
Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Briefing Report on Feedback Received from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Area

Purpose

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

Executive Summary

Overall, 51 submissions were received on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from the board area. This represented two per cent of the total submissions received. Responses suggested that the majority of submitters supported the overall direction of the draft plan with:

- 75 per cent supporting expanding council's focus to non-domestic waste
- 83 per cent supporting working with businesses to reduce construction and demolition, plastic and organic waste
- 75 per cent supporting the expansion of the council's network of Community Recycling Centres
- 73 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, Māori priorities, waste minimisation education and zero waste events.

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.

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. 51 (two per cent) of these were from the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area.

Table 1: Number of Submitters by Local Board Area

Local board	Number of submitters	Percentage of submitters
Albert-Eden Local Board	172	8%
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board	97	5%
Franklin Local Board	57	3%
Great Barrier Local Board	7	0%
Henderson-Massey Local Board	99	5%
Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	114	5%
Howick Local Board	173	8%
Kaipātiki Local Board	97	5%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board	51	2%
Manurewa Local Board	112	5%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board	100	5%
Ōrākei Local Board	85	4%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board	50	2%
Papakura Local Board	68	3%
Puketāpapa Local Board	35	2%
Rodney Local Board	190	9%
Upper Harbour Local Board	57	3%

Local board	Number of submitters	Percentage of submitters
Waiheke Local Board	75	3%
Waitākere Ranges Local Board	96	4%
Waitematā Local Board	130	6%
Whau Local Board	88	4%
Regional	1	0%
Not Supplied (non ARA)	174	8%
Outside Auckland	25	1%
*Not Supplied ARA	4,605	

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

Informal submission type*	Number of comments
Videos and drawings	96
Other informal submissions	1478
Have your say event feed back	449
Total	2023

Table 3. Types of Informal Submissions

Informal submission type*	Number of comments
Videos and drawings	96
Other informal submissions	1,478
Have Your Say event feed back	449
Total	2,023

Support for Key Directions in Draft Plan

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

Table 4. Priority Outcomes for Board Residents

Question	Response	% submissions local board	% submissions regional
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.)	Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders	6%	14%
	Reliability of collection services	6%	9%
	Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions	28%	26%
	Reducing environmental and marine pollution	28%	26%
	Tidy public places	13%	13%
	Creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries	17%	9%
	Other	1%	3%

Results showed that the highest priorities for residents of the board area were reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions and reducing environmental and marine pollution. The lowest priorities were delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders and reliability of collection services.

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

Question	Response	% submissions Local board	% submissions regional
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?	Strongly agree	67%	57%
	Agree	8%	27%
	Neutral	4%	5%
	Disagree	4%	2%
	Strongly disagree	12%	5%
	Don't know	6%	2%
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	Strongly agree	75%	60%
	Agree	8%	27%
	Neutral	4%	4%
	Disagree	2%	1%
	Strongly disagree	8%	7%
	Don't know	4%	1%

businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why?			
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?	Strongly agree	65%	59%
	Agree	10%	27%
	Neutral	6%	5%
	Disagree	4%	1%
	Strongly disagree	14%	7%
	Don't know	2%	1%
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?	Strongly agree	59%	61%
	Agree	14%	23%
	Neutral	12%	4%
	Disagree	2%	2%
	Strongly disagree	12%	8%
	Don't know	0%	2%
6. The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. The <i>Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan</i> sets a vision and outlines a practical approach to waste management and minimisation for the communities of Waiheke, Aotea Great Barrier, Rakino and Kawau Islands. What do you think about the approach outlined in this plan and why?	Strongly agree	43%	27%
	Agree	13%	24%
	Neutral	15%	16%
	Disagree	2%	1%
	Strongly disagree	11%	4%
	Don't know	17%	28%

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

Some of the key themes from submissions in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area are highlighted below with some typical comments:

Food Scraps Collection

Organic waste pick ups

Let's have an organic food waste pick up

Charging all rate payers for a service they don't need is not fair. I live in south Auckland, own chickens (to feed food scraps), have a worm farm (to eat what the chickens don't), and have

a very simple compost heap that every household in nz could build for free. I paid over \$300 for my worm farm, and the cost of supplementing my chickens diet on top of that. I love the idea to encourage aucklanders to reconsider how their food waste is disposed, but do not believe we should all be charged for this service. Thank you.

Household kitchen waste collection will reduce waste to landfill significantly

Māori Priorities

Prioritize Maori perspective

Get Maori to teach you about Para kore. Change our systems to suit each individual community. What works in East or Central Auckland doesn't work in South Auckland.

Our marae Papatuanuku Marae are active in this Kaupapa. Use us along the way

Waste Minimisation Education and Zero Waste Events

The council should provide increased support to community groups and schools that have zero waste initiatives. These groups provide much needed waste education for communities and increased funding would allow them to expand their efforts. Council can also support Auckland events that are aiming to be zero waste. This could include checking the events are actually zero waste when they say they are. Lastly, separated bins in public spaces so that people can separate waste easily.

Council should continue its ongoing support and education for communities on how to reduce waste, including increased funding for schools to implement waste minimization programmes and educate our children. this approach in south Auckland has been effective and created innovative ways to get the word out

We need; - more support for community events to be zero waste, including checking whether events that say they're reducing waste really are.- separated bins (recycling, landfill, food waste) in public spaces.

More community education waste events and support for this - compulsory 3 waste streams.

Other Comments

Mangere bridge wants separated bins (recycling, landfill, food waste) in its village business area - we think this approach should also be extended to other public spaces.

Council should walk the waste talk not just in its offices but in all Council-operated sites city-wide, demonstrating three waste streams in all locations eg swimming pools, sports centres, libraries etc.

Keep the good work - I would work for free to pick up rubbish around my own roads and community.