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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

An apology from Member C Brewer has 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

The Rodney Local Board will confirm the minutes from the business meeting of Thursday, 19 April 2018 at its business meeting on Thursday, 17 May 2018.

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 7.7 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 Rodney 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.: CP2018/05875

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 2017/2018.

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 / Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) receive the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and draft Auckland Plan 2050 consultation feedback report (Attachment A to the agenda report).

b) receive the consultation feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (Attachment B to the agenda report).
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, noting that a report on the proposed Rodney transport targeted rate will be the subject of a future report to a business meeting.

f) recommends 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 $484,400 of 2017/2018 Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) operating expenditure to be deferred to 2018/2019 to the Governing Body (Attachment C to the report).

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

j) provide feedback on the draft Auckland Plan 2050.

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

l) note that the following redacted submissions are available on the following link:

   https://aklcwmy.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/localboards_aklcwmy_onmicrosoft_com/EkBZlo0bEZhMkVzJsO5LHUBXQ10e4ceihX1Djh7FlqE92A?e=OSOi5B

i. submissions on the Rodney Local Board priorities

ii. submissions on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and draft Auckland Plan 2050 from people or organisations based in the Rodney Local Board area.

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 three in the local board area. Feedback was received through written, event and social media channels.

12. Consultation feedback on the Rodney Local Board priorities for 2018/19 and on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 from people or organisations based in the Rodney 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 are available through the Auckland Council website at the following link:

https://aklcwm-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/localboards_aklcwm_onmicrosoft_com/EkBZlo0bEZhMkVzJs0SLHU8BX10e4ceiHX1DJH7FtgE92A?e=OSOi5B

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

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 Rodney 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 Rodney 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
   - 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 Rodney 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. The analysis in 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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<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Scheduled meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>27 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Plan 2050</td>
<td>Planning Committee</td>
<td>5 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<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 Rodney Local Board

1. Purpose

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

- Feedback on the Rodney 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 Rodney local board area.

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

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 Rodney Local Board priorities for 2018/2019

The local board consulted on the following 5 priorities:

- Priority 1: the completion of a masterplan (concept plan) for the future reserve at Green Road, Dairy Flat
- Priority 2: contributing funding to the design of the future multisport building at the Warkworth Showgrounds
- Priority 3: funding and supporting community projects to improve our town centres
- Priority 4: contributing funding to construct a local indoor court facility at Huapai Domain (OLI)
- Priority 5: transport targeted rate

The majority of people either partially support (45 per cent) or support (25 per cent) the local board’s priorities and consider that the local board is heading in the right direction. Only 29 per cent of submitters disagreed with the local board’s priorities, with most of them citing that not enough in being done for roading and transport issues, or coping with growth.
Feedback on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 from the Rodney local board area

Out of the 26,556 written submissions received on the regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, 1,799 submissions were from people living in the Rodney local board area.

**Issue 1: Transport**

Feedback shows the majority of submissions for Rodney do not support the proposed regional fuel tax (56 per cent)

**Issue 2: Natural Environment**

The majority of submissions for Rodney support the proposed water quality targeted rate (54 per cent)

**Issue 3: Rates and charges**

The submissions indicate that there is support for the natural environment targeted rate (50 per cent) but there was a division as to whether the rate should be $21 per year (23 per cent) or $47 per year (27 per cent). Only 36 per cent of submissions opposed the proposed rate entirely.

**Issue 4: Other changes and budget information**

The submissions indicate that people in Rodney do not support the proposed rate rises of 2.5 per cent for the first three years of the 10 yr budget and 3.5 per cent thereafter, with 52 per cent of responses against this proposal.

There is clear support for the online accommodation providers targeted rate with 60 per cent of submissions in support of this proposal.

Feedback on the Auckland Plan 2050 from the Rodney local board area

Most submissions on the Auckland Plan 2050 outcome areas were evenly divided between agree, not agree and partially agree across all six outcome areas. Few showed clear agreement or disagreement with the statement that the focus areas would lead to the outcomes proposed.

**Outcome area 1: Belonging and participation**

Most submissions either agreed (38 per cent) or partially agreed (35 per cent) that the focus areas in the Auckland Plan 2050 would lead to a more inclusive Auckland. Only 29 per cent did not agree with this statement.

**Outcome area 2: Māori identity and wellbeing**

Most submissions either agreed (31 per cent) or partially agreed (29 per cent) that the focus areas would support Māori wellbeing, however the largest singular group was those that did not agree with this statement (41 per cent).

**Outcome area 3: Homes and places**

Only 28 per cent of submissions agreed that the focus areas would lead to more affordable homes in Auckland. A further 38 per cent partially agreed with this statement, and 34 per cent did not agree.

**Outcome area 4: Transport and access**

Most submissions agreed (41 per cent) or partially agreed (38 per cent) that the focus areas would make moving around Auckland easier, with only 24 per cent not agreeing with this statement.
Outcome area 5: Environment and cultural heritage

A clear majority of the submissions (52 per cent) agree that the focus areas would lead to the protecting and enhancing of our environment. Only 17 per cent disagreed with this statement.

Outcome area 6: Opportunity and prosperity

Most submissions either agreed (38 per cent) or partially agreed (38 per cent) that the focus areas in the Auckland Plan 2050 would equip people for future jobs. Only 24 per cent did not agree with this statement.

Shaping our growth

Most submissions agreed (39 per cent) or partially agreed (35 per cent) that the proposed approach for enabling growth would prepare Auckland for the future; 26 per cent of submissions did not agree with this statement.

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 Rodney 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 – 26,555 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 Auckland Council’s Facebook and Twitter (@aklcouncil). Additional comments were received through local board Facebook pages and other pages.
4. Feedback received on Rodney Local Board priorities for 2018/19

The Rodney local board consulted on the following 5 priorities:

- Priority 1: the completion of a masterplan (concept plan) for the future reserve at Green Road, Dairy Flat
- Priority 2: contributing funding to the design of the future multisport building at the Warkworth Showgrounds
- Priority 3: funding and supporting community projects to improve our town centres
- Priority 4: contributing funding to construct a local indoor court facility at Huapai Domain (OLI)
- Priority 5: transport targeted rate

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

- Transport, in particular the congestion and travel times on State Highway 16 and at Hill Street, the general lack of public transport throughout Rodney, and the need to seal Rodney’s unsealed roads.
- Growth and the perception that Auckland Council cannot keep up with growth and address growth related issues, most notably traffic congestion, but also a lack of local services, facilities and infrastructure that is no longer fit for purpose.
- That Auckland Council continues to focus on the CED and does not provide enough services or spending in the north.
- That not enough is being done for the smaller towns, mainly Wellsford and Helensville, but also the towns/villages of Kaukapakapa, Omaha and Matakana get particular mention with submitters stating that they feel “forgotten”.

A summary of the feedback received through each channel is provided below.

Feedback received through written submissions

1,799 written submissions were received on Rodney local board priorities for 2018/19 in total.

A total of 1,287 pieces of written feedback were received regarding the local board’s general priorities, showing that the majority of people either partially support (45 per cent) or support (26 per cent) the local board’s priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen Priorities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback received through events

The Rodney Local Board held two have your say events where 340 pieces of feedback were received at these events from 89 people.
Feedback received through social media channels

No feedback was received from the @aklcouncil Facebook or Twitter channels, but 29 pieces of feedback were received from Rodney Local Board Facebook page.

Additionally, a third party Facebook page that had been set up regarding the Huapai Indoor Courts Facility was identified. It received an additional 406 pieces of feedback.

Priority 1: Green Road
(1386 total submission points)

The graph below gives an overview of all of the responses for this priority; responses from the Rodney Local Board area are also listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Rd</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most submissions were in support of this proposal (58 per cent) with key themes noting excitement/a preference that this site could become the “Cornwall Park of the North.” Additionally, there were numerous requests that the site be dedicated to equestrian facilities. Many submitters saw the value in progressing with this proposal given the expected growth.

Those submissions that did not support the proposal (22 per cent) stated they did not agree with the location i.e Dairy Flat isn’t as important as their town; that this project is not as high a priority as other projects (i.e. roading); or, that it would have no benefit for them personally.

Priority 2: Warkworth Multisport
(1383 total submission points)

The graph below gives an overview of all of the responses for this priority; responses from the Rodney Local Board area are also listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warkworth Multisport</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (AC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most submissions (51 per cent) were in favour of this priority, with common themes including that this project is long overdue, that this will provide a much needed facility for the local community, and that submitters support it, but also want a swimming pool.

Those submissions that did not support the proposal (28 per cent) cited reasons such as that this facility should be paid for by the users and/or clubs that would benefit, that there are higher priorities (i.e. roading) or that Warkworth Showgrounds has had enough spent on it in recent years.
A further theme in those that provided partial support was that they did not want to see the multisport proceed at the expense of the existing ponyclub or Warkworth Rodeo.

**Priority 3: Town Centres**
(1409 total submission points)

The graph below gives an overview of all of the responses for this priority; responses from the Rodney Local Board area are also listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town Centres</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>869</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear majority of submissions supported this proposal (71 per cent) with common themes including that these improvements are important to bring communities together as well as creating jobs and attracting tourists to our towns.

Those that did not support the proposal (12 per cent) did so because they believed there were higher priorities (ie roading) or that they consider the proposal “a waste of money”, or that this is a role for business associations and local communities to fund and deliver privately.

**Priority 4: Huapai Indoor Courts (OLI)**
(1708 total submission points)

The graph below gives an overview of all of the responses for this priority; responses from the Rodney Local Board area are also listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLI</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (AC)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (Ors)</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>870</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 42 per cent of written submissions support this proposal, but a considerable contribution via social media boosted support to 57 per cent. Submissions that supported the initiative cited that it will be a significant community asset in the growing community.

Those that did not support this proposal primarily stated that the proposed facility should be paid for by users and/or the sports clubs, or that they believed there were higher priorities, in particular roading.
Priority 5: Transport Targeted Rate
(1452 total submission points)

The graph below gives an overview of all of the responses for this priority; responses from the Rodney Local Board area are also listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Rate</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (AC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest group of submitters did not support the proposal (43 per cent) with only 36 per cent of submission points in support. However, 21 per cent of submitters partially support the proposal (which would bring the combination of support/partial support to 57 per cent).

The comments provided by those that gave partial support shows varying degrees of support for the proposal, ranging from those that support the proposal in principle, but not the individual projects or the specific amount ($150); those that want assurances that the rate would be spent in Rodney; and, those that are sceptical that the rate will be collected and spent correctly at all. A notable number qualified their support stating that they could not support the proposal if the regional fuel tax was also implemented.

Submissions that did not support the targeted rate commonly cited that rates are already too high; that they object to paying for services other parts of Auckland get from general taxation; or, that they did not know what the projects proposed were/the proposed projects had no value for them.

Feedback on other local topics

Key themes across feedback received on other local topics include:

- Not enough money is spent locally. At a higher level this is a comment that Auckland Council is CBD centric and Rodney is missing out. However this includes those submitters that deem “local” to be their immediate town, i.e. submitters from Warkworth do not consider Kumeu to be local (and vice versa) and object to funding being directed there.
- Smaller towns need to be a higher priority. Primarily these comments come from Wellsford and Helensville, but Kaukapakapa, Omaha, Matakana are also noted in the submissions feedback.
- Issues outside of the local board area, most notably, funding Penlink.

Requests for local funding

Requests for local funding included:

- Two submissions requesting that more funding is given to the Kumeu and Helensville arts centres, and that Helensville’s funding match that given to Kumeu.

Information on submitters

The majority of submissions were made by females (56 per cent) of European ethnicity (62 per cent). The next highest ethnicity was Maori (6 per cent) followed by “other” (5 per cent). The most submissions were received from submitters in the 45-54 age group which submitted approximately 23
per cent of all submissions. The next highest group were in the 55-64 range (20 per cent). Since the average age of a person in Rodney is 42, this represents a slight bias towards submissions from the older age group, but is significantly more balanced than submissions received on the 2017/2018 annual plan.

Of note, only 17 per cent of submissions were received from people under the age of 35.

The tables and graphs below indicate what demographic categories people identified with. This information only relates to those submitters who provided demographic information.
5. Overview of feedback received on the 10-year Budget from Rodney 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
- Issue 3: Rates and charges
- Issue 4: Other changes and budget information

The written submissions received from the Rodney 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

- Support: 539
- Do not support: 865
- Other: 145

Those submissions that were against the proposal primarily did so because they considered it unaffordable (116) or that it would have a disproportional impact on rural communities (165). A lot of “other” comments were received (257), with most stating that they did not know what the projects were, or that they suspected all the revenue would go to the CBD and therefore, they couldn’t support this tax.

Most of the feedback in support of the proposal cited the potential to improve public transport in Rodney (144), and a broad support for user pays as a solution to transport issues (44). A lot of “other” comments were also made (95) with themes including that the submitters weren’t happy, but realised there were no other options available, and that support was given only on the basis that the submitter expected it to solve road issues in Rodney.
Attachment A

Item 12

**Issue 2: Natural environment**

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

**Question 2:** Our harbours, beaches and streams are being polluted by overflows from ageing sewerage 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 $66 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?*

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

- Support: 827
- Do not support: 568
- Other: 149

Those that supported this proposal, did so because of they value/support the environmental benefits (141).

Those that did not support the proposal stated that rates were already too high (99) or that they would not see any benefit (33). A lot of ‘other’ comments were received (225), most citing this as a ‘city’ problem that they shouldn’t have to fix, or blaming Auckland Council waste or mismanagement etc for not having enough money to fix it out of regular rates.

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 graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

![Graph](image)

**Issue 3: Rates and charges**

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 graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

![Graph](image)

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 graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.
Most submitters who supported this proposal did so because they thought it was fair because online accommodation providers are essentially businesses and should be treated as such (133). Some submitters (74) felt it was fair to treat hotels, motels and online accommodation providers equally.

Those that opposed the proposal cited reasons including that they liked AirBnB, that people pay enough rates already, or that it would hurt them renting out their bach etc.

**Issue 4: other changes and budget information**

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.**

Two submissions were received from Rodney on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority – one supported the plan, the other was “violently opposed to stopping vehicle access to volcanoes.”

There were no submissions received specifically on the food waste collection (which does not impact Rodney).

There were no identifiable submissions on the proposal to disestablish ACIL or any other proposal in the consultation document (such as resource consent or cremation fees, or charging for land owner approvals).
6. Overview of feedback received on the Auckland Plan 2050 from Rodney 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 Rodney Local Board area is set out under each question.

While questions asked were whether the focus areas will help deliver the outcomes, it is clear from the commentary that many people either support or do not support the outcome in general and have not discussed the focus areas. Accordingly, the lack of support for a question may be more a rejection of the outcome, rather than the proposed approach, and vice versa.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think the six focus areas identified in Belonging and Participation will achieve this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support: 318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially: 420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

Most submissions that agreed with this proposal stated that it was a good start.

Most submissions that did not agree with the proposal considered it a waste of time and/or money, or not what the submitter thought of as part of council’s core business.
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?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

![Support, Do not support, Partially](Support: 356, Do not support: 470, Partially: 330)

Most submission that did not agree with this question indicate that the submitter does not agree with the outcome rather than the focus areas. Even some of the submission that agreed with the questions cited this outcome as “not council’s business”.

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?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

![Support, Do not support, Partially](Support: 344, Do not support: 413, Partially: 462)

Submission points from those that partially support, or do not support this area cited concerns that the focus areas appear race based (which they object to) and that they do not consider that Auckland needs growth – so it should not be a focus. There was also a common call for council to fix infrastructure as a priority before tackling these issues.
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?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submissions that agreed with this question used it to call for specific initiatives – notably more footpaths, and trains to Huapai. There were also requests to build Penlink.

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?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most submitters that supported this approach did not leave comments, but those that did cited the need to be sustainable and to be good environmental stewards as key factors for supporting this.

Those that only partially supported the proposal expressed concern about the potential cost (some thinking the outcome would result in the need for higher rates, others thought the focus areas sounded like council wouldn’t put in enough money to achieve the outcome); others expressed some degree of scepticism that this would achieve environmental benefits at all.
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?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support: 431
Do not support: 273
Partially: 438

There were few comments from those that support these focus areas.
Those that partially support these focus areas commented that they disagree with the race based focus, and that this area is a job for central government, not for council.

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?

The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Rodney Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support: 461
Do not support: 310
Partially: 407

Most submitters did not leave responses but those that did, and supported the proposal, did so primarily because they want more intensification and less sprawl (including those that said they wanted to keep rural land, rural). Some comments said that they need to build more industry/business areas closer to where people live, to avoid travel.

Those that did not support the proposal often gave very similar answers as above (so they agree with the outcome) but thought that the approach would achieve that.
Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Briefing Report on Feedback Received from the Rodney Local Board Area

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

Executive Summary
Overall, 190 submissions were received on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from the local board area. This represented nine per cent of the total submissions received. Responses suggested that the majority of submitters supported the overall direction of the draft plan with:

- 90 per cent supporting expanding council’s focus to non-domestic waste
- 91 per cent supporting working with businesses to reduce construction and demolition, plastic and organic waste
- 92 per cent supporting the expansion of the council’s network of Community Recycling Centres
- 89 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, the waste levy, community recycling centres and council’s Zero Waste Vision.

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 to the 10 May 2018 agenda report 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.gov.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 local board area is shown below. 190 of these (nine per cent) were from the Rodney 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>Kaipātiki 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-Papatoeto 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>
</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board</th>
<th>Number of submitters</th>
<th>Percentage of submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<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>Waitāmatā Local Board</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau Local Board</td>
<td>88</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 feedback</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 feedback</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<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>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of collection services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing environmental and marine pollution</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tidy public places</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries</td>
<td>11%</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 priorities for residents of the local board area were reducing environmental and marine pollution and reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions. The lowest priority was reliability of collection services.

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>67%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</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</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. The Titapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan sets a vision and outlines a practical approach to waste management and minimisation for the communities of Wahoko, Aotea Great Barrier, Rakino and Kawau Islands. What do you think about the approach outlined in this plan and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Food Scraps Collection**

*For me having a food waste bin is high priority as is government policy banning single use plastics. Education is schools is also important - children are the future caretakers of the earth and we need them to be aware of the impact of waste*

*Think it's important to have a food scraps collection to help address climate change.*
I support a food waste collection in Auckland.

I support a short-term targeted rate to pay for the initial coordination of food waste management, but would like a pay-as-you-throw food waste collection within five years.

I do not want an organic waste bin so why should I have to pay for one. We compost our waste.

I would hope that my rates do not increase to cover the cost of household food waste collection when I already compost all food waste myself.

Community Recycling Centres

We have used the Helensville recycling centre a lot and would encourage Auckland councillors to look closely at what is going on there and reproducing it elsewhere! However, the key is to have people who are driven to make change and improve the state of our environment.

Warkworth area desperately needs a resource recovery operation urgently. So much goes to landfill due to the costs of "trying to do the right thing" when it should be free to take unwanted items or recyclable/reusable waste in for processing. The environment should not be held to ransom by commercial enterprise and financial contracts. Residents of whole wider Warkworth area need a sensible option for taking unwanted items for processing without the associated costs.

Community Recycling centres are a fantastic way to reduce waste whilst giving to others and creating jobs.

Waste Levy

I want to see a gradual increase in the landfill waste levy from $10/tonne to $140/tonne.

Zero Waste

I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040. Because it is vital for our future. Auckland needs to make changes and we have a responsibility to steward what we have (kaitiakitanga) and an opportunity to make our region a more liveable and sustainable place.

I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040. New Zealand portrays itself as a green nation leading the way but that’s just not true. Auckland (and NZ as a whole) need to seriously up their game to try to maintain the image they project.

Other comments

There needs to be more policing/surveillance of illegal dumping and harsher fines where perpetrators are identified. There should also be a proper plan on the table as to where clean, managed and landfills are to be sited in the future, taking into account access to these sites, the amenity value compromised by immediate and close proximity neighbours and the long term residual effect of such dumps. I am also a keen supporter of cut and fill where new
housing/business developments are taking place, rather than the wholesale removal of entire mountains of earth.

Stop dumping soil from sites, use it to contour the land and reduce carbon footprints and destruction of usable land in rural areas and contamination and sedimentation issues in streams which end up in our harbours!

This is a very important issue. Move forward with haste

We need more inorganics in rural or semi-rural areas. We need better access to recycling services and NZ's "Take it to the dump" attitude needs to be changed. On a purely anecdotal level, the majority of people I'm surrounded by would handle their larger trash items (old printers and computers, couches, mattresses etc) responsibly if it wasn't going to cost them a fortune to use a recycling initiative and if they actually knew who to contact/where to take the item. For a lot of people it's not a matter of money or apathy etc. it's lack of knowledge and education, lack of recycling facilities and no ease of use with the current system. If you can't figure out if pizza boxes go in the recycling then you end up throwing all cardboard in the trash. A website where you can type what you're trying to recycle and get a yes or no answer would be great.

We need to be reducing waste overall and living in a semi-rural environment as we do (Dairy Flat) that impacts on us as a community
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:

- Coastal environmental - $17,400
- Consultation re indoor sports Kumeu/ Huapai/ Helensville - $30,000
- Feasibility study for swimming pool - $40,000
- Greenways Plans - $260,000
- Parks strategic fund - $27,000
- Revitalisation of town centres - $60,000
- Green Road Masterplan - $50,000
Additional Business meeting 24 May 2018

File No.: CP2018/06962

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek formal approval from the Rodney Local Board to hold an additional business meeting on Thursday, 24 May 2018 at 11.30a.m. in the Council Chamber, Orewa Service Centre, 50 Centreway Road, Orewa.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. An additional meeting is required on Thursday, 24 May 2018 in order to consider a report on the local board’s proposed Rodney transport targeted rate.
3. This report has not been able to be considered earlier due to consultation on the Regional Land Transport Plan being delayed by several weeks. The local board has requested additional time to consider this matter and feedback on it, including feedback on the proposed Regional Fuel Tax.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:
 a) approve an additional business meeting be held on Thursday, 24 May at 11.30a.m. in the Council Chamber, Orewa Service Centre, 50 Centreway Road, Orewa.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.
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