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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 Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:
  a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 5 April 2018, as a true and correct record.

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 Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum. 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.

8.1 Hobsonville Community Trust update

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To address the Upper Harbour Local Board to give a general update on the trust’s activities and socialise their annual report.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Gavin Gunston, Community Coordinator from the Hobsonville Community Trust, will be in attendance to discuss their organisation’s activities over the past year.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:
  a) receive the deputation from Gavin Gunston from the Hobsonville Community Trust and thank him for his attendance and presentation.
8.2 North Harbour Air Gun Club

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To address the Upper Harbour Local Board to give an overview of their activities and to discuss options for a replacement venue.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Rob Cawood, President, and Rob Dyer and Carl Robinson, committee members, from the North Harbour Air Gun Club, will be in attendance to discuss the club’s recent challenges. They have previously shared a site with Riding for the Disabled who have recently relocated to another area. As the gun club does not have their own lease arrangement, they are seeking the board’s advice and assistance on an alternate venue.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:

a) receive the deputation from Rob Cawood, Rob Dyer, and Carl Robinson from the North Harbour Air Gun Club and thank them for their attendance and presentation.

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

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:
   - advocacy on local priority projects
   - any new/amended Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rates
   - any new/amended local targeted rate proposals
   - proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility
   - release of local board specific reserve funds.
4. Auckland Council consulted with the public from 28 February to 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 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 Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:
b) approve its advocacy initiatives, including its key advocacy project, for inclusion (as an appendix) to its 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement.

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

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

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

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

g) 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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

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

i) provide feedback on the draft Auckland Plan 2050.

j) 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 to 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, 5374 people attended 100 engagement events, including three in the Upper Harbour Local Board area. Feedback was received through written, event and social media channels.

12. Consultation feedback on the Upper Harbour 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 Upper Harbour 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.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

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 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.

Local board input on regional plans

20. 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 give 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

21. 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
Item 12

• Issue 2: Natural environment
• Issue 3: Rates and charges
• Issue 4: Other changes and budget information.

22. 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 2018.

23. The feedback form contained at least one question relating to each issue. Consultation feedback received from the Upper Harbour 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.

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

Draft Auckland Plan 2050

25. 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.

26. 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 Upper Harbour Local Board area on the outcome areas in the draft Auckland Plan 2050 are summarised in Attachment A.

27. 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

28. 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.

29. 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-of products like tyres and e-waste
- address the needs of the Hauraki Gulf islands through the Tikapa Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands draft Waste Plan.
30. This report asks for local board input to the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

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

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

Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan

33. 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.

34. 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

35. 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.

36. 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 a Finance and Performance Committee workshop on key topics, and special briefings have been arranged.

37. 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.

38. 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

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. 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.

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

44. Copies of individual submissions to the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 and the 10-year Budget are under separate cover and can be viewed as Attachments C through to G.

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 2018, in order for the Governing Body to be able to make decisions on them when considering the 10-year Budget in June 2018.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
48. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes in June 2018.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Decision-maker</th>
<th>Scheduled meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-year Budget</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<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>
### Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-2028 and draft Auckland Plan 2050 consultation feedback report</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Draft Waste Management and Minimisation 2018 consultation feedback report</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 submissions (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-2028 submissions (Volume 1) (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-2028 submissions (Volume 2) (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-2028 submissions (Volume 3) (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>10-year Budget 2018-2028 submissions (Volume 4) (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Rachel Wilson - Local Board Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Perry - Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 consultation feedback report for Upper Harbour Local Board

1. Purpose

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

- Feedback on the Upper Harbour 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 Upper Harbour local board area.

The feedback received will inform the Upper Harbour Local Board decisions on allocation of their local budgets in their local board agreement for 2018/2019. It will also inform the Upper Harbour Local Board input and advocacy on regional budgets and proposals that will be agreed at their Community Forum meeting on 3 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 Upper Harbour Local Board priorities for 2018/2019

The local board consulted on the following four priorities:

- Priority 1: Connecting our local parks and reserves through ‘street to street’ cycling and pedestrian crossings to improve accessibility and user experience.
- Priority 2: Constructing a coastal walkway between Limeburners Reserve and Marina View Drive
- Priority 3: Protecting and conserving Upper Harbour reserves through methods such as restoration planting.
- Priority 4: Seeking funding for the construction of a sub-regional, multi-use, multi-sport indoor facility for the north-west, which could potentially be located in Whenauapai.

Seven-hundred and eight written submissions were received on Upper Harbour local board priorities for 2018/19, showing that the majority of people either partially support (46 per cent) or support (34 per cent) the local board’s priorities.

Feedback on regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 from the Upper Harbour local board area

Out of the 26,556 written submissions received on the regional proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, 768 submissions were from people living in the Upper Harbour local board area.

Issue 1: Transport

A total of 662 submissions were received from Upper Harbour residents. Forty-one per cent supported the proposal for the fuel tax, 52 per cent didn’t support it, with 7 per cent commenting on other transport issues. Common issues raised by submitters were:
affordability and the impact on large families
what the fuel tax would be spent on
the need to improve public transport
preference by some for a congestion charge rather than fuel tax
the impact on rural communities.

Issue 2: Natural Environment
A total of 670 submissions were received from Upper Harbour residents on the proposed water quality targeted rate. Fifty-eight per cent supported the proposed targeted rate, while 35 per cent opposed it and 7 per cent had other comments. Common issues raised by submitters were:

- the environmental benefit
- opposition to an additional rate
- the impact on lower income households
- a belief that central government should pay.

A total of 680 submissions were received on the proposed environmental targeted rate. Twenty-eight per cent supported Option A - $21 average per annum, 28 per cent supported Option B - $47 average per annum and 44 per cent opposed both options.

Common themes in feedback were:

- rates are already high enough
- there is no benefit from the expenditure
- the government should pay.

Issue 3: Rates and charges
A total of 647 submissions were received on general rates increases. Of those submissions, 39 per cent supported the proposed increase, 52 per cent opposed it and there were 8 per cent other comments.

Issue 4: Other changes and budget information
A total of 617 submissions were received relating to the on-line accommodation provider question. Sixty-four per cent supported this proposal, while 29 per cent opposed it, with 8 per cent of other comments. Themes coming through the feedback were:

- it was fair to hotels and motels
- online accommodation providers are businesses
- other tourism related businesses should also pay
- there was no benefit from Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development’s (ATEED’s) activities.

Feedback on the Auckland Plan 2050 from the Upper Harbour local board area
Out of the 26,586 submissions received on the Auckland Plan 2050, 722 submissions were from people living in Upper Harbour Local Board area.

Outcome area 1: Belonging and participation
Forty-six per cent fully and 33 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only 21 per cent of those who responded opposed it.
Outcome area 2: Māori identity and wellbeing
Thirty-eight per cent fully and 29 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only thirty-two per cent opposed it.

Outcome area 3: Homes and places
Forty per cent fully and 39 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only 25 per cent opposed it.

Outcome area 4: Transport and access
Fifty-two per cent fully and 36 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only 18 per cent opposed it.

Outcome area 5: Environment and cultural heritage
Fifty-six per cent fully and 32 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only 14 per cent opposed it.

Outcome area 6: Opportunity and prosperity
Forty-six per cent fully and 33 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only 18 per cent opposed it.

Shaping our growth
Forty-seven per cent fully and 35 per cent partially supported this aspect of the proposed Auckland Plan 2050. Only 17 per cent opposed it.

3. Context
Auckland Council consulted on its 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and the Auckland Plan 2050 between 26 February and 28 March 2018. 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 Upper Harbour 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 to these plans will be presented at a later date.

Types of feedback
Overall, Auckland Council received feedback through the following channels:
- written feedback – 26,556 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.

4. Feedback received on Upper Harbour Local Board priorities for 2018/19
The Upper Harbour Local Board consulted on the following four priorities:
- Priority 1: Do you support locating the sub-regional multi-use, multi-sport indoor facility in Whenuapai to cater to the North West, as opposed to Albany for the North Shore?
Priority 2: Are there any areas you think the Upper Harbour Local Board should invest in to improve ‘street to street’ cycling and pedestrian connections through our local parks and reserves?

Priority 3: Do you support construction of a coastal walkway between Limeburners Reserve and Marine View Drive?

Priority 4: Do you support a focus on restoration planting to protect Upper Harbour reserves? If so, which areas do you think are of higher priority?

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

Feedback received through written submissions

Seven-hundred and three submissions were received on Upper Harbour Local Board priorities for 2018/19, showing that the majority of people either partially support (46 per cent) or support (34 per cent) the local board’s priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5  UH Local priorities</td>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH priorities - yes</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH priorities - no</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH priorities - partially</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH priorities - other comments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Upper Harbour Local Board had the opportunity of asking a number of questions on the on-line version of the submission form. The high-level responses to those questions were:

- Sub-regional multi-sport facility in Whenuapai. Fifty per cent of those responding supported this. Thirty-six per cent opposed it and 14 per cent partially supported it. There were a wide range of comments made both in support and against the proposal. Concerns were raised about duplication of facilities, access to Whenuapai, the need for facilities in Albany and a small number suggesting that the funding would be better applied to other issues such as transport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH Multi-sport facility in Whenuapai - yes</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH Multi-sport facility in Whenuapai - no</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH Multi-sport facility in Whenuapai - partially</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6  UH Local priorities UH Multi-sport facility in Whenuapai - other comments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ‘Street to street’ connections. Sixty-six per cent supported and 13 per cent partially supported this proposal, with 21 per cent opposing it. There were a wide range of comments with respondents split between those who support walking and cycling and those who believe that
too much investment goes into cycleways for the numbers using them and that transport investment would be better focused on improving the road network.

- Coastal walkway. Sixty-three per cent supported and 16 per cent partially supported this idea. Twenty-one per cent opposed it. Support was strongest from that portion of the community living closest to the planned route. There was far less support from further away in the board area and a number of respondents didn’t know where Limeburners Bay was.

- Protection of reserves. Seventy-six per cent supported and 13 per cent partially supported the concept. Eleven per cent opposed the idea. A wide range of reserves were suggested as candidates for attention.

Feedback received through events
The Upper Harbour Local Board held three ‘Have Your Say’ events and provided collateral for one community event. Feedback was received from 31 people.

Eighty-four per cent supported and 3 per cent partially supported the board’s priorities. Six per cent opposed the board’s priorities. The issues raised were similar to those in the written submissions.

Feedback received through social media channels
Eighteen pieces of social media feedback was identified as coming from the Upper Harbour Local Board area. The issues raised were similar to those in the written submissions.

Feedback on other local topics
A wide range of other comments were received as part of the submissions process. There are no dominant themes arising from this feedback.
Feedback received from mana whenua

No specific feedback was identified as coming from iwi on the Upper Harbour Local Board priorities. Feedback was, however, received on Auckland Plan questions. Iwi were supportive or partially supportive on all the issues raised in consultation.

Information on submitters

The tables and graphs below indicate what demographic categories people identified with. This information only relates to those submitters who provided demographic information.

![Bar chart showing gender and age distribution](attachment:A/Item_12/Figure_1_Submitter_age_gender_analysis.png)

**Figure 1 Submitter age / gender analysis**

![Bar chart showing ethnicity distribution](attachment:A/Item_12/Figure_2_Submitter_ethnicity_analysis.png)

**Figure 2 Submitter ethnicity analysis**

The age / gender and ethnicity analyses broadly mirror the population characteristics as at the 2013 Census.

5. Overview of feedback received on the 10-year Budget from Upper Harbour 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 Upper Harbour 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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

![Support, Do not support, Other](image)

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support**
  - The fuel tax would be fine as long as the results are successful and timely.
  - with reservations as this will be collected only from motorists with petrol / diesel vehicles. Something has to be done so that’s a start.
  - It will encourage people to use public transport and reduce the number of cars on the road.
  - If funds are used to improve road transport too and not only for alternative travel! I can’t ride from Hobsonville to the city each morning, so let’s be sensible and invest in road widening, express bus lanes and more ferries on the water highway that’s totally underutilised with 2 morning services weekdays and three evening services, build it and they will come!

- **In opposition**
  - Prefer a toll system.
  - With the house prices in Auckland already at an unaffordable state, there are more and more people who seem to be moving out to the fringes of the city. Assuming they will not be the ones benefiting from the transporting improvements (at least in the near future) I view this as unfair for the people who already have to deal with 2 hour commutes.
  - This should be NZ wide - not just Auckland. Everyone in NZ has an internet in getting AK moving. The tax should be GST exempt.
  - *Is the proposed Tax ring fenced to ensure proper use?*
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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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

![Support](image)

- Support: 59%
- Do not support: 35%
- Other: 7%

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support:**
  - Absolutely essential
  - I support it, but speed up the time line
  - I think the rate is relatively small in proportion to the huge benefit of cleaning our waterways.
  - Absolutely. Do it, good to see something thought through.

- **In opposition:**
  - Cost is way too much. Reduce council spending in other areas and make this top priority.
  - Reduce council salaries rather than charging rate payers.
  - Once infrastructure improvements made the targeted rate should be removed from rates bills

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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support – Option A**
  - I support this because we need to pay for the things that we value - but we should also be pushing central government to invest more in this area
  - Again work need to be done but 47 is a handful for some
  - Because it’s still helping/protecting the environment but it isn’t costing too much that it isn’t affordable for most rate payers

- **In support – Option B**
  - I can see the sense in this proposal
  - Urgent help is needed for our Kauri trees. More action should already have happened. The slower we are to act the worse the situation will be. Kauri trees take hundreds of years to replace.
  - Yes, support, but must be a shift of mindset around how to protect the environment, i.e. wildlife corridors and habitat and increasing overall green space plus the ecosystem health of existing green space (i.e. taking care of the soil)

- **In opposition**
  - We cannot raise the rates in absurdum. Threatened species needs to be a national initiative and should not be on my rate-ticket. Adding point after point to rates will just make the city more and more unequal and widen the gaps between the have and the have-nots.
  - Threatened species needs to be a national initiative and should not be on my rate-ticket.
  - This is a national not a local problem. Again taxation by stealth.

### Issue 3: Rates and charges

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

Question 4: For this 10-year Budget we are proposing an average general rates increase of 2.5 per cent for the first two years and then 3.5 per cent 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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.
A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support**
  - I support this provided the extra money is used efficiently and with transparency. We cannot afford for money to get sucked up into bureaucracy, we need to fix this great city.
  - I’d prefer to pay towards a beautiful city rather than live free in a polluted congested dump.
  - So long as everything that is promised gets done.
  - So long as we can see value in the extra funding you are receiving, I have no problem with paying an extra 3.5 per cent each year.

- **In opposition**
  - Raise the level of Uniform Annual Charge instead.
  - You do not need more money. Reduce your spending on activities and functions that are not required by law. Stop wasting our money on 'nice to have' and 'sound bites' and you will have plenty of money to spend on growth.
  - Keeps rates to CPL. Add infrastructure from developments charges.

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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

The graphs show the following distribution:
- Support: 8%
- Do not support: 23%
- Other: 64%

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support**
  - Anyone who uses Airbnb is operating a commercial enterprise therefore they should pay the same as others operating a commercial enterprise.
  - These should be equivalent to commercial accommodation as using same resources.
  - It is only fair that these parties are treated like other accommodation providers.
  - Provided proof of this use of their property can be verified.

- **In opposition**
  - Leave them alone, they're just trying to get by.
  - You will not be able to enforce this. Just kill ATEED.
  - Extra income should be taxed as income tax.
  - Just another rate increase hidden as something else.

**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.

A wide range of comments were made under this heading. Comments covered issues such as: sticking to core services, cutting council overheads, changing the council funding system to ensure all of the community contributes – not just property owners, increasing sports facility funding, comment on transport issues and in the main supportive comments on the changes to waste management practices.

Feedback on other regional proposals with a local impact

Feedback was received from the Upper Harbour Local Board area on other regional proposals. The majority of this feedback covered three main areas:

- transport, roads, footpaths, public transport, key transport projects and travel demand management
- regional community services
- solid waste and environmental services
- rating and funding issues

6. Overview of feedback received on the Auckland Plan 2050 from Upper Harbour 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 Upper Harbour 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?

The graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Upper Harbour Local Board area.
A relatively few comments (in comparison to the number of submissions) were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- In support
  - It’s a lot of words! I notice that the Arts and Sport are not mentioned in your 10 year plan. Surely both of these are hugely important for the welfare of all Aucklanders, no matter their ethnicity.
  - My “Yes” is a qualified one, meaning that I do hope that your so-called focus areas are not simply empty, meaningless “motherhood” statements.
  - We need to have everyone regardless of finance, race, gender, religion, etc. feeling as though they can participate and use council services.
  - Good focus areas for becoming inclusive.

- In opposition
  - All of the above except maybe safety, is personal stuff. It is not council’s job to make people socially active, leaders, talk up treaty, celebrate cultural differences or heal disparity rifts. If council concentrated on running a decent city (by concentrating on priorities of water quality, transport and design standards) all of the above will happen authentically and genuinely by themselves at a personal level as they should.
  - We want core infrastructure from the Council not social engineering projects
  - The proposed focus areas are not focused but just general sounds-good-feel-good promises that cannot have a KPI assigned.

**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 graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

A relatively few comments (in comparison to the number of submissions) were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- In support
  - Restore cultural involvement can only be a positive move
10-year Budget and Auckland Plan refresh consultation feedback report

- Less tokenism, more Maori in actual decision-making roles, and/or supported so they are not stretched across multiple roles and areas, and not having to constantly educate everyone on powhiri. Make a real difference please.
- I am not an Indigenous person but as an educator I welcome this proposal.

- In opposition
  - I see why everyone cannot be treated with equality. Identifying a certain group based on demographics is not making everyone equal. In my opinion everyone should be treated in exactly the same way irrespective of race, ethnicity, gender, etc.
  - Treat everyone the same, no matter what race, religion, ethnicity. Why should the Council invest in advancing mana whenua leadership? Shouldn’t the Maori community be taking responsibility for that themselves?
  - Again, this is not the role of a city council. This is the role of community groups and Maori organisations.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think the five focus areas identified in Homes and Places will achieve this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A relatively few comments (in comparison to the number of submissions) were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- In support
  - Hopefully house pricing will be lowered
  - Better living environments for renters will allow renters the health required to work towards potential home ownership, which is currently impossible for most. Increased availability of low cost homes is important, especially for those most in need.
  - Accelerating quality development at scale needs to focus explicitly on improving affordability.

- In opposition
  - Release more land and build more roads in rural fringes and let free enterprise reduce housing pressure and cost. The current constraints are artificial because AC restricted expansion. You’re not solving a problem but creating another one.
  - The cost of Auckland housing is ridiculous, and is now unaffordable for many that do not already own a property. There is too much profit in owning and building houses.
  - Many families also need financial support to get into the housing market, so this does not address that need.

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 graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A relatively few comments (in comparison to the number of submissions) were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support**
  - Because Auckland Traffic is just Chaotic. Having lived in Sydney NSW, their traffic runs smoothly even at Peak times!
  - Make public transport more accessible. Excellent progress were made over the past years in enhancing the motorway system but this only solves part of the problem.
  - I think it helps having the government fully onboard this time. I would like to see Vision Zero explicitly embraced.
  - More parking need for park and ride, or more feeder buses as I found in Germany.

- **In opposition**
  - Words are cheap. Action costs. Better public transport needs to be implemented ASAP. Plus cars need to be reduced from all areas. One should achieve the other. Then walking and cycling should be safer. The Auckland car mindset needs to be altered.
  - Public transport can’t work in Auckland. The area is too large and population too small. We don’t have well defined areas either. Focus on roads and car parks, don’t subsidise public transport.
  - Auckland city is not geographically right to have walking, cycling, and public transport as the preferred choice for many. Even our weather is not reliable enough to make public transport our main form of commute.

**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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support**
Aucklanders need more encouraging education on the environment, starting with the younger ones.

I support this but the costs are high and the gains are difficult to measure. This stuff is of lesser priority to fixing the transport and pipes. I would not want to pay more rates just so you can hire consultants to write reports telling us how to live our lives.

These focus areas, particular #4, are critical.

Environmental groups are working on small projects. Keep encouraging and funding them.

**In opposition**

- Let private people do the job, subsidy does not work
- The environment has already been ruined. Unless you decide to raze the concrete and replant the forest no point trying to pretend anything can help
- Is this core business?
- This is your core role...do it. No fancy words.

**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 Upper Harbour Local Board area.

![Graph showing the responses](image)

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

**In support**

- Auckland needs to allow for the expected growth in the number of young people as well
- Technologies is going to be a game changer for not only Auckland, but also the rest of world given the progress in the area.
- I also believe the long-term plan needs to think about this in terms of the geographic implications - how do we get businesses out of the CBD, make it more attractive to drive commercial organisations into satellite hubs and furnify enough we might just see congestion (and the need for taxes around this) to go away.
- As long as it keep people of the doles.

**In opposition**

- Council should stick to core business
- It’s not your area as a council stop trying to compete with the private sector help the elderly more
- This is a national issue for parliament to deal with.

**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
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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 graph below gives an overview of the responses from the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

![Graph showing support, do not support, and partially support percentages.]

A wide range of comments were made in support of and against the proposal. Typical comments were:

- **In support**
  - Sensible balance - well done
  - All good! But your projection of growth is far too low, considering the situation in the world today. My guess is, in 10 years our population doubles to approx. 3 Mio. That is the kind of figure to look at, and all planning should use it. If I am wrong, no harm is really done, but if I am right, and the figure was not used, we will be in a worse position, than we are now.
  - We have to stop the sprawl. Medium density done well (Hobsonville Point Model) is key the future of Auckland intensification.
  - Support intensification over urban sprawl with its problems of car traffic and need for new infrastructure.

- **In opposition**
  - Before you intensify think of the impact on current road infrastructure. Just how much more traffic do you think the transport network can handle before it just grinds to a halt?
  - Auckland is filled...no more people please so just tell sorry go to Hamilton or somewhere else
  - Increased growth means more rates. More income for council so no need to increase rates.
  - So confused
Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Briefing report on feedback received from the Upper Harbour Local Board area

Purpose

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

Executive Summary

Overall, 57 submissions were received on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from the board area. This represented three per cent of the total submissions received. Responses suggested that the majority of submitters supported the overall direction of the draft plan with:

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

Submitters also included a number of comments on key topics of interest to them, such as, the food scraps collection and the goal of Zero Waste by 2040.

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 2012-2028 consultation process is not described in this report. This is covered in the separate report “10-year Budget 2018-2028 and Auckland Plan 2050 consultation feedback report for Upper Harbour Local Board” 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 also attached. This will be provided to the Hearings Panel for the draft plan by the end of April 2018 before they hear submissions.

The final Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 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 in the form of videos and drawings.

Of these written submissions, 4,605 were pro formas from the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance. The pro forma submissions from the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance did not answer feedback form questions and did not include an address. Their responses are, therefore, not included in the statistics for the board shown below.

Submissions by Board Area

The breakdown of submissions by board area is shown below in Table One. 57 of these (three per cent) were from Upper Harbour Local Board area.

Table 1: Breakdown 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>Kaipōtiki 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>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakdown by Submission Type - Regional

As Tables Two and Three show, submissions were received in various forms, including 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>Formal submission type</th>
<th>Number of submissions</th>
<th>Percentage of submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council’s submission feedback form</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(online and hard copy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long form submissions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro forma - Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro forma submissions (non-Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,758*</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 – Regional 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>95</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>

Responses to Consultation Questions for Board Area

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 residents of the board area

<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>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of collection services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing environmental and marine pollution</td>
<td>25%</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>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that the highest priorities for residents of the 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. 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</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>Neutral</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why?</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We want to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where crink 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?</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. The Tikapa-Moaia Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan 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?</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></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
Additional comments about the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan:

In addition to the responses above, some of the key themes arising from submissions in the Upper Harbour Local Board area are highlighted below with some typical comments:

Food Scraps Collection

Go back to basics- stop plastics. Go brown paper bags, glass, compostable. Please bring food waste bins and have a facility to process it and turn into compost 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 believe the intention of a targeted rate for food waste is unfair. Some of us already recycle such through the use of compost or worm farms. We should not have to pay for a collection scheme we do not use. It should be user pays

Auckland Council’s Zero Waste by 2040 Goal

I want Auckland to be zero waste by 2040 because we are drowning in our own filth

Every City needs a zero waste plan. Every Citizen needs to be aware of the need to cut waste and why.
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 (excluding 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. One-hundred and twelve submitters opposed the proposal and 28 supported it. Ninety-one submitters, including the Queen Elizabeth the Second Trust (QEII Trust) and Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand (Forest and Bird), wanted remissions retained for land with a QEII covenant. Twenty-seven responses cited the uncertainty of on-going support. Twenty-four thought grants would require more administration. Nine 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 (e.g. 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 10 years. Thirty-nine submitters supported and 30 were opposed to the proposal. Thirteen 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. Six submitters were supportive of aspects of the regional schemes, and none were opposed. Officers recommend adoption as proposed.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Upper Harbour 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 the 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.

c) 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 11 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 provide 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 2018 meeting of the Finance and Performance Committee.

16. Consultation was open to the public from 13 March to 13 April 2018. 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 QEII Trust and Forest and Bird.

Tātāritanga 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 (excluding 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 of 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. One-hundred and fifty-three 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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>Commented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports proposal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposes proposal</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback related to remissions for natural heritage

23. One-hundred and five 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 Trust covenanted land should be non-rateable</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Land is only non-rateable if owned or used by (e.g. under a lease) the QEII trust. The QEII Trust is empowered by its establishing legislation to pay the rates on land that has a covenant to the Trust.</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.</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 covenanted land. Council offers grants that can be used for costs associated with covenanted land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remissions recognise value to environment of QEII Trust 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 QEII Trust land as identified in Waikato study(^1) which put the cost to owners for establishing a covenant at $64,000, and the annual cost to maintain the land at $6000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Figures in the study were derived from a sample of properties with QEII Trust covenants, of which 11 were in Auckland. For the Auckland sample, the study records an average cost for establishment as $8457 in cash and $2818 in non-cash costs. Annual maintenance costs were $319 cash and $1062 non-cash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing remissions is inconsistent with Resource Management Act (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 Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SEA status does not guarantee enduring protection for native habitats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback related to remissions for community and sporting organisations

24. Thirty-six 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:

---

\(^1\) Waikato University: “2017 Investment in Covenanted Land Conservation” prepared for the Queen Elizabeth the Second Trust
### Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

#### Key stakeholder feedback

26. The QEII Trust and Forest and Bird opposed the proposal to replace legacy remissions with grants for QEII Trust covenanted land. The feedback of the QEII 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 QEII Trust and Federated Farmers supported consideration by the council of grants in addition to remissions for QEII Trust covenanted land.

#### Remission for the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) 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 the 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 10 years.

29. Seventy-three submitters provided feedback, with 39 in support of the proposal and 30 opposed. Of those opposed, five 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remission supported because can’t pass on rate to operator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></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.
### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to remissions</th>
<th>Feedback points</th>
<th>Officers’ comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remission shouldn't be offered - everyone should pay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APTR remission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No APTR should be charged</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Six supported and six opposed the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remission should be available to more properties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Three supported, four opposed proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full remission should be granted until lease ends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One supported proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should use bed tax or similar charge rather than APTR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two supported, one 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:
  - retirement villages as residents now qualify for central government rates rebates
  - 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. Four submitters broadly supported the policy. Grey Power and four 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 (excluding GST) as a grant guaranteed for three years
- development of a standardised approach to support 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. This will 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 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 in 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.
feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

45. Local board feedback will be reported at the 30 May 2018 meeting of the Finance and Performance Committee for the consideration and adoption of the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy.
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### 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>Orakei</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>Puketapapa</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>Waitheke</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>Waitatiha</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
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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 ‘licence 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 a rates 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 60 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.
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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 2018/2019, 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:

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

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:
   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 478554 or Lot 2 DP 510763
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-sports 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 ratepayer or assigns or attempts to assign the ratepayer 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>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</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>$85,531.28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$77.73</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>Ōrākau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$21,846.83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ītara-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>Waitāheke</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,616.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,460.28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitimestā</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>Average value of remission per property</th>
<th>Heritage (Covenanted land) Remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Community and Sporting Remissions</td>
<td>Regional Community and Sporting Remissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$1,006.70</td>
<td>$2,694.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$5,560.85</td>
<td>$2,603.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$2,110.52</td>
<td>$2,103.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$77.73</td>
<td>$391.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$146.93</td>
<td>$136.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$3,428.48</td>
<td>$3,824.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$2,444.11</td>
<td>$1,788.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$2,083.19</td>
<td>$2,980.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$574.12</td>
<td>$253.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$442.30</td>
<td>$255.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$254.87</td>
<td>$2,265.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>$1,985.08</td>
<td>$1,128.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>$142.74</td>
<td>$140.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$380.63</td>
<td>$166.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukehāpapa</td>
<td>$271.12</td>
<td>$262.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$2,823.73</td>
<td>$2,248.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$747.01</td>
<td>$5,719.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waheke</td>
<td>$323.35</td>
<td>$203.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Flanges</td>
<td>$205.02</td>
<td>$108.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitēmatā</td>
<td>$315.92</td>
<td>$2,074.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$416.69</td>
<td>$248.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,832.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,713.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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></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></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>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment C  Item 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Criteria</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Amount remitted</th>
<th>No. granted</th>
<th>Regional remissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$85,782</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$31,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$1,273</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$5,407</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Value of Remission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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.</td>
<td>20% of capital value based rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Henderson-Massey</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>$12</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>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>$38,180</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</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% Rate associated with value of land's potential for redevelopment.</td>
<td>$4,086</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</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>See confidential attachment</td>
<td>1</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>Kapatiki</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>$1,053</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapatiki</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 sports, recreation, or community purposes</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>$32,248</td>
<td>6</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</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>2</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Meungakiekie-</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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</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>11</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>10</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-clubs, of which two have utilised the scheme Rates associated with value of land’s potential for redevelopment</td>
<td>See confidential attachment</td>
<td>$1,124</td>
<td>8</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>$842</td>
<td>$1,832</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>$164</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>$1,627</td>
<td>$524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment C

#### Feedback on Rates Remission and Postponement Policy

**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>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>$1,018</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</td>
<td>30</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</td>
<td>1</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</td>
<td>1</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>$12,544</td>
<td>38</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>$308</td>
<td>$820</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>$64</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>Waiheke</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>$880</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 covenant 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 covenant 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>10</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></td>
<td>$821 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 12</td>
<td>$544 5</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></td>
<td>$392 20</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>$948 3</td>
<td>$6,250 4</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>9</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.
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<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, public inspection of remissions for individual rating units 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>
</tbody>
</table>