grangers Point as per the Auckland City Council Coastal Management Doc written by Paul Klinac & the Bucklands Beach Restoration & Upgrade Plan. 3. Howick Council to put a staged plan together with date targets, along with Auckland City Council Coastal Erosion team with Residents & Rate payers associations”

Local Economic Development
Another submitter requested funding to support the Howick Village Association:
“More financial support needs to be given to the Howick Village Association. Also the board should include those businesses in Howick which are excluded from the Village Association”

Local parks, sport and recreation:
Submitters requested support for a multi-sport facility at Lloyd Elsmore park as well as improvements to existing facilities. New playgrounds and improvements to existing playgrounds was also a priority:
“We need better maintenance of our roads, better public transport and more funding for sporting facilities in our area. There has been a lot of growth in the last 10 years but our facilities have not kept up. For example a proper Gymnasium like the one in Bruce Pullman park is desperately needed, the local pool needs an upgrade, and an indoor tennis court facility would not go amiss”
“Because the local board covers a very big area with diverse needs. The developments at Flat Bush really only cover a small part of the Board’s area. In Howick and Pakuranga there are similar needs, or many of the facilities are old and run down”
“Artificial turf for football at Riverhills (Ti Rakau Dr) Improved athletic facilities at Lloyd Elsmore (stand and shelter by track)”
“Include a Multi Sports Complex on Lloyd Elsmore Park, for Gym Sports, Tennis & Bowls”
"Lloyd Eismore still needs further development to include more clubs for sport, running and walking tracks and club rooms for sports like the gymnastics club. I don’t believe this area has been maximised yet”

"Need more updated playgrounds for our kids and a community bike track would be fantastic”

"We need some FANTASTIC playgrounds in east auckland like re Cental [sic] city has already got”

"Don’t lose sight of children’s playgrounds! Our area is not well endowed with these. Pleased to see the flying fox well used at Macleans Park and the recent upgrade”

Local arts, culture and events
A number of submitters requested ongoing support for arts and culture. Concern was expressed that existing facilities/groups be supported:

“Generally need more support for libraries and arts especially opera and classical music”

“I support the development planned for Flatbush as this area needs more facilities to keep pace with the growing population in this area. However, we need to ensure that our existing libraries and swimming pools are adequately funded and that Uxbridge is managed and funded effectively for it to remain a key ‘going concern’ within the community”

“Te Reo Maori activities to introduce the culture into our communities such as POI making, wearing, ti raku skills etc. The culture into our communities such as poi making, wearing ti rarakau, au raku skills, te reo classes etc”

“Increased funding to support the arts as a vehicle to engage and develop communities”

“please advocate for other hobbies that are not fully based on sports and the outdoors”

“More funding towards art that supports local artists to thrive and be innovative”

“Love the dog thing, but want some focus on youth and health/ well being”

Local governance & support
A number of submitters made comments in relation to the need to focus on the entire Howick ward:

“stop focusing on Howick there are other suburbs and communities in your Ward”

“pukuranga heights is treated like the poor relative”

“There is a huge focus on the Flat Bush development which provides little for the more central areas of the Howick Local Board such as Sunnyhills, Farm Cove, Pakuranga”

“They have left Pakuranga out. We are constantly told by the local board that there are big plans for Pakuranga - all based around the Plaza - but nothing is happening. Meanwhile the rest of Pakuranga - where the residents actually live - is being allowed to turn into a slum with unkempt houses and berms. Rubbish in the gutters. Pakuranga is being sacrificed for some big development so that people living further out - Howick and Botany - can continue to drive their cars”
“I would love to see more work with Tangata Whenua. Howick is so strongly represented by the fencibles - where are they honouring the treaty? Where is the representation of Te Ao Maori?”

Local – transport related:
Transport generated a significant number of comments from submitters which have been grouped into themes. A number of submitters were unhappy with the East bus network, there was a significant number of comments supporting cycleways, and also requests for AMETI to be brought forward and include provision to Howick up Pakuranga Highway:

Public Transport:
“Public Transportation in East Auckland is Poor. The new bus timetable for getting into the city is ridiculous! Congestion in East Auckland around rush hour is even worse”
“We need better transport in the east Auckland area which leads us straight to town instead of taking 2 buses”
“I think the main problem in this area is the changes to public transport system - if the board can do anything at all on this, that should be the first priority”
“There is nothing in your priorities about advocating with AT to review and improve the public transport services in our area”
“AMETI and the Howick board priorities all seem to be focused on the Botany and Flat bush parts of Howick. There is no discussion about improving the facilities at Lloyd Elsmore or extending the busway to Howick. A large part of the congestion for Howick residents is the Pakuranga highway, yet there is no indication even in the 10 year plan that there is any thought to improving this”
“Transport (Promote more Bus Lanes, connections to Railway Stations should be smoother) From Ormiston to Manukau Station takes an hour to travel on bus”
“My number one recommendation is to establish a wharf operation at Musick Point so as to cut ferry trips to Auckland to 20 minutes. Have hookups with Waitakere and beach lands ferries and provide land based shuttle services/bus to make this possible. I envisage ferries capable of carrying the same numbers as a train”
“Ormiston town centre needs to move along faster than it has been. If you want people to use public transport the bus interchange at Ormiston needs to be fast tracked. The population is booming [sic] but the infrastructure is not keeping up”

Walking & Cycling:
“We have no bike lanes in this area - we are behind the rest of Auckland on this front. I’m disappointed that with all the congestion in this area, cycle lanes to all major transport hubs are not a priority”
“There is no mention of safe cycling initiatives in the area, nor of dedicated bus lanes connecting Howick/Highland Park to Pakuranga (New Transport Hub). This is a huge oversight. Botany, Pakuranga and Panmure will be transformed by 2025 but Howick will be left out. Dog exercise
areas…a priority, honestly? More sports fields? I wonder what criteria Howick Local Board use to establish ‘priority’. How does the local board see the future of the areas transport? Has it been considered? I will tell you - cars, cars, cars, jams, jams, jams. Number one priority is getting people out of cars”

“While all of the priorities are great, I think it would be amazing if there were more bicycle paths that were meant both for leisure rides as well as when you need to get to places. As the road can be dangerous and I feel unsafe. This will compliment the gas tax Auckland is proposing as it will limit pollution if people have the option to ride their bikes. It will also get more people up and out doing exercise. It is a fantastic alternative to people who don’t care for the traditional sports that sport fields are used for”

“There needs to be a larger focus on encouraging walking and cycling through providing cycle lanes and more walking shortcuts to make it more desirable than driving a car”

“My teenage son cycles everyday in our local area, there are no safe cycle lanes on the roads that he can use. He rides on the footpaths – this is not an ideal option. It would be great if his bike use could allow him a fuller independence - been able to ride safely to the Half Moon Bay ferry and to the Panmure Train Station”

“Enhancement of cycling facilities to catch up on poor infrastructure in this ward. Our ward does well on recreational routes, but offers a poor choice to commuters. The board should be pushing for a timely AMETI construction, particularly the proposed two-way protected cycleway over Pakuranga Bridge”

“Safe bike links to major transport hubs like the Half Moon Bay Ferry and Panmure Train Station. An integrated system includes safe travel for people on bikes, because bike-and-ride is the most efficient park-and-ride, freeing up space and decongesting local streets. Fix the Rotary walkway on Tamaki estuary damaged in storms during 2017”

“There needs to be a great focus on commuter public transport options and cycle routes. The network is not connected well and does not provide safe or reliable options. A greater focus on cycle ways will help to decrease congestion and give people options other than driving, especially to the East Tamaki business area”

GETBA also made a submission requesting intersection improvements be brought forward:

“Please see submission document for details on prioritising the funding for road widening and intersection improvement on Smales/Allens/Springs/Harris Roads”

Other priorities for consideration

Pakuranga Community Centre:

“The Pakuranga community activity center [sic] is too crowded. There are more than 500 members, but the space is too small. Can we build a large activity center [sic] so that many people can enjoy themselves?”
I hope the government can be aware of the limited space of Pakuranga Chinese Community. The current small venue cannot allow over 600 old people to take part in activities. Also, the space restriction will be inconvenient for the old to carry out activities and it is also a big problem for the old people’s health. I hope the government can support the community in terms of the venue and community building.

Barry Curtis Park:

“We request that the ‘Mayor Park’ [Barry Curtis Park] have lights installed and the small dirt roads be paved with concrete”

“I hope the public toilets in the ‘Mayor Park’ [Barry Curtis Park] have rain shelters to prevent people from being drenched”

“Please build a pedestrian road that links ‘Mayor Park’ [Barry Curtis Park] and Pakn’save as soon as possible”

General and central government issues:

“Control ‘food gathering’ along the foreshore - shellfish depletion, anglers collecting undersized catch from coastal casting & catching endangered bird species (Pied Shag) in lines & hooks”

“The Pakuranga plaza is too crowded. I suggest the government upgrade the area as soon as possible. 2. I suggest building ‘a daycare centre for the old’ in the Botany area like the one in Howick. (During 9:30am-3pm Monday to Friday, the old who cannot afford to live in the nursing home will have somewhere to go)”

“Howick Special Character statement. Advance Howick Village Carter [sic] Plan. Do not demolish War Memorial Information Centre”

Requests for local funding

Requests for local funding included:

- Multisport facility at Lloyd Elsmore to cater for Howick Gymsport, Pakuranga Bowls Club, Pakuranga Tennis Club and BMX Club.
- Uxbridge funding
- More financial support for Howick Village Association
- Crossnet requesting assistance to develop 34 Moore St as a Community Hub

4. Overview of feedback received on the 10-year Budget from Howick Local Board area

The 10-year Budget 2018-2028 sets out our priorities and how we're going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed 10-year Budget focused on four key issues:

- Issue 1: Transport
- Issue 2: Natural Environment
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- Issue 3: Rates and charges
- Issue 4: Other changes and budget information

The written submissions received from the Howick Local Board area on these key issues is summarised below, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

**Issue 1: Transport**

Aucklanders were asked their opinion on whether they would support a regional fuel tax to help pay for improvements to the transport system.

**Question 1:** We want to improve our transport system. As the population grows, congestion (and the pollution it creates) is getting worse, safety is declining and businesses are struggling to move freight and people. We are proposing that a regional fuel tax of 10 cents per litre (plus GST) be used to raise more funding for transport projects and services.

**What is your opinion on the proposal to introduce a regional fuel tax to help pay for improvements to the transport system?**

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area. Of the 1301 submissions received, 12225 respondents provided a response to this question. Of these, 54% do not support the proposal while 39% support the proposal.

![Graph showing support and non-support for regional fuel tax]

A review of submitters comments suggested people are opposed the tax due to the cost and concerns about lack of investment in infrastructure in the east Auckland area, with perceived lack of public transport options. Others supported that tax on the basis that transport issues need to be addressed and the tax allows this, provided it is spent on transport. Other submitters also suggested congestion charges as a fairer method of raising funds.

"Regional tax will only be beneficial if all the areas in Auckland get benefit. Public transport connectivity and frequency is non reliable in Howick area"

"This will affect businesses that use personal transport to work however it may cause road users to rethink their use and through efficiency reduce their time on the road. Until road users reduce road use then the 10 cents/litre is well worth investing in transport projects and services"

"Auckland is so behind the rest of the world in terms of public transport. If adding a fuel tax to motorists speeds up the work to improve the public transport system, then fine, on the proviso that a clear end date is given for the end of the fuel tax and this date is adhered to”

"This tax will affect all motorists, even those who don’t contribute to road congestion. A fairer method would be congestion charges, collected electronically via pickups fitted to vehicles. The public transport options in our area are pathetic, no train service and an inconvenient bus service. So we are forced to travel by private car"
"I don’t mind paying more but it needs to go towards transport! Transport is the biggest issue with Auckland, and we need to implement light rail to help people get to their jobs efficiently. This means light rail to the Airport, and to East Auckland (Botany - via Te Irirangi Dr). Everybody is focusing on the other parts of Auckland, but have completely forgotten about East Auckland that is just as big. They only have buses, and buses are no good in traffic, they also create a lot of pollution!"

**Issue 2: Natural environment**

Aucklanders were asked whether they would support a water quality targeted rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2: Our harbours, beaches and streams are being polluted by overflows from ageing sewage and stormwater systems that can’t cope with heavy rainfall and from contaminants washed into natural waterways. We want to improve our infrastructure to address this problem. Under current budgets this would take 30 years to achieve. We propose to introduce a new targeted rate to increase our funding of water infrastructure and speed up delivery of cleaner harbours, beaches and streams to 10 years. Our proposed targeted rate would cost the average residential ratepayer $56 per year ($1.30 per week), although this will vary based on your property value. What is your opinion on this proposed targeted rate to speed up the delivery of cleaner harbours, beaches and streams?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area. Of the 1301 submissions received, 1220 respondents provided a response to this question. Of these, 58% support the proposed targeted rate for water quality while 36% are opposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing support and non-support for water quality targeted rate]

A review of submitters comments demonstrates that most people value a water quality and agree with the goals of the targeted rate. The targeted rate was seen as a small cost given the importance of water quality. However, many believe this is core council business and should be funded by existing rates. Furthermore, a targeted rate should focus on business/commercial properties and not residential. Others would prefer to flat rate as opposed to a rate based on the capital value.

"It’s important to look after our environment, not just for ourselves, but for future generations"

"$56 is not much for such an important goal."

"This is work you are meant to be doing with the existing rates take. Businesses and the council itself (with run off from roads) are the main polluters. The rate should not be residential, business only"

"Improving the infrastructure is very important but funds should be derived from other sources rather than increased rates"

"Do not support extra cost based on property value. This is a wealth tax when while the value of your property does not have any relationship to your ability to pay such as people on superannuation"
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People were also asked if they supported a natural environment targeted rate. Two options (A and B) were provided for the natural environment targeted rate.

**Question 3:** Auckland’s rapid growth is putting pressure on the environment, as is the spread of pests, weeds and diseases that are threatening many of our native species. Approximately two-thirds of Auckland’s local native species are under threat of extinction.

Our proposal is to invest more in environment initiatives and to fund this through a targeted rate (based on your property value) at one of two levels described below.

**Option A** – a targeted rate of an average rate of $21 per year per residential ratepayer. This increase would allow us to make limited improvements to environmental protection, mainly focusing on kauri dieback disease.

**Option B** – a targeted rate of an average rate of $47 per year per residential ratepayer. This increase would allow us to spend more on tackling kauri dieback disease, and allow us to better protect our native species and ecosystems.

**What is your opinion on a proposed targeted rate to invest more to protect our environment?**

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area. Of the 1301 submissions received, 1221 respondents provided a response to this question. Of these, 37% do not support the targeted rate, 27% support Option A ($21 p.a.), 22% support Option B ($47 p.a.) and 13% prefer another option.

A review of the comments made by submitters suggests most people value the environment and support the intentions of the targeted rate. However, many questioned whether this was a local government issue and suggested central government should fund these initiatives. Some submitters emphasised the small amount of money per ratepayer compared with the benefits, while others were willing to pay more to achieve the goals of the full Pest Management Plan. Others suggested that it would be fairer for all people in Auckland to pay, not just ratepayers and that it was unfair to base the rate on property value.

“Locking after our environment should be a top priority same as the previous question we need to fix now before it’s too late”

“once again, $47 over a year comes down to barely a dollar a week for the average ratepayer... and so little can achieve so much”

“I reluctantly support this initiative. Surely this is a central government issue as it involves fauna and wildlife that serves a national interest”

“These measures should be covered by DOC. We shouldn’t be asked for yet more money”
“Environmental protection is not a primary issue for the council. Focus on making the city more liveable for your residents first”

“Property value should not determine fee charged. The fee should be levied on all AKL residents and therefore would bring some degree of responsibility to all”

“I want to protect our forests from invading pests like kauri dieback, predators and weeds, therefore I want full funding for the Regional Pest Management Plan and for our natural environment”

“I think that the environment is very much what makes a lot of Auckland so nice, and I would be happy to pay more to sustain it. However, if this were to become a long term rate, I could see it becoming problematic with some households. If the results were efficient and effective, I would be happy to support it, so it would be very disappointing if the extra money didn’t make a significant impact”

People were asked about a proposed rates increase of 2.5 percent for the first two years and 3.5 percent for years three to 10.

**Question 4:** For this 10-year Budget we are proposing an average general rates increase of 2.5 percent for the first two years and then 3.5 percent for years three to 10. This will be used to fund our growing city. Without this level of rate increase, we would have to reduce existing service levels and defer or cut some currently planned projects.

What is your opinion on this proposed rates increase?

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area. Of the 1301 submissions received, 1188 respondents provided a response to this question. Of these, 49% do not support the rates proposal and 41% do support the rates proposal.

![Pie chart showing support, do not support, and other responses]

A review of the comments made by submitters indicated those in support recognised there was a need, and people should be contributing if we expect high levels of services and community facilities. In contrary, others believe the council to be inefficient and were concerned about ever increasing rates while levels of service in the community (particularly in relation to maintenance, grass mowing, etc) have reduced. The inability of people on fixed incomes to pay increased rates also contributed to a lack of support. Concerns were also expressed around transparency and perceived frivolous spending:

“People shouldn’t demand a good level of services but not expect to pay for them!”

“We live in this city and although I may not use all the facilities - it will be better for our future community and generations”

“I’m mixed on this as evidence has not been provided as to why this rate is necessary, yes it’s a growing city so more rates should be coming in from new Aucklanders, not taking off the existing ones”
“Although a rates increase may not be popular among some people, I feel strongly that it is up to each individual to contribute towards making Auckland a better place and ensuring we can keep up with future growth and sustainability.”

“There is no way people like myself on fixed incomes can even contemplate this type of increase. Look at interest rates, barely 2% and the reserve bank says unlikely to increase in the medium term. Council needs to recognise that there are 10’s of thousands if not 100’s of thousands in this position where we cannot improve our income”

“The council needs to learn to do more with less cost, otherwise there is no end to the cost escalation. Stop wasting money on attracting tourists, etc. Stick to core functions. Split the council into smaller entities to get rid of overpaid management positions. No council or CCO employee, director or elected member should be paid more than $100k per year. Completely eliminate all use of consultants. Until the council has eliminated all wastage, it is not in a moral position to demand more money from residents, many of whom currently can barely afford to survive in this city”

“Perhaps I’m not looking in the right place, but I often wonder where all my tax payer dollars go, especially when I see money being spent in what seems frivolous ways on things that don’t benefit many people. I understand that tax increases are inevitable, but I’d like to see more accountability, more sense, more transparency go into what money is being spent on. We need to feel like our money is being well spent, in a way that the majority of the people benefit from, and agree with”

“The proposed rate increase which is quite dramatic for some properties like ours and neighbours as was the valuation increase. As the rate increase is for some obscure reason dependent on the land value the subsequent results are often ridiculous. Ours is a prime example. We live in a “transition Zone”, a kilometre of road amongst residential areas surrounding us. We have no water supply, no fire hydrants, sewage, street lights, curbing and one footpath. This situation has not changed since we moved here 37 years ago. At present our rates are $4,700 and with the new CV which has increased by 100%, the new proposed rates show an increase of $2,000 and we will still get nothing. Quote Council website “A change in your property’s value does not mean that your rates will increase or decrease by the amount of the change - instead your property’s new value will determine the share of rates that you pay”. Really!”

Secondly people were asked about whether online accommodation providers that meet particular thresholds should pay business rates and the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate.

**Question 5:** We are proposing that online accommodation providers (e.g. Airbnb properties) who let out their whole property (not just a room) for a certain number of days per year should pay business rates and the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (if the property is within a certain zone). This would mean they are treated the same way as other accommodation providers. What is your opinion on this proposal?

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area. Of the 1301 submissions received, 1117 respondents provided a response to this question. Of these, 67% support the online accommodation provider rate, while 256 are opposed.
A review of submitters commented identified several themes:

- General support based on the level playing field – treating online accommodation as a business and applying the same rules faced by other accommodation providers
- Recognition of the impact of Airbnb on availability of normal rental housing and neighbourhoods
- Concern about the impacts on tourism and also recognition that tourists impact on the cities infrastructure
- Need for provisions to ensure people who occasionally rent out their house are treated differently from those who effectively rent a house only for online accommodation
- Need for more public discussion and clarification in relation to this proposal

“Tourism is becoming New Zealand leading industry and this change would hurt it”

“Air bnb provides the same services as a hotel (under certain conditions) so therefore should be treated like one”

“Sounds fair that they should pay business rates for what is effectively a business”

“As long as this is only applied to those who do this for a significant portion of the year, and 2 years in a row I support it. It should not apply to those who only do this occasionally, or if there is a one off longer period (eg while owners do an overseas trip)”

“Absolutely! They are running a business and should operate and pay as such. They are also undercutting the professional accommodation providers, who have to invest heavily in training/certification/compliance to meet legal requirements. Whereas anyone can setup a AirBnB and not be bound by the same laws that affect (say) a motel or Hotel, for compliance of health & safety. Issue 4: other changes and budget information”

“I see this as closing a loophole that allowed people to profit off of a technicality, at the expense of the area as a whole. Short-term accommodation is necessary, but too much is detrimental for the neighborhood and providers should pay the cost of that”

“Landlords should not take housing away from local people. Tourism needs to grow through the proper channels and not by taking housing stock away from locals that need it”

“Absolutely - it is clear that tourists add to Auckland’s issues - environment, rental cars on the road, ignorance of rubbish/recycling requirements etc”

Aucklanders were asked if they had any other feedback on matters in the consultation document.
Question 7: Please provide any other feedback on other matters in the consultation document or supporting information, such as changes to waste service charges (targeted rate to fund food waste collection service and standardisation of user-pays refuse collection), Tūpuna Maunga Authority Draft Operational Plan or the proposal to disestablish Auckland Council Investments Limited.

A small number (11) of submitters commented on the proposal to dis-establish Auckland Council Investments Limited. Eight submitters were in favour of disestablishment, and three were opposed. One submitter emphasised the importance of keeping Ports of Auckland and Airport shares, while another suggested the Airport shares be sold to fund water quality improvements.

Fifteen people made submissions on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority Draft Operational Plan – of these comments the overwhelming theme was the need to retain access, including vehicle access so people with walking issues can access the maunga. Comments also related to maintenance, and opposition to the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

In relation to the Revenue and Finance Policy, four submitters supported this proposal while three were opposed.

Feedback on other regional proposals with a local impact

Feedback was received from the Howick Local Board area on other regional proposals:

- Howick Historical Village is requesting $500,000 regional funding in addition to current funding.
- GETBA is requesting planned intersection improvements/widening be brought forward in the major arterial route of Smale and Allen’s Roads, which feeds into Highbook Drive, particularly where it intersects with Springs and Harris Roads. GETBA is requesting this upgrade be addressed within the next three-year funding period. They would also like improvements around the Gossamer/Tī Rakau/Trugood/Cryers/Harris area promised as part of AMETI to be brought forward. Also support the Preston/Ormiston Rd intersection upgrade.
- Pakuranga Bowling, Tennis and Gymnastics Clubs seeking funding to establish a multi-sport facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park (see also local funding requests).
- “We need to support Auckland Justice’s Peace Association’s submission for annual funding of $100,000 per year. I am a Justice of the Peace member of AJPA. This submission supports the Outcome ‘Belonging and Participation — All Aucklanders will be part of and contribute to society, access opportunities, and have the chance to develop to their full potential.’ Focus area 2. Provide accessible services and social infrastructure that are responsive to people’s evolving needs.”
5. Overview of feedback received on the Auckland Plan 2050 from Howick Local Board area

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets our long-term direction and looks at the important challenges we need to address in the following outcome areas:

- Outcome area 1: Belonging and participation
- Outcome area 2: Māori identity and wellbeing
- Outcome area 3: Homes and places
- Outcome area 4: Transport and access
- Outcome area 5: Environment and cultural heritage
- Outcome area 6: Opportunity and prosperity.

There is a question in the feedback form that relates to each outcome area. The questions and text below are directly from the feedback form. The feedback from the Howick Local Board area is set out under each question.

Question 1: An inclusive Auckland

In a fast-growing city of increasing diversity and social change, people may or may not feel included or enjoy positive life experiences. The Auckland Plan proposes an inclusive Auckland where people live together with trust and mutual respect and everyone has the opportunity to participate to their full potential.

Do you think the six focus areas identified in Belonging and Participation will achieve this?

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 1065 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.

[Graph showing support, do not support, partially support percentages]

Question 2: Advance Māori well-being

The strengths and contributions Māori bring to Auckland will fuel economic growth and advance Māori well-being. With nearly a third of all Māori in Auckland aged under 15 years old, the Auckland Plan proposes investing more in tamariki and rangatahi to advance Māori well-being.

Do you think the seven focus areas identified in Māori Well-being and Identity will achieve this?

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 999 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.
Question 3: Affordable homes

Lack of affordable housing is creating stress for many Aucklanders. It is driving some key workers out of Auckland and limiting our ability to attract and retain talent. The Auckland Plan proposes that all Aucklanders deserve healthy, affordable homes with secure tenure in well-designed places, whether they own or rent their homes.

**Do you think the five focus areas identified in Homes and Places will achieve this?**

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 1059 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.

Question 4: Moving easily around Auckland

People lack choice in how they get around and it can take a long time to get where they need to go. To better connect people and places, the Auckland Plan proposes an integrated transport system that accelerates progress on walking, cycling and public transport and makes better use of existing networks.

**Do you think the seven focus areas identified in Transport and Access will achieve this?**

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 1074 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.
Question 5: Protecting and enhancing our environment

Unprecedented growth has required Auckland to provide for essential development, which has had an impact on our environment and cultural heritage. The Auckland Plan proposes utilising every opportunity to protect and enhance Auckland’s environment as growth and development happens.

Do you think the six focus areas identified in Environment and Cultural Heritage will achieve this?

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 1022 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.

- Support: 55%
- Do not support: 35%
- Partially: 10%

Question 6: Equipping people for future jobs

Rapid technology advances will create challenges, opportunities and change across many industries and jobs. The Auckland Plan proposes Aucklanders will need to adapt to the coming changes by investing in education, training and skills development for all.

Do you think the five focus areas identified in Opportunity and Prosperity will achieve this?

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 999 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.

- Support: 46%
- Do not support: 37%
- Partially: 17%

Question 7: Shaping our growth

Auckland has to provide for around 740,000 more people in the next 30 years, which would mean another 320,000 dwellings and up to 270,000 extra jobs. The Auckland Plan proposes to manage long-term population growth by prioritising development in existing urban areas and establishing new communities and new business land in future urban areas. Investment in Auckland’s infrastructure will need to keep up with the pace and scale of growth.

Do you think the proposed approach for enabling growth will effectively provide for Auckland’s future?

Of the 1301 submitters in the Howick area, 1009 responded to this question. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Howick Local Board area.
Appendices

Appendix A contains a compiled PDF of all the 10 year budget and Auckland Plan submissions for the Howick Local Board Area.

Appendix B contains a regional consultation summary in relation to the WMMP plan.
Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Briefing Report on Feedback Received from the Howick Local Board Area

Purpose
To summarise feedback received from residents of the Howick Local Board area on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

Executive Summary
Overall, 173 submissions were received on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from the board area. This represented eight per cent of the total submissions received. Responses suggested that the majority of submitters supported the overall direction of the draft plan with:

- 84 per cent supporting expanding council’s focus to non-domestic waste
- 79 per cent supporting working with businesses to reduce construction and demolition, plastic and organic waste
- 85 per cent supporting the expansion of the council’s network of Community Recycling Centres
- 86 per cent supporting advocacy for product stewardship and container deposit schemes

Submitters also included a number of comments on themes such as the food scraps collection and other waste issues.

Context
This report is provided to the local board summarising the consultation feedback received on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from their area. The report covers the key consultation topics raised, primarily, through feedback form.

This report only covers formal submissions received by 28 March 2018. Late or informal submissions have not been included in the analysis due to time constraints.

Waste-related feedback given through the Long-term Plan consultation process is not described in this report. This is covered in attachment A which summarises all feedback received from the board area on the long-term plan, including on waste issues.

A report summarising all submissions from across the region to the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 is available on the Auckland Council website: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say/hearings/find-hearing/Pages/Hearing-documents.aspx?HearingId=202. The Waste Hearings Panel will consider this report when they meet from 30 April to 11 May.

The final plan will then be approved by Environment and Community Committee on 12 June 2018.
Overview of Submissions

At the close of the submission period on 28 March 2018, 6,758 submissions had been received online and in hard copy form. 96 submissions were provided by video and drawings.

4,605 of the submissions received were pro forma submissions from the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance. These did not answer feedback form questions and did not include an address. They are therefore not included in the statistics for the local board below.

The total number of submissions which specified a board area is shown below. 173 of these (eight per cent) were from the Howick Local Board area.

Table 1: Number of Submitters by Local Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board</th>
<th>Number of submitters</th>
<th>Percentage of submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Local Board</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Local Board</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki Local Board</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa Local Board</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Local Board</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa Local Board</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Local Board</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

Attachment B

Item 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board</th>
<th>Number of submitters</th>
<th>Percentage of submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke Local Board</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāmata Local Board</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau Local Board</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Supplied (non ARA)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Auckland</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Not Supplied ARA</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown by Submission Type

As shown in Tables 2 and 3 below, submissions were received in various forms, including on the feedback form (on-line and written), long-form submissions, pro forma submissions and informal submissions including videos and drawings.

Table 2. Regional Breakdown by Formal Submission Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal submission type*</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Videos and drawings</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other informal submissions</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have your say event feed back</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Types of Informal Submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal submission type*</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Videos and drawings</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other informal submissions</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Your Say event feed back</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for Key Directions

The consultation feedback form asked respondents to answer seven questions relating to key directions in the waste plan. Responses to each from residents of the board area are summarised below in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4. Priority Outcomes for Board Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% submissions local board</th>
<th>% submissions regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Auckland Council is responsible for managing and minimising waste across the region. When we make decisions about waste, which outcomes are most important to you? (Please select up to 3 options.)</td>
<td>Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of collection services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing environmental and marine pollution</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tidy public places</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that the highest priority for residents of the board area was reducing environmental and marine pollution. The lowest priority was creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries.

Table 5. Local and Regional Support for Key Directions in Draft Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>% submissions Local board</th>
<th>% submissions regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. In the last plan, we focused mostly on our services to households, which handle around 20 per cent of the waste that goes to landfill. Now we want to expand our waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities. What do you think of this approach and why?</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The three largest categories of commercial waste going to landfill are construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste (food, green and other types of organic waste). We want to work with</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. We want to make it easy for people to make better choices locally about how they dispose of unwanted items, so those items can be reused or recycled. Five Community Recycling Centres are up and running and we have plans to provide seven more by 2024. What do you think of this approach and why?</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>44%</th>
<th>59%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. We want to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where drink containers such as plastic, glass bottles and cans include a refundable deposit when returned for recycling. This would encourage more recycling and help to shift the costs of recovery from council and ratepayers to the producers and consumers of beverages. What do you think of this approach and why?</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>54%</th>
<th>61%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. The Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan sets a vision and outlines a practical approach to waste management and minimisation for the communities of Waiheke, Actaea Great Barrier, Rakino and Kawau Islands. What do you think about the approach outlined in this plan and why?</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>27%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional comments about the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:

Some of the key themes from submissions in the Howick Local Board area are provided below with some typical comments:

**Food Scraps Collection**

Maybe some discounts available for those composting at home eg discounts for buying hungry bins and other systems.

Am not impressed to have another $67 added to my rates to get rid of rubbish I can compost on my section. This should apply to apartment dwellers only.
We need to roll out the food waste collection soon.

Organic food waste bin essential

I do not agree with the kerbside collection of food scraps.

Yes the proposal for small containers for organic waste is unjust and quite comic. Most households, as I have stated before, compost or use waste disposal sink units. I would imagine very little organic waste goes into the red lid bins, I for one object strongly to having to pay for a service I would not use.

Other Comments

I think we need more and more accessible soft plastic recycle or that be part of the recycling scheme and have more education in school about soft plastic recycling. More no waste shop in all area.

Fabulous, businesses have the most food waste and introduce the most plastic packaging into households, there should be a phase out on all plastic bags and reduction single use plastic as well.

Howick is becoming very untidy and dirty. It is often the businesses that contribute to this. They seem unaccountable. It is a pity that Howick is becoming so unloved.

The traditional way of dealing with these 'wastes' are not working for Auckland - they are imposing financial and environmental costs. This is not necessary as these wastes can be used as resources, but the business perception and ease of disposal of these products needs to change. Levies and bans are regulatory tools that Council should consider at a regional scale for these wastes; along with investing in capacity building and training schemes, new market stimulation - in conjunction with lobbying central government to enact priority products in the WMA (but don't just leave it to them, as it may still never happen). Organic waste needs to be addressed immediately for multiple reasons - food accessibility and carbon reduction in particular.

I fully support the idea of more CRCs, they create jobs and provide upskilling opportunities for locals. They also make it easier for people to dispose of their waste if they don't have a vehicle.

Community recycling centers do not always take all items that can be recycled. They may be difficult to access if you do not have a trailer to transport larger items.

More choices but also easy access so people don't 'dump' stuff because it's too far or travel time expensive. Make it rewarding like in the past ... with beer bottles or 'rewards of some kind, even if its local recognition.
2017/2018 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) operating projects to be deferred to 2018/2019

The following projects meet the criteria for deferral under the Local Board Funding Policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community grants</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility partnership fund</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Pride of Place (Tamaki River Festival)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green assets</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity: Youth participation in council decision making and youth-led initiatives</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Initiatives</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$805,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

File No.: CP2018/06223

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide analysis of public feedback on the review of the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy and to seek the views of the local board on the proposed policy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
Replacement of legacy schemes for natural heritage and community and sporting organisations with grants

2. The Rates Remission and Postponement Policy proposal provides for:
   • transfer of current budget for legacy remission schemes to the operating group with relevant expertise (e.g. remissions budget for Natural Heritage will transfer to Environmental Services while those for local community facilities will transfer to the relevant local board as asset based service funding)
   • current recipient receives same support (exc GST) as a grant guaranteed for three years
   • development of an integrated approach to supporting outcomes for natural heritage, and community and sporting activities across the region.

3. 112 submitters opposed the proposal and 28 supported it. 91 submitters, including the Queen Elizabeth the Second Trust (QEII) and Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand, wanted remissions retained for land with a QEII covenant. 27 responses cited the uncertainty of ongoing support. 24 thought grants would require more administration. 9 respondents stated they would be worse off as they were not GST registered.

4. Currently there is significant regional variation in the level of support available and how it is provided (for example, remissions, grants, subsidised rentals.) Depending on location, some properties are receiving multiple forms of council funding. This leads to inequity and a lack of transparency in the use of council funding.

5. This proposal aligns this legacy funding with council’s broader funding for these activities. The proposal is a transitional step that enables the relevant council groups to integrate this legacy funding into regionally consistent support schemes.

6. Officers recommend that the proposal be adopted with the following amendments:
   • budget increased by $10,000 to cover the cost of GST for recipients not GST registered
   • direct officers to work with sector groups on the development of an integrated approach to council support for these activities.

Introduction of a remission for the accommodation provider targeted rate (APTR)

7. The proposed remission provided for owners of no more than two serviced apartments with long term fixed rental leases to hotel operators to receive a remission of the APTR. The remission would be reduced in equal steps over ten years. 39 submitters supported and 30 were opposed to the proposal. 13 thought the APTR should not be charged while 11 wanted the remission scheme to be more generous.

8. Officers recommend adoption of the APTR remission scheme as proposed.
Amendments to regional remissions

9. 6 submitters were supportive of aspects of the regional schemes, and none were opposed. Officers recommend adoption as proposed.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations

That the Howick Local Board endorses the:

a) proposal to:
   i. transfer current budget for legacy remissions schemes for natural heritage and community and sports organisations to the operating group with relevant expertise
   ii. transfer current budget for postponements for Great Barrier Island businesses to Great Barrier Island Local Board
   iii. grant the current recipient the same support guaranteed for three years
   iv. develop an integrated approach to supporting outcomes for natural heritage, and community and sporting activities across the region

b) Rates Remission and Postponement Policy in Attachment B to this report, which includes the following amendments to the existing policy:
   i. introduction of a remission scheme for the Accommodation Provider Targeted rate.
   ii. amendments to the remission for residents of licence to occupy retirement villages and Papakāinga housing to remove references to retirement villages and the Interim Transport Levy
   iii. amendments to simplify the remission for rates penalties
   iv. removal of the legacy remissions schemes for natural heritage and community and sports organisations and postponement for Great Barrier Island
   v. amendments to the postponement for Manukau Sport Clubs to restrict the scheme to current applicants and to close off the scheme after three years.

Horopaki / Context

10. Council is required to review and consult on its Rates Remission and Postponement Policy every six years. The policy was last reviewed in 2012.

11. The policy offers eleven legacy remissions and postponement schemes that were carried over from the previous councils. These schemes only apply in the district of the originating council. They providing varying levels of support for:
   - community and sporting organisations
   - rating units protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes
   - commercial properties on Great Barrier Island.

12. A summary of the level of funding provided by these remission schemes by local board is in Attachment C. Attachment D provides a list of community and sporting organisations receiving support by local board area.

13. The policy also includes seven regional schemes that provide financial assistance or address anomalies in how rates are applied.

14. When the APTR was adopted in 2017 the council asked officers to consider applications for remissions for properties with long term fixed rental agreements with hotel operators and forward contracts that didn’t include provision for price adjustments. These were considered under the Remission of Rates for Miscellaneous Purposes scheme.
15. A review of the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy was undertaken by officers. Local Boards provided feedback on the draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policy at their December meetings. The draft policy for consultation was agreed by the 27 February meeting of the Finance and Performance Committee.

16. Consultation was open to the public from 13 March to 13 April. Notification of the consultation was targeted to:
   - current recipients of legacy remission and postponement schemes
   - ratepayers currently charged the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate
   - administrators for retirement villages currently receiving the remission for licence to occupy retirement villages and Papakāinga.
   - relevant key stakeholders including the Queen Elizabeth II Trust and Forest and Bird.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

17. Analysis of feedback and officers responses has been separated into the key issues on which feedback was received. A summary of feedback by Local Board is in Attachment A.

Legacy remission and postponement schemes

Proposal

18. The proposal retained the current budget for each legacy scheme and transferred administration and budget to the operating group with the relevant expertise. Decision making for regional activities would fall under the relevant operating group delegation and local asset based services with local boards.

19. Support would be provided in the form of a grant rather than a remission. Current recipients would receive a grant (exc GST) at the same level as the existing remission for a period of three years adjusted for any changes in their rates.

20. Officers would report back on the integration of these grants with a wider approach to supporting these activities, developed with sector groups, within the three year transition.

21. The draft policy retained the postponement of rates for two Manukau golf clubs for a period three years after which it would expire. At the end of the three years any postponed rates would remain as a liability on the property, to be paid on sale or transfer of the property.

Feedback

22. 153 submitters provided feedback on the proposal for legacy schemes for natural heritage and community and sports organisations. Responses are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback on Legacy Remission</th>
<th>Number of submitters who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports proposal</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposes proposal</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback related to remissions for natural heritage

23. 105 submitters commented on legacy remissions for natural heritage, with 91 opposed to the proposal. Key themes from feedback and officers comments are set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Feedback Points</th>
<th>Officers Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEII covenanted land should be non-rateable</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Land is only non-rateable if owned or used by (for example under a lease) the QEII Trust. The QEII Trust is empowered by its establishing legislation to pay the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Feedback Points</td>
<td>Officers Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rates on land that has a covenant to the Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be worse off because not GST registered</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Officers recommend funding the GST component which would leave recipients in the same position as currently. This will cost $10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing support (after three years) is uncertain</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Neither grants nor remissions guarantee on-going support, as policies can be changed. All support should be subject to regular review to ensure value for ratepayers in terms of outcomes achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants require more administration</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grants can provide long-term support with same administration requirements as current schemes. Properties in Waitakere already receive grants for rates in the same position as currently. This will cost $10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants will not encourage people to covenant land in future</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>The incentive value of remissions is minimal compared to the opportunity cost of covenating land. Council offers grants that can be used for costs associated with covenating land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remissions recognise value to environment of QEII covenants</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Grants offer flexibility to increase recognition of the beneficial outcomes achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remissions recognise the cost of maintaining covenanted land</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Amount of remission is limited to the amount of rates charged to the land and is not related to the costs of maintenance. Grants provide more flexibility in level of support offered. This issue can be considered when options for future support are developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of maintaining QE2 land as identified in Waikato study¹ which put the cost to owners for establishing a covenant at $64,000, and the annual cost of maintain the land at $6000.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Figures in the study were derived from a sample of properties with QE2 covenants, of which 11 were in Auckland. For the Auckland sample, the study records an average cost for establishment as $8,457 in cash and $2,818 in non-cash costs. Annual maintenance costs were $319 cash and $1,062 non-cash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing remissions is inconsistent with RMA and/or Unitary Plan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Council uses a variety of mechanisms to meet its obligations under the RMA and Unitary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend remissions to SEAs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Significant Ecological Area status does not guarantee enduring protection for native habitats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback related to remissions for community and sporting organisations

24. 36 submitters commented on legacy remissions for community and sporting organisations, of which 15 represented organisations receiving a remission. The following table sets out the key themes from submitters commenting on remissions for community groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Feedback Points</th>
<th>Officers Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing support is uncertain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Neither grants nor remissions guarantee on-going support, as policies can be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants require more administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Grants can provide long-term support with same administration requirements as current schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support should be continue because of the benefit the organisation provides to the community</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Feedback reflects concerns for continuation of support rather than the form in which it is received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing support will have significant financial impact on organisation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>It is proposed that options for future support be developed with input from relevant sectors within the three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports grants or remissions so long as support maintained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Waikato University: “2017 Investment in Covenanted Land Conservation” prepared for the Queen Elizabeth the Second Trust
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Feedback Points</th>
<th>Officers Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates cost will need to be met through existing funding agreement with council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harmonising funding mechanisms will reduce administration for some organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. No feedback was received on the proposals for postponements for Manukau Sports Clubs that are provided to two golf clubs. One submitter opposed the transfer of rates postponements to Great Barrier Island businesses to grants as they thought any future loss of support may make essential services financially unviable.

Key Stakeholder Feedback

26. The Queen Elizabeth the Second Trust and Forest and Bird, opposed the proposal to replace legacy remissions with grants for QEII covenanted land. The feedback of the QE II Trust and Forest and Bird reflect the key feedback points above. Federated Farmers considered that transitioning legacy remissions for natural heritage and community and sporting organisations to grants would signal a lack of commitment by council to these activities. Both the QE II Trust and Federated Farmers supported consideration by the council of grants in addition to remissions for QEII covenanted land.

Remission for the Accommodation provider targeted rate

Proposal

27. The draft policy proposed a new remission scheme to remit APTR for the following:
   - properties used as emergency accommodation, in proportion to the amount of time and the part of the property that is put to this use
   - ratepayers who own no more than two serviced apartments, who are paid a fixed rent by a hotel operator (with no profit sharing), and who are unable to pass on the cost of the rate and unable to exit the contract before the start of rating year. (A partial remission will apply where the lease to the accommodation operator expires during the rating year.) This remission will be phased out over 10 years, with the amount of remission available declining by a tenth each year.

28. Remissions under this scheme are expected to cost ratepayers $1.2 million in 2018/2019, with this amount declining over the next ten years.

29. 73 submitters provided feedback with 39 in support of the proposal and 30 opposed. Of those opposed, 5 thought the remission should be more generous. The key themes from feedback are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Remissions</th>
<th>Feedback Points</th>
<th>Officers Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remission assists those who most need it</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This feedback reflects the key issues for and against adoption of an APTR remission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remission supported because can't pass on rate to operator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remission shouldn't be offered - everyone should pay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No APTR should be charged</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 supported and 6 opposed the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remission should be available to more properties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 supported, 4 opposed proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full remission should be granted until lease ends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 supported proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should use bed tax or similar charge rather than APTR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 supported, 1 opposed proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. None of the key stakeholder organisations notified of the consultation opted to make a submission.

Amendment to regional schemes

Proposal

31. The proposed changes are:
rates penalties – simplifying the scheme for easier administration
license to occupy retirement villages and Papakāinga housing – removes references to:
  o retirement villages as residents now qualify for central government rates rebates
  o Interim Transport Levy (should this levy not be continued.)
remission for rates transition management policy change properties – this scheme is redundant.

Feedback
32. Two submitters supported the proposed change to the Remission for licence to occupy retirement villages and Papakāinga scheme. Grey Power requested that the scheme remain unchanged until the rates rebate process has been established. 4 submitters broadly supported the policy. Grey Power and 4 other submitters wanted greater support for older/retired residents in general.
33. One submitter supported the changes to the penalty scheme.

Conclusions and Recommendations
34. Officers recommend that for the legacy remissions schemes:
  • transfer of the current budget to the operating group with relevant expertise
  • current recipient receives same support (exc GST) as a grant guaranteed for three years
  • development of a standardised approach to support of these outcomes across the region
  • an increase in the budget of $10,000 to cover GST cost for recipients not registered for GST.
35. The proposal:
  • maintains supports for existing recipients with a three year transition
  • aligns responsibility for these grants with relevant areas of council
  • allows this support to be considered alongside other sources of funding as regionally consistent support mechanisms are developed
  • remove the current legacy remissions schemes.
36. Grants are recommended over remissions as they offer greater transparency and oversight for rates expenditure. The proposal provides a first step in transitioning the issue of equitable council support for natural heritage and community and sporting organisations and recognises that support is currently inconsistent across the region. Currently, some areas may be able access remissions while others receive grants, subsidised rents or are directly supported to deliver services for council. For example, two sports facilities receive remissions and community access grants, while 16 of the 42 recipients of the Green Network Grants for rates also claim the rates remission.
37. Officers also recommend the changes to the regional schemes in the Rates remission and postponement policy and the introduction of a scheme for the Remission of the accommodation provider targeted rate be adopted as proposed.

Alternative Options
38. Officers considered the following alternatives but do not recommend them. The council could choose to:
  • retain the existing schemes - this will continue the current inequities in regional support.
  • remove the schemes without a transition -potential for significant impact for current recipients particularly as other forms of council support are not always consistently available across the region.
extend the remission schemes to cover the entire region - would require further policy work to develop appropriate options and have substantially increased cost. Does not align support with other council funding mechanisms. Level of support determined by rates (driven by property values) rather than outcomes achieved.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe /
Local impacts and local board views

39. Implications for local boards are set out in the report. Under the proposal boards will be provided with additional asset based service funding to maintain the existing level of support for local community and sports groups in their board area that currently receive remissions (or postponements in the case of Great Barrier Island).

40. The amount of support provided by the rates remission and postponement policy varies significantly by local board area. (A summary of the amount of remissions, and the individual schemes by board area is in Attachment C.) In other areas, support may be provided to through grants, discounted rentals, and the direct provision of facilities and services by council. Within the three year transition period, officers will report back on options for integrating funding mechanisms across the region.

41. Analysis of feedback by local board area is Attachment A to the report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

42. No significant feedback was received from Māori or Māori organisations. Māori land is eligible for support under the Rates remission for Māori freehold land policy. This policy is not under review.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

43. The financial implications are set out in the report.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

44. There are no identified risks.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

45. Local board feedback will reported to the 30 May meeting of the Finance and Performance Committee for the consideration and adoption of the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Feedback by local board</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Proposed Draft Remission Policy</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Remission value by local board</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Community and Sports Remissions by local board (Under Separate Cover) - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Sullivan - Principal Advisor Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Duncan - Manager Financial Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A: Feedback on the Draft Rates Remission and Postponement Policy summarised by Local Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>No of submitters receiving remission</th>
<th>Supports Proposal for Legacy Remissions</th>
<th>Opposes Proposal for Legacy remissions</th>
<th>Supports APTR Remission</th>
<th>Opposes APTR Remission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangare-Otahuhu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otaheite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukeatapapa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Auckland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B: Draft Rates remission and postponement policy

Policy purpose and overview

The objective of this policy is to:
- provide ratepayers with some financial or other assistance where they might otherwise have difficulty meeting their obligations
- address circumstances where the rating system results in anomalies in the incidence of rates
- support the achievement of broader council policy objectives.

The council’s remission and postponement policy is set out in three parts each containing a number of schemes.

Part 1 - Financial assistance and support

- remission of rates to top-up the rates rebate
- remission for residents who occupy Papakāinga housing under a licence to occupy
- remission of rates penalties
- postponement of rates for residential properties
- remission of accommodation provider targeted rate.

Part 2 - Addressing anomalies

- remission of rates for miscellaneous purposes
- remission of uniform annual general charges and targeted rates levied as uniform annual charges on certain rating units.

Part 3 - Other schemes

- postponement of rates for sports clubs in the district of the former Manukau City Council

Policy background

Section 102(5) of the Local Government Act 2002 provides that a council may have a rates remission and postponement policy.
Full details and criteria for the remission and postponement schemes

This section has the full details of each remission and postponement scheme, as well as outlining the objectives and criteria for each scheme.

Applications

The ratepayer or ratepayer’s agent must apply to the council on the prescribed remission or postponement form. The application should show how the remission or postponement will support the objectives of the scheme and how the property fits within the objectives. For the rates to be remitted or postponed, the council may require evidence each year, by way of statutory declaration, to confirm that the rating unit still complies with the conditions and criteria of the scheme. The council can apply for the remission or postponement on behalf of the ratepayer, provided the council is certain that the property meets all the criteria of the scheme. The council reserves the right to seek further information if it deems it necessary.

The remission or postponement will apply from the beginning of the rating period in which the application is approved and will not be backdated to prior years, unless otherwise stated in the scheme.

Part 1 - Financial assistance and support schemes

Remission of rates to top-up the rates rebate

Objectives

The objective of this remission scheme is to enable the council to address the inequity that results from Auckland ratepayers being unable to include water and wastewater charges when applying for the central government’s rate rebate scheme. This scheme allows the council to remit the difference between its rates rebate top-up calculation and the government’s rates rebate scheme to include Watercare Services Limited’s and Veolia Water Limited’s (previously United Water Limited) water and wastewater charges in the calculation.

Conditions and criteria

To be eligible for the top-up remission, the ratepayer must meet the following criteria:

1. be a residential ratepayer and reside on the property
2. have resided on the property at the beginning of the rating year (1 July)
3. be an individual, rather than an organisation or trust. The amount remitted will vary according to the:
   a. ratepayer’s gross income, including any overseas income
   b. amount of Auckland Council rates payable by the ratepayer
   c. amount of water and wastewater charges payable by the ratepayer
   d. number of children or other dependants that the ratepayer supports
e. maximum rebate and threshold limits set by central government under its rebate scheme.

Central government updates thresholds for its rates rebate scheme each year. The council’s extended rates rebate scheme is automatically updated for the new thresholds.

Remission for residents who occupy Papakāinga housing under a licence to occupy

Objectives

This remission scheme allows council to remit the uniform annual general charge for residents of Papakāinga housing who would otherwise qualify for central government’s rate rebate scheme, except they occupy their property under a licence to occupy agreement.

The remission will be applied to the rates of the Papakāinga in which the applicant resides, where an agreement exists between the village operator and Auckland Council (see more below). The benefit of the rates remission will be passed to the resident.

Conditions and criteria

To be eligible for the licence to occupy remission, the applicant must meet the following criteria:

1. be a resident of Papakāinga housing under a licence to occupy agreement
2. reside in a unit or apartment that is identified by Auckland Council as a separately used or inhabited part of the Papakāinga housing to which a separate uniform annual general charge is applied
3. reside in Papakāinga housing that has entered into an agreement with Auckland Council to:
   f. identify the rates for applicants to the scheme
   g. pass the full benefit of any rates remission granted under this scheme to the successful applicant
4. have resided on the property at the beginning of the rating year (1 July)
5. be an individual, rather than an organisation or trust
6. only one application per unit or apartment will be accepted.

Granting of a remission will depend on:
1. the applicant’s gross household income, including any overseas income
2. the share of Auckland Council rates payable by the applicant to Papakāinga housing in which the applicant resides
3. the maximum rebate and threshold limits set by central government under its rebate scheme.

Central government updates thresholds for its rates rebate scheme each year. The council’s remission for residents of a “license to occupy” within Papakāinga housing is automatically updated for the new thresholds.

How to apply

The management of Papakāinga housing accepted into the scheme will provide application forms to their residents.
Remission of rates penalties

Objectives

The objective of this scheme is to enable the council to act fairly and reasonably in relation to penalties applied when rates have not been received by the due date.

Conditions and criteria

Penalties on rates may be remitted when one or more of the following criteria are met.

1. The ratepayer has paid after the penalty date for no more than one instalment, but has not received a rates penalty remission under this policy within the past two years.
2. A new ratepayer for a rating unit has not received the rates instalment notice due to the notice of the sale or transfer of the rating unit not being received by the council prior to the issue of the instalment notice.
3. The penalties incurred on the first instalment of each new financial year will be automatically remitted if the ratepayer pays the total amount of rates due for the year, excluding the penalty on the first instalment, but including any arrears owing at the beginning of the financial year, by the second instalment due date.
4. Where the ratepayer meets the payment conditions agreed with the council to resolve arrears, the council can remit any part of the penalties already incurred in the current rating year, or yet to be incurred.

The remission will apply from the beginning of the rating period in which the application is approved and will not be backdated to prior years.

Treatment of penalties on small overdue balances

When a small balance is overdue, which it is uneconomical to collect, council officers may write off the balance in line with other council procedures. Penalties will not be applied in these circumstances.

Postponement of rates for residential properties

Objectives

The objective of this scheme is to assist residential ratepayers who want to defer the payment of rates by using the equity in their property. This scheme also applies to those who may have financial difficulties or unusual circumstances, as long as they have the required equity in their property.

Criteria

The ratepayer must meet the following criteria to be considered for rates postponement:

1. The ratepayer must be the current owner of the rating unit and owned the property for at least two years.
2. The rating unit must be used solely by the ratepayer as his or her residence.
3. The postponed rates will not exceed 80 per cent of the available equity in the property. The available equity is the difference between the council’s valuation of the property (the capital value at the most recent triennial revaluation) and the value of any encumbrances.
against the property, including mortgages or loans, if the ratepayer has insured the property for its full value. Otherwise, the available equity will be the 80 per cent of council’s valuation of the land less any encumbrances against the property.

4. The ratepayer or the ratepayer’s authorised agent must apply to the council on the prescribed form.

Conditions

1. The council recommends that ratepayers considering postponing their rates seek advice from a financial adviser on the financial impacts and appropriateness of postponing their rates.
2. The council will postpone payment of the residual rates (what is left after any optional payment) if the ratepayer meets the above criteria.
3. The council may add a postponement fee each year to the postponed rates. The fee will cover the period from when the rates were originally due to when they are paid. The fee will not exceed the council’s administrative and financial costs of the postponement.
4. The postponement will apply from the beginning of the rating year in which the application for postponement is made, although the council may backdate the postponement application depending on the circumstances.
5. Once the postponed rates are equal to, or greater than, 80 per cent of the available equity in the property, no further rates will be postponed. Any postponement will apply until one of the situations listed below occurs, at which time the postponed rates (and any postponement fee) will be immediately payable:
   a. the ratepayer’s death
   b. the ratepayer no longer owns the rating unit
   c. the ratepayer stops using the property as his or her residence
   d. a date set by the council in a particular case.
6. All or part of the postponed rates may be paid at any time.
7. The applicant can choose to postpone the payment of a lesser amount of rates than the full amount that they would be entitled to postpone under this policy.
8. Postponed rates will be registered as a statutory land charge on the rating unit’s title.
9. For the rates to be postponed, the council will require evidence each year, by way of statutory declaration, of the ratepayer’s property insurance and the value of encumbrances against the property, including mortgages and loans.

Remission of accommodation provider targeted rate

Objectives

The objective of this scheme is to promote fairness in the application of the Accommodation provider targeted rate by allowing the council to remit the rate in circumstances where it is equitable to do so.

Criteria and conditions

The council may remit the accommodation provider targeted rate, where the application meets one of the following criteria:
1. The ratepayer owns no more than two rating units that attract the Accommodation provider targeted rate, and which are under contract to be used as serviced apartments, and where the applicant can demonstrate that they have
   a. entered into a contractual arrangement regarding the use of the rating unit as commercial accommodation prior to 1 June 2017
   b. no contractual or relational/negotiating means of managing the additional costs of the rate
   c. no ability to exit, terminate or renegotiate the contract prior to the start of the rating year in which remission is applied for.

2. Where the applicant has contracted some or all of their commercial accommodation capacity to Work and Income New Zealand or other central government agency for the purpose of emergency housing.

Amount of rate to be remitted

For remissions granted under criterion 1 of this scheme:

- 100 per cent of the Accommodation provider targeted rate for the qualifying rating units in 2001/2019, with the amount of remission declining in equal steps until 2027/2028 when 10 per cent of the Accommodation provider targeted rate will be remitted. This remission scheme will expire on 30 June 2028.
- the amount of remission will be reduced on a proportional basis where the applicant is able to exit, terminate or renegotiate the contract during the rating year.

For remissions granted under criterion 2 of this scheme:

- A proportion of the Accommodation provider targeted rate calculated as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of rooms or units under contract} \times \text{Number days under contract}}{\text{Total number of rooms or units in motel or hotel}} \times 365
\]

Part 2 - Addressing anomalies in schemes

Remission of rates for miscellaneous purposes

Objectives

The objective of this scheme is to enable the council to remit rates in circumstances that are not specifically covered by other schemes in the rates remission and postponement policy, but where the council considers it appropriate to do so.

Conditions and criteria

The council may remit rates on a rating unit where it considers it just and equitable to do so because:

1. There are special circumstances in relation to the rating unit, or the incidence of the rates (or a particular rate) assessed for the rating unit, which mean that the unit’s rates are disproportionate to those assessed for comparable rating units.
2. The circumstances of the rating unit or the ratepayer are comparable to those where a remission may be granted under the council’s other rates remission policies, but are not actually covered by any of those policies.

3. There are exceptional circumstances that the council believes that it is equitable to remit the rates. The council has the final discretion to decide whether to grant a rates remission under this policy.

Remission of uniform annual general charges and targeted rates levied as fixed charges on rating units

Objectives

The objective of this scheme is to promote fairness in the application of rating by allowing the council to remit fixed charges in circumstances where it is equitable to do so.

Conditions and criteria

The council may remit uniform annual general charges and targeted rates levied as fixed charges, where the application meets one of the following criteria:

1. The rating unit is used solely for vehicle parking in conjunction with a building on a rating unit in the same ownership, and no car parking is available on the main property.

2. The rating unit is used jointly with one or more units as a single farm or horticultural entity and the group of rating units would otherwise be treated as a single rating unit, except that:
   a. the units are not strictly contiguous (for example, a farm run-off block).
   b. the occupier of all the rating units is the same but the occupier does not own the rating units or does not own all the rating units.

3. The rating unit is Māori land used jointly with one or more Māori land units as a single entity and the group of rating units would otherwise be treated as a single rating unit, except that:
   a. the units are not strictly contiguous
   b. the occupier of all the rating units is the same but the occupier does not own the rating units or does not own all the rating units.

4. The rating unit is classed by the council as a remote island that is uninhabitable or cannot be used for any practical use.

A remission will not apply to any rate that is levied for:
   a. separate residential dwelling or business located on the rating unit
   b. service actually provided to the rating unit.

Owners wishing to claim a remission under this policy may be required to make a written application or declaration and to supply such evidence as may be requested to verify that a remission should be granted under this policy.

Part 3 - Other schemes

Postponement of rates for land described as Lot 2 DP 476554 or Lot 2 DP 510763

Objectives
To provide continued relief for three years to the two rating units that had rates postponed under the former Auckland Council rates postponement scheme “Postponement of rates for sports clubs in the district of the former Manukau City Council”.

Postponement had previously been granted to sports clubs where the rateable value of land that was owned and used for sports was significantly attributable to potential residential development or subdivision. Postponement of rates will not be available to any other land under this scheme.

Conditions and criteria

1. For the purposes of this scheme
   a. ‘sports’ means any organised outdoor sport but excludes horse or dog racing of any kind and ‘sporting’ has a corresponding meaning
   b. to be eligible the land used for sports must not be less than 5 hectares and must be part of the land described as Lot 2 DP 476554 or Lot 2 DP 510783

2. The rates postponement value is to be determined:
   a. so as to exclude any potential value that, at the date of valuation, the rating unit may have for non-sporting uses
   b. so as to preserve the uniformity and equitable relativity with comparable parcels of land within the district of the former Manukau City Council and used for sporting purposes, the values of which do not contain any such potential value

3. There will be no right of objection to the rates postponement value determined under clause 2(a) and (b), except to the extent that it is proved that the rates postponement value does not preserve uniformity with existing District Valuation roll values for comparable rating units (used for sporting purposes) within the district of the former Manukau City Council having no potential value for non-sporting development.

4. Where a rates postponement value has been determined, the payment of rates will be deemed to have been postponed for the portion of the rates for any rating period of an amount equal to the difference between the amount of the rates for that period calculated according to the rateable value of the rating unit and the amount of the rates that would be payable for that period if the rates postponement value of the rating unit were its rateable value.

5. All rates whose payment has been postponed under this scheme will become due and payable immediately:
   a. on the rating unit ceasing to be used for sporting purposes
   b. where the ratepayer parts with possession of the rating unit or assigns or attempts to assign the rating unit in any way or for any purpose other than the giving of security for funds intended to be used for the further development of the rating unit for sporting purposes
   c. where the rating unit or part of the rating unit is developed for any purpose other than sports

6. The postponement will generally apply from the beginning of the rating period in which the rate postponement value is determined.

7. Postponed rates will be registered as a statutory land charge on the title of the rating unit.

8. The council will add a postponement fee to the postponed rates for the period between the due date and the date they are paid. This fee will not exceed an amount which covers the council's administration and financial costs (an annual interest rate to be set by the council).

9. No further rates may be postponed under this scheme after 30 June 2021.
Delegation of decision-making

Decisions relating to the remission or postponement of rates payments will be made by council officers.
## Attachment C: Value of legacy schemes by local board area

(Remissions for community/sporting are split by regional and local. Excludes council properties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Local Community and Sporting Remissions</th>
<th>Regional Community and Sporting Remissions</th>
<th>Regional Heritage (Covenanted land) Remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number granted</td>
<td>Amount Remitted</td>
<td>Number granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$21,142.44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$55,608.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$86,531.28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$777.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$293.85</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$54,855.64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,888.22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$33,331.08</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,148.24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$884.60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,274.33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$21,846.83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,427.35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$841.88</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,626.73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$112,909.12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$6,723.05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,616.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,460.28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitertatā</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$947.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$3,750.21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>$414,185.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Average value of legacy remission per property by Local Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Local Community and Sporting Remissions</th>
<th>Regional Community and Sporting Remissions</th>
<th>Heritage (Covenanted land) Remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$1,006.78</td>
<td>$2,694.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$5,560.85</td>
<td>$2,603.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$2,110.52</td>
<td>$2,103.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$77.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>$391.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$146.93</td>
<td>$136.70</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$3,428.48</td>
<td>$3,824.64</td>
<td>$3,351.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$2,444.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>$178.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāpiti</td>
<td>$2,083.19</td>
<td>$2,980.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$574.12</td>
<td>$253.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$442.30</td>
<td>$255.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$254.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,265.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>$1,986.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,128.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>$142.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$280.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>$166.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$271.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>$262.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$2,822.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,248.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$747.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5719.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>$323.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>$203.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$205.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitēmatā</td>
<td>$315.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,074.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$416.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>$248.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total**                    | **$1,832.68**                           |                                           | **$1,713.69**                       | **$595.23**
### Summary of schemes by Local Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Value of Remission</th>
<th>Local remissions</th>
<th>Regional remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$21,142</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former North Shore City Council</td>
<td>Land owned and occupied by a charitable organisation, which is used exclusively or principally for sporting, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>$55,405</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Value of Remission</th>
<th>Local remissions</th>
<th>Regional remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Franklin District Council</td>
<td>Land owned and occupied by a charitable organisation, which is used exclusively or principally for sporting, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>50 to 100%</td>
<td>$85,762</td>
<td>$31,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Remission of rates for natural areas protected in the district of the former Franklin District Council</td>
<td>Natural areas that have, voluntarily, been appropriately physically and legally protected or classified</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$1,273</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Remission of rates for rating units in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>10% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Remission of rates on land in the district of the former Papakura District Council protected for natural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 covenant or similar covenant for natural conservation purposes</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$5,407</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>Remission of rates for private covenanted land in the district of the former Auckland City Council</td>
<td>• Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 covenant • conservation covenant under section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>Postponement of rates for commercial properties on Great Barrier island</td>
<td>Postpones part of the value of the rates for business properties. Rates are written off after 6 years if business use continues. 20% of capital value based rate</td>
<td>$2,800 p.a. with $10,400 total postponed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$294</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>Remission of rates for rating units in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>10% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amount remitted</td>
<td>no. granted</td>
<td>amount remitted</td>
<td>no. granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former North Shore City Council</td>
<td>Land owned and occupied by a charitable organisation, which is used exclusively or principally for sporting, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>$38,160</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates where organisations by their existence in the district directly benefit the residents of the district of the former Rodney District Council</td>
<td>Sport, recreation and welfare organisations in the district of the former Rodney District Council which directly benefit the residents of the district.</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
<td>$15,916</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$4,868</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postponement of rates for sports clubs in the district of the former Manukau City Council</td>
<td>Available to three golf clubs, of which two have utilised the scheme</td>
<td>Rates associated with value of land’s potential for redevelopment</td>
<td>See confidential attachment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

**Attachment C**  
**Item 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Value of Remission</th>
<th>Local remissions</th>
<th>Regional remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$1,063</td>
<td>$059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former North Shore City Council</td>
<td>Land owned and occupied by a charitable organisation, which is used exclusively or principally for sporting, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>$32,248</td>
<td>$35,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$1,148</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtāhuhū</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$885</td>
<td>$766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>Postponement of rates for sports clubs in the district of the former Manukau City Council</td>
<td>Available to three golf-clubs, of which two have utilised the scheme</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$1,274</td>
<td>$11,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orākei</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$21,847</td>
<td>$2,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$1,427</td>
<td>$1,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Postponement of rates for sports clubs in the district of the former Manukau City Council</td>
<td>Available to three golf-club, of which two have utilised the scheme</td>
<td>Rates associated with value of land's potential for redevelopment</td>
<td>See confidential attachment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$642</td>
<td>$1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>Remission of rates on land in the district of the former Papakura District Council protected for natural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 covenant or similar covenant for natural conservation purposes</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
<td>$524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission for land in the district of the former Rodney District Council voluntarily protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$1,016 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Remission for land in the district of the former Rodney District Council voluntarily protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$16,170 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$365 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Remission of rates for rating units in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>10% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$534 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Remission of rates where organisations by their existence in the district directly benefit the residents of the district of the former Rodney District Council</td>
<td>Sport, recreation and welfare organisations in the district of the former Rodney District Council which directly benefit the residents of the district</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
<td>$112,544 38</td>
<td>$11,243 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td>$620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former North Shore City Council</td>
<td>Land owned and occupied by a charitable organisation, which is used exclusively or principally for sporting, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>$6,415</td>
<td>$56,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Remission of rates for rating units in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>10% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Franklin District Council</td>
<td>Land owned and occupied by a charitable organisation, which is used exclusively or principally for sporting, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>50 to 100%</td>
<td>$737</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>Remission of rates for private covenanted land in the district of the former Auckland City Council</td>
<td>• Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 covenant • conservation covenant under section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$2,898</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>Remission of rates for private covenanted land in the district of the former Auckland City Council</td>
<td>• Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 covenant • conservation covenant under section 77 of the Reserves Act 1977</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$21,440</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount remitted</td>
<td>No. granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Remission for land in the district of the former Rodney District Council voluntarily protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>100% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$621</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$2,460</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Remission of rates for rating units in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>10% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$392</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$948</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
<td>Local remissions</td>
<td>Regional remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Remission of rates for community, sporting and other organisations providing community services in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td>Not for profit sport, recreation clubs or associations, or organisations providing community services providing significant public good</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Remission of rates for rating units in the district of the former Auckland Regional Council protected for natural or historic or cultural conservation purposes</td>
<td>Land voluntarily protected by a covenant or equivalent protection mechanism</td>
<td>10% of the rates for the part of the land protected</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. This report seeks formal local board feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and the draft Contributions Policy 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) sets out a ten-year capital and operating programme for transport in Auckland. It covers transport activities delivered by Auckland Transport, the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), Auckland Council and KiwiRail.
3. The draft RLTP has been developed in collaboration with the NZTA. Legislation requires that the RLTP is revised every six years and reviewed after three years. It has been agreed that the level of change associated with Auckland’s growth warrants a full revision of the RLTP.
4. The RLTP will be consulted with the public between 1 and 14 May 2018.
5. Alongside the RLTP, Auckland Council is consulting the public on a draft Regional Fuel Tax (RFT) proposal. The council consulted on a fuel tax to fund transport improvements as part of the 10-year Budget. The regional fuel tax, if introduced, would add 10 cents a litre (plus GST), and generate approximately $1.5 billion over 10 years for transport projects in Auckland. At the time, the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) and the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) were still under review so the projects proposed to be funded by a regional fuel tax could not be identified. The draft RFT proposal sets out the programmes and projects that the regional fuel tax would fund.
6. The draft RFT proposal is conditional on the enactment of the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill which is currently passing through the Parliamentary process.
7. The Council is also consulting on a draft Contributions Policy 2018. The draft Contributions Policy proposes an increase in development contributions to reflect additional investment, including for parks.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation
That the Howick Local Board give formal written feedback on:

a) the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan
b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal
c) the draft Contributions Policy.

Horopaki / Context
Regional Land Transport Plan
8. The Land Transport Management Act 2003 requires that the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) prepare an RLTP every six years, which sets out the region’s transport priorities for the next ten years and must contribute to the purposes of the Land Transport Management Act and be consistent with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS).
9. At its meeting of 24 October 2017, the Auckland Transport Board agreed that the level of change associated with Auckland’s growth warrants a full review of the RLTP. Since the
2015 RLTP was prepared, Auckland’s population growth has increased at a much faster pace than was envisaged. By 2028, the population of Auckland is expected to be around two million people – four years earlier than projected in 2015. Significant investment in transport infrastructure and services will be required to meet the increasing needs of these additional people both to service new housing required to match growth and to service many more customers.

10. The draft RLTP, included in Attachment A, has been developed in collaboration with the NZTA and was considered by the Regional Transport Committee (a committee comprised of the Auckland Transport Board and a representative of the NZTA convened to adopt the RLTP) on 1 February 2018, and was subsequently approved by the Chair and Deputy Chair under delegation.

11. Preparation of the draft RLTP and consultation were delayed as the GPS and ATAP were still under review, leading to some uncertainty about project priorities. Both the GPS and ATAP have now been released and have informed the draft RLTP.

**Regional Fuel Tax**

12. In preparing the 10-year Budget 2018-28, the Council considered a range of funding options for its activities. The consultation on the 10-year Budget signalled that in order to achieve the level of investment that Auckland needs to address its transport issues, new funding mechanisms for transport were required. An RFT of 10 cents per litre plus GST was proposed, subject to central government providing a legislative basis for such a tax.

13. While the RFT, as a funding mechanism, was the subject of consultation, there was no ability to identify the projects that might be funded from the RFT at that time, due to the review of the GPS and ATAP.

14. The government has initiated the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill. If passed, this will enable Auckland to levy a regional fuel tax of up to 10 cents per litre, plus GST, from 1 July 2018.

15. A draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal, included in Attachment B, has been developed based on the requirements of the draft legislation. While the legislation is still to progress through the full Parliamentary process, the transitional provisions in the legislation mean that Auckland Council can develop a draft proposal, consult with the public, and submit to the responsible Ministers (the Minister of Finance and Minister of Transport) for consideration, once the legislation has been passed.

**Contributions Policy**

16. Development contributions enable the Council to charge developers for a portion of the cost of growth infrastructure needed as a result of development. The current Contributions Policy expires on 30 June 2018. The policy needs to be amended to reflect changes to capital expenditure in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and the RLTP.

17. Over the next ten years, the council needs to fund additional infrastructure to enable the construction of 120,000 dwellings to house an expected 300,000 additional Aucklanders. The 10-year Budget also allowed for an increase in investment in parks.

18. The proposed Contributions Policy 2018, included in Attachment C, proposes an increase in both urban and greenfield prices to reflect this additional investment.

19. Central government has recently introduced the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill which would restore the Council’s ability to use development contributions to fund public swimming pools and libraries. It is not certain when this legislation will be passed so provision for the inclusion of public swimming pools and libraries has not been included in the draft Contributions Policy 2018. Once the legislation has been passed the Council can consider amending the policy to include the growth component of any qualifying expenditure or to prioritise within the expenditure programme for community infrastructure.
20. The timetable for this process is very compressed. Public consultation on the draft RLTP, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy will run for two weeks between 1 May and 14 May 2018.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
21. The consultation material for the draft 2018-2028 RLTP, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Development Contributions Policy have been attached for local boards consideration. Formal feedback on these consultation documents is being sought from local boards through this report.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
22. The RLTP sets out a ten-year regional programme. Early engagement with local boards has taken place to ensure that projects of particular interest to local communities could be taken into account in the prioritisation process by which the programme was developed.

23. This report provides the opportunity for local boards to give formal feedback on the capital and operating programmes, and any other aspects of the RLTP, including projects of particular interest to local communities. In particular, feedback from local boards is sought on whether the RLTP places the appropriate emphasis on the priority areas.

24. The draft RFT proposal reflects the priority projects in the RLTP, along with a few specific local board priorities.

25. The draft proposal signals the Council’s intent to exclude Great Barrier Island from the regional fuel tax, in line with council’s submission on the draft legislation and subject to the legislation being amended accordingly. The consultation will also signal council’s advocacy in support of rebates being enabled for fuel that is purchased for off-road use, an issue which has been raised by a few local boards.

26. The draft Contributions Policy price varies by location depending on the cost of infrastructure required to support development in an area. The capital expenditure programme to be funded by development contributions was included in the draft 10-year budget and local boards can provide feedback on the proposed programme through the LTP process.

27. Local boards have been invited to attend a briefing on the draft RLTP on 30 April 2018, followed by a full day of informal hearings-style sessions on 7 May 2018 with representatives of the Auckland Transport Board to give verbal feedback. This report enables boards to provide formal feedback to inform further decision-making on the RLTP.

28. The draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and draft Contributions Policy will also be covered in the briefing. Formal feedback from local boards will be considered by the Governing Body and/or the Finance and Performance Committee when making their decisions on the Regional Fuel Tax and the 10-year Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
29. Many components of the RLTP are of importance to and impact on Māori. The RLTP is one of the tools that can enable and can demonstrate responsiveness to Māori. Early engagement with mana whenua took place throughout the region during the development of the draft.

30. The introduction of a regional fuel tax will negatively impact some lower socio-economic communities who do not have access to alternative transport options and rely on their private vehicles. Māori tend to represent a high proportion of these communities, however, many of the projects that will be funded by the regional fuel tax are targeted at improving transport access to jobs and education for these communities as well as providing greater public transport alternatives. In the longer term, this should have a positive impact for these communities.
31. The impact on Māori for the changes to development contributions will be similar to the impact on other residents and ratepayers. The Council’s Māori Cultural Initiatives Fund provides grants to support marae and papakāinga development and can be used to fund development contributions. The Contributions Policy treats Kaumatua housing the same as retirement villages, which generally place lower demands on council services.

32. There is a need to continue to build relationships between the Council, transport agencies, mana whenua, and where relevant the wider Māori community. Ongoing engagement will assist the Council and agencies in understanding priorities for Māori, and can encourage Māori participation in decision-making processes.

33. Appropriate engagement on the RLTP, RFT Proposal and Contributions Policy are planned for the consultation period.

Ngā ritenga a-pūtea / Financial implications

34. The financial implications of the draft RLTP, RFT Proposal and Contributions Policy are set out in those documents. There are no specific financial implications from seeking local board feedback.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

35. This report seeks local board feedback on draft regional proposals, which is part of the local board role. There are no specific risks from this process.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

36. Possible changes to the RLTP, RFT Proposal, and Contributions Policy will be considered following public consultation.

37. The RFT Proposal will be considered by the Governing Body for adoption and submission to Government on 31 May 2018.

38. Decisions on the Contributions Policy will also be made on 31 May 2018, with the final policy document planned to be adopted on 27 June 2018.

39. The final RLTP document will be considered by the Auckland Transport Board for approval prior to 30 June 2018.
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Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Howick Local Board:

a) note the confidential status of Attachment D - Community and Sports Remissions by local board to item 13 Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy.

13 Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy - Attachment D - Community and Sports Remissions by local board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of a deceased person. In particular, the report contains information on individual rating units and public inspection is not permitted under s38(1)(e) of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
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