
Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Briefing Report on feedback received from the Waitematā Local Board Area

Purpose

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

Executive Summary

Overall, 130 submissions were received on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from the board area. This represented six per cent of the total submissions received. Responses suggested that the majority of submitters supported the overall direction of the draft plan with:

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

Submitters also included a number of comments on key themes of interest such as, the food scraps collection, the waste levy, 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 2018-2028 consultation process is not described in this report. This is covered in attachment A of the report which summarises all feedback received from the board area on the long-term plan, including on waste issues.

A report summarising all submissions from across the Auckland region to the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 is included in this attachment. 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 total number of submissions which specified a board area is shown below in Table One. 130 (six per cent) of these submissions were from the Waitematā Local Board area.

Table 1: Breakdown by Local Board area

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

Local board	Number of submitters	Percentage of submitters
Rodney Local Board	190	9%
Upper Harbour Local Board	57	3%
Waiheke Local Board	75	3%
Waitākere Ranges Local Board	96	4%
Waitematā Local Board	130	6%
Whau Local Board	88	4%
Regional	1	0%
Not Supplied (non ARA)	174	8%
Outside Auckland	25	1%
*Not Supplied ARA	4,605	

Breakdown by Submission Type - Regional

As Tables Two and Three show, submissions were received in various forms, including on the feedback form (on-line and written), long-form submissions, pro forma submissions and informal submissions including videos and drawings.

Table 2 – Breakdown by formal submission type - regional

Formal submission type	Number of submissions	Percentage of submissions
Council's submission feedback form (online and hard copy)	1,834	27%
Long form submissions	80	1%
Pro forma - Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance	4,605	68%
Pro forma submissions (non-Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance)	239	4%
Total	6,758*	100%

Table 3 – Types of Informal Submissions - Regional

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

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 Four and Five.

Table 4. Priority Outcomes for Residents of the Board Area

Question	Response	% submissions local board	% submissions regional
1. Auckland Council is responsible for managing and minimising waste across the region. When we make decisions about waste, which outcomes are most important to you. (Please select up to 3 options.)	Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders	11%	14%
	Reliability of collection services	9%	9%
	Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions	29%	26%
	Reducing environmental and marine pollution	29%	26%
	Tidy public places	10%	13%
	Creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries	9%	9%
	Other	3%	3%

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 outcomes were reliability of collection services and creating jobs in resource recovery and processing.

Table Five. Support for Key Actions in Draft Plan

Question	Response	% submissions	% submissions
		Local board	regional
2. In the last plan, we focused mostly on our services to households, which handle around 20 per cent of the waste that goes to landfill. Now we want to expand our waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities. What do you think of this approach and why?	Strongly agree	68%	57%
	Agree	21%	27%
	Neutral	2%	5%
	Disagree	3%	2%
	Strongly disagree	6%	5%
	Don't know	0%	2%
3. The three largest categories of commercial waste going to landfill are construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste (food, green and other types of organic waste). We want to work with businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why?	Strongly agree	69%	60%
	Agree	21%	27%
	Neutral	1%	4%
	Disagree	1%	1%
	Strongly disagree	8%	7%
	Don't know	0%	1%
4. We want to make it easy for people to make better choices locally about how they dispose of unwanted items, so those items can be reused or recycled. Five Community Recycling Centres are up and running and we have plans to provide seven more by 2024. What do you think of this approach and why?	Strongly agree	64%	59%
	Agree	21%	27%
	Neutral	8%	5%
	Disagree	2%	1%
	Strongly disagree	4%	7%
	Don't know	1%	1%
5. We want to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where drink containers such as plastic, glass bottles and cans include a refundable deposit when returned for recycling.	Strongly agree	71%	61%
	Agree	18%	23%
	Neutral	4%	4%
	Disagree	2%	2%

This would encourage more recycling and help to shift the costs of recovery from council and ratepayers to the producers and consumers of beverages. What do you think of this approach and why?	Strongly disagree	6%	8%
	Don't know	0%	2%
6. The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. The <i>Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan</i> sets a vision and outlines a practical approach to waste management and minimisation for the communities of Waiheke, Aotea Great Barrier, Rakino and Kawau Islands. What do you think about the approach outlined in this plan and why?	Strongly agree	29%	27%
	Agree	19%	24%
	Neutral	21%	16%
	Disagree	0%	1%
	Strongly disagree	5%	4%
	Don't know	27%	28%

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 Waitemata Local Board area are highlighted below with some typical comments:

Food Scraps Collection

I live in the city and would like to know of ways to dispose of my food waste. I currently keep food scraps and take them to my mum's garden. However, it would be good for more people living in the city to have the option of disposing of their food scraps. I think the council is already working towards collecting food waste to go to composting and I support this!

I support a food waste collection in Auckland. I think it is very important to have an organics collection system that works to prices that food and make it back into something that can feed our soils and divert it from landfill.

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.

Like the idea of food waste being collected as it is in England.

I'd love to see food waste collections implemented across the city.

I support investment into decentralised community composting hubs as the primary way to manage food waste in Auckland, with community garden facilitators funded to support composting.

Support for Zero Waste by 2040 Goal

I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040. With the right education everyone will get on board with this and it will be a lasting mindset change

I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040. Redefining our relationship to the environment and living in harmony with it will help us to create a kinder and less destructive way of living. This target, and the steps to get us there will take Aucklanders on a transformative behaviour and attitude change that will create a healthier and stronger community and economy for our city.

I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040. Make a safer future for our children and future generations.

Other comments

More recycling bins and compost bins need to be provided around Auckland Central, I often see rubbish bins overflowing with plastic bottles and recyclable materials so there need to be more. Soft plastic recycling stations need to be in every supermarket, post shop, library, public space as these items are often confusing for consumers as they don't know where to put these items. Chewing gum should be banned, that nasty stuff creates rubbish, sticks to peoples shoes and clothes and often birds end up eating it. There should be more education to businesses, schools and community groups about reducing, reusing and recycling and practical ideas to show people how to do the above. More water stations around the city so people can easily fill up their water bottles and avoid using single use containers. Disposable coffee cups should be banned!

Yes on with the composting of organic waste by council already! Plus - product stewardship schemes, to get producers taking responsibility for the waste they're generating through their product design and processes (e.g. container deposits). - community recycling centres in every local board, so we can deal with our waste locally and create employment - ongoing support and education for communities on how to reduce waste, including increased funding for schools to implement waste minimisation programmes and educate our children - more support for community events to be zero waste, including checking whether events that say they're reducing waste really are. - Council, as one of the largest employers in Auckland, to be implementing waste minimisation practices in everything they do. - separated bins (recycling, landfill, food waste) in public spaces. - local procurement by Council for work done in our communities e.g. in caring for waterways, parks, zero waste event support etc.

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

The Grey Lynn Residents Association applauds efforts to minimise the amount of material going to landfill through the reuse and recycling of waste products. We applaud Auckland Council's efforts to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill by 30% between 2012 and 2027 and the target of zero waste by 2040. Across Auckland section sizes are shrinking and more people live in apartments or residences with small garden areas, fewer people will be able to utilise their own green waste at home to make compost for their gardens. Therefore, it is important that council provides an easy way for this type of waste to be recycled rather than ending up in landfill. We support the introduction of a separate food scraps collection and the recycling of this waste into compost.

First, we would like to say that the business improvement district model is an excellent way for Council to partner with the commercial sector to find ways to reduce and divert waste

from landfill. Some BIDs have introduced initiatives to assist local businesses to minimise waste to landfill. These include educational forums, annual pallet collections and recycling initiatives. We ask that Council use a portion of the current Council Waste Minimisation Fund to partner with BIDs and business sectors so that we can maintain and enhance these initiatives in a sustainable ongoing way. We agree that the priority must be the three largest waste items - construction and demolition, plastic and organic waste. We ask that Council pay particular attention to the nature and frequency of its collections in business improvement districts.

Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 - Summary of Submissions received from the Auckland region

Introduction

On 5 December 2017, the Environment and Community Committee of Auckland Council approved the draft *Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan* (WMMP) for public consultation. The draft WMMP is a revision of the *Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2012*. The draft WMMP includes input from the *Auckland Council Waste Assessment 2017*, pre-statutory engagement with Councillors, Local Boards, Mana Whenua and Maatawaka, community waste-wise partners, youth, the Community Recycling Centre operators, and stakeholders from the recycling and waste industry.

The Committee passed the following resolutions (ENV/2017/185):

- Adopt the draft *Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste*, as the statement of proposal, pursuant to section 44 of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 and sections 83 and 87 of the Local Government Act 2002, for the purpose of undertaking formal consultation in accordance with the special consultative procedure.
- Approve that the draft *Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste* be made publicly available for consultation on 28 February 2018 with the consultation period ending on 28 March 2018 (the “Consultation Period”).
- Approve that the *Auckland Council Waste Assessment* be made publicly available with the *Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste*, for public consultation pursuant to section 50 (3)(a) and 44(e) of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008.
- Note that public consultation will occur concurrently with the special consultative procedure for the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.
- Recommend that the Governing Body delegate authority for spoken interaction at public engagement events during the consultation period in line with any such delegation made in respect of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and/or Auckland Plan refresh.

Feedback from the consultation process is intended to assist council determine the most appropriate combination of council’s legislative obligations and community expectations. This report summarises the submissions received as a result of the public consultation.

Public notification of the draft WMMP was included in the extensive publicity around the 10-year Budget (Long-term Plan) 2018-2028 consultation process. Submissions were also encouraged through the community waste-wise partners and networks (including youth), the five Community Recycling Centre operators, council’s Sustainable Schools Team, and the Para Kore Ki Tāmaki project to marae and marae whanau. An email was sent to the waste and resource recovery sector, businesses, and industry bodies, informing them of the draft WMMP consultation process.

The draft WMMP, summary of the draft WMMP, and submission feedback forms were made available online as part of akhaveyoursay consultation process. Hard copies were also made available at libraries and Have Your Say events. The draft WMMP summary document and feedback form were translated into Chinese, Korean, and New Zealand sign language and made available in an 'easy read' format.

A total of 6,758 submissions were received as a result of the consultation process. Of these, 4,605 were in the form of pro forma online submissions from Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance (ARA). Three online submission forms were made available on the ARA website combining topics relating to both the draft WMMP and the 10-year Budget (Long-term Plan) 2018-2028. To provide a clearer picture of submissions on the draft WMMP, ARA submissions are identified and reported on separately where applicable.

A small number of submissions that were late, were not processed in time for inclusion in this summary report.

In addition to the formal submissions, there were a number of informal submissions including pictures drawn by primary school children, videos from rangatahi from Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hoani Waititi Marae, and verbal feedback received through the 40 Have Your Say Events that were attended by Waste Solutions staff.

The numbers and types of submissions received are shown in the two tables below.

Table 1 – Types of formal submissions

Formal submission type	# subs	% subs
Council's submission feedback form (online and hard copy)	1,834	27%
Long form submissions	80	1%
Pro forma - Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance	4,605	68%
Pro forma submissions (non-ARA)	239	4%
Total	6,758*	100%

* 2,153 submissions received if ARA pro formas are not counted.

Table 2 – Types of informal submissions

Informal submission type*	# comments
Videos and drawings	96
Other informal submissions	1478
Have Your Say event feedback	449

Informal submission type*	# comments
Total	2023

*Informal submissions record comments and views that are not always attributable to individuals. They are not included in the data analysis but are included in the narrative of this report.

Over two-thirds of submissions were Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance pro formas.

A breakdown of the submissions, based on the type of submitter group, is presented in the table on the following page. The percentage of submissions both including and excluding ARA pro formas is shown.

The number of submissions received during consultation for the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2012 has been included for comparison.

Table 3 – Breakdown by submitter group

Submitter Group	# subs	% subs	% subs excluding ARA pro formas	# of subs 2011
Business (general)	28	0.4%	1%	23
Community sector	40	1%	2%	53
Individual	1,830	27%	85%	1868
Local government/government	1	0.01%	0%	3
Māori	214	3%	10%***	6*
Māori/iwi organisations/marae	5	0.1%	0.2%	
Professional associations	13	0.2%	1%	10
Pro forma - Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance	4,605	68%	-	-
Waste and resource recovery industry	22	0.3%	1%	60
Total	6,758**			2,035

*Māori submissions were classified differently in 2011 and 2018.

** 2,153 submissions if ARA pro formas are not counted.

*** The percentage of Māori in table 6 is 12% as the submitters were able to tick more than one ethnicity

If the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance pro forma submissions are included, 95% of the submissions received were from individual submitters, with the remainder being put forward by the community sector, the waste and resource recovery industry, and other organisations. The 3% of submissions classified as Māori (12% if ARA pro formas are excluded) included both individuals and organisations.

Submissions were received from all areas of the Auckland region, with a small number being received from outside of the region. A breakdown of the local board areas from which submissions were received, and for which address information is available, is provided in the table below. ARA pro forma submissions are not included as they did not include address information.

Table 4 – Breakdown by local board

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

Local board	# subs	% subs
Waiheke Local Board	75	3%
Waitākere Ranges Local Board	96	4%
Waitematā Local Board	130	6%
Whau Local Board	88	4%
Regional	1	0%
Not Supplied (non ARA)	174	8%
Outside Auckland	25	1%
*Not Supplied ARA	4605	

The gender of submitters was predominantly female (67%), with 32% of submission from males, and 1% from individuals who identified as gender diverse. Submissions were provided by residents from all age groups. The following table provides an overview of the age of submitters. ARA pro forma submissions are not included as they did not include age information.

Table 5 – Breakdown by age

Age of submitters	# subs	% subs
14 or younger	40	2%
15-24	164	9%
25-34	272	15%
35-44	357	20%
45-54	322	18%
55-64	282	16%
65-74	271	15%
75 or older	101	6%

The ages of submitters, where the submitters provided the information (1809) were well-distributed, with no single group predominating.

The following table provides an overview of the ethnicity of submitters, as recorded on the submission forms. ARA pro forma submissions are not included as they did not include ethnicity information.

Table 6 – Breakdown by ethnicity

Ethnicity of submitters	# subs	% subs
European	1205	68%
Māori	214	12%
Pacific	132	7%
Asian	371	21%
Other	53	3%

Note: some submitters ticked more than one ethnicity

In the following sections of this summary report, each of the seven questions in the submission feedback form is presented separately. Each section includes a synopsis of the themes that emerged from the consultation. The summary, ordered by feedback form questions, is followed by an analysis of responses from a range of submitter groups and an analysis of pro forma and informal submissions.

Throughout this summary report, verbatim responses from submitters are presented in italics. Further verbatim comments are included in Appendices 7 to 11.

Errors and omissions

Every effort has been made to ensure the data that has been presented is as accurate a reflection of the results of the submissions process as is possible. Any errors that are detected will be corrected.

Errors in form completion

The submission feedback form enabled the public to submit their views on the draft WMMP. The feedback form requested submitters to tick a box to show their level of support for six of seven questions included on the form. Five of these six questions ask for submitters to tick a box to show whether they: 'Strongly disagree', 'Disagree', 'Neutral', 'Agree', 'Strongly agree', or 'Don't know'.

The layout of these boxes, with 'Strongly disagree' at the top of the list, may have confused some submitters as some of the comments provided by submitters that ticked 'Strongly disagree' were clearly in agreement with the question. In the time available to prepare this summary report, it has not been possible to do a separate quantification or analysis of this issue.

Q1 - Most important outcomes

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)

1.1 Level of support for proposed outcomes

Submitters were asked to select up to three options from the outcomes listed or to provide other possible outcomes that they value. The level of importance submitters have given the different outcomes are in the table below. Only those submissions that answered the question have been included in the analysis. As submitters were asked to identify their three priority outcomes, the numbers total more than the number of submitters.

A breakdown of levels of support by Local Board is given in Appendix 1. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 7.

Table 7– Waste outcomes – Q.1

Question 1) Importance of waste outcomes	Response	# Subs	% Subs
	Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders	777	14%
	Reliability of collection services	485	9%
	Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions	1395	26%
	Reducing environmental and marine pollution	1394	26%
	Tidy public places	696	13%
	Creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries	496	9%
	Other	137	3%

Of the six outcomes provided in the feedback form, the most popular outcomes were “Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions” (26%) and “Reducing environmental and marine pollution” (26%).

“Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders” was the next most important outcome (14%), followed closely by “Tidy public places” (13%).

There were relatively few comments regarding the proposed outcomes. Ease of use and convenience of systems were mentioned by a number of submitters, as was the importance of education with regards to schools, businesses and the public. Waste reduction at source

was mentioned by some submitters (“*reducing consumption and production of unnecessary waste at source*”), and there were several comments about the importance of community ownership of waste solutions and a small number regarding the reduction of the use of plastics. A small number mentioned the need to keep costs and/or rates down.

Q2 - Focus on business and commercial activities

In the last plan, we focused mostly on our services to households, which handle around 20 per cent of the waste that goes to landfill. Now we want to expand our waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities. What do you think of this approach and why?

2.1 Level of support for proposal

An analysis of the overall level of submitters' agreement with the question is given in the table below. Only those submissions that answered the question have been included in the analysis. A breakdown of levels of support by Local Board is given in Appendix 2. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 8.

Table 8 – Level of support – Q.2

Question 2) Expand efforts to include business and commercial activities	Response	# Subs	% Subs
	Strongly disagree	129	7%
	Disagree	43	2%
	Neutral	102	5%
	Agree	509	27%
	Strongly agree	1104	57%
	Don't know	36	2%

The level of support for council to expand waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from business and commercial activities was very high. Overall, 84 per cent of submitters 'Strongly agree' or 'Agree' with this approach. Nine per cent of submitters 'Disagree' or 'Strongly disagree'. Seven per cent of submitters were either neutral or didn't know.

2.2 Themes emerging

2.2.1 Submissions agreeing with proposal

Submitters who agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal (84%) generally felt that it was logical for council to include the 80 per cent of waste from business and commercial activities due to the large proportion of the waste stream it comprises. *"Because the commercial sector is responsible for 80%, and because you can't have a double-standard of doing well at home, but not at work - the one influences the other, so a double-pronged approach is best."* A similar proportion of submissions stated that businesses need to do their fair share to reduce waste.

Many submissions made broad reference to the amount of waste generated by construction and demolition work and noted that they would like to see specific focus in this space.

Many submissions, while agreeing with the proposal, assumed that it would be council providing additional services to the commercial sector although this is not specified in the draft WMMP.

There was support for education on diversion and minimisation being provided by council, but many believed this would need to be accompanied by regulation or incentives as *“Businesses won't make changes unless they are forced to. The environment should not be collateral damage for their commercial choices”*.

A number of submissions raised concerns about environmental degradation. Specific issues referred to were pollution of waterways, emissions associated with global climate change, microplastic pollution, and the leaching of toxic chemicals into the soil from landfill.

There was significant support for the reduction of, or banning, of single use packaging – both supporting council implementing this or seeing businesses being responsible for reducing waste by influencing the amount of packaging being produced.

2.2.2 Submissions disagreeing with proposal

The submissions that disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal (9%) mostly mention cost as the reason as it is not seen as ratepayers' responsibility to pay for business waste minimisation efforts. Some submitters disagreed with council expanding its focus to commercial waste management on the basis that they believe council is not yet adequately managing residential waste and should improve residential waste minimisation first.

A small number of submissions state that central government should be more proactive.

“The regulation of private industry is not best done by local governance, rather better by central government. In my opinion councils do not tend to have a good understanding of how businesses work and can create complex regulations which suck up time and money from organisations trying to meet the regulations. I would rather council supported the development of accreditation schemes or solutions created and managed by private industry, who may be more effective at driving positive behaviour change.”

While most of the waste and resource recovery industry submissions agreed with council expanding its efforts to include business and commercial activities, Waste Management NZ Ltd strongly disagreed. Waste Management NZ Ltd has *“serious concerns about Auckland Council taking a more active role in the commercial waste sector in Auckland than it already does, and underplaying the important role that private operators play”*. The submission repeatedly raises the issue of competition law - *“...the Council, as a waste operator itself, will potentially be in breach of competition law where it attempts to assert greater control over commercial competitors through regulation.”*

Packaging Council of New Zealand Inc. questions *“what is the justification for directing rate payer resources into the private commercial sector?...We suggest that ‘plastic waste’ is such a general term as to be worthless in the context of this draft plan.”*

Q3 - Reduce commercial C&D, plastic, and organic waste

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?

3.1 Level of support for proposal

An analysis of the overall level of submitters' agreement with the question is given in the table below. Only those submissions that answered the question have been included in the analysis. A breakdown of levels of support by Local Board is given in Appendix 3. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 9.

Table 9 – Level of support – Q.3

Question 3) Reduce commercial C&D, plastic, and organic waste	Response	# Subs	% Subs
	Strongly disagree	135	7%
	Disagree	14	1%
	Neutral	77	4%
	Agree	510	27%
	Strongly agree	1151	60%
	Don't know	28	1%

A strong majority of submitters (87%) 'Agree' or 'Strongly agree' with council's proposal to try new approaches to reduce commercial construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste from landfill. Sixty per cent of submitters 'Strongly agree' and a further 27 per cent 'Agree'.

Seven per cent of submitters 'Strongly disagree' and 1 per cent 'Disagree' with this proposal.

3.2 Themes emerging

3.2.1 Submissions agreeing with proposal

Most submissions agreed or strongly agreed (87%) with the proposal and many stated that businesses need to do their fair share to reduce waste and agree that the three priority waste streams should be reduced or recycled. There was strong support for businesses taking more responsibility for the waste they produce.

While many submissions suggested that council should play a role in both educating and supporting businesses to achieve effective diversion, a number of submitters believed the proposal needed to be supported with regulation, bylaws, and/or financial incentives.

There was a general feeling amongst submitters that businesses need to take more responsibility for the waste they are producing but many considered that businesses would not make the necessary changes without incentives, either in the form of mandatory waste management plans, product stewardship schemes, or through other financial incentives. There was strong agreement that council should reinforce such initiatives with education and support for businesses.

A high proportion of submissions in favour of reducing food waste suggested a food redistribution system as the first step in reducing waste, with excess food from businesses being given to those in need. In general, there was support for better systems to collect and process all types of organics.

Fewer submissions commented on construction and demolition waste than on organics. Many of the submissions acknowledged that construction and demolition waste contributes significantly to waste to landfill and expressed concern at the potential for this to increase with the future development in Auckland. These submitters agreed it should be a focus for council. Many submissions observed that only a single bin was used at construction sites and nothing was recycled.

Many of the submissions that agreed mentioned concerns about pollution and environmental protection. Plastic packaging was mentioned frequently in the context of plastic waste.

Product stewardship and the broader idea that businesses and producers need to be responsible for the end-of-life of their products was frequently referred to, with a particular focus on reducing plastic packaging.

The majority of submissions from the waste and resource recovery industries expressed support for council working with businesses to reduce the three priority waste streams.

3.2.2 Submissions disagreeing with proposal

Most of the submissions that disagree or strongly disagree with council working with businesses to reduce the three specified waste streams (8%) state that, as rates are paid for household services and not for businesses, council should stay focussed on household waste.

Northland Waste considers that a cost/benefit analysis should be undertaken before council embarks on commercial waste minimisation. *“What, for example will be the impact on the cost of new homes, and will the environmental benefits be sufficient to outweigh the impacts?”*

Waste Management NZ Ltd *“agrees that new approaches to reducing commercial waste should continue to be explored, but strongly disagrees that the Council should drive this”.*

Q4 - Community Recycling Centres

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.

4.1 Level of support for proposal

An analysis of the overall level of submitters' agreement with the question is given in the table below. Only those submissions that answered the question have been included in the analysis. A breakdown of levels of support by local board is given in Appendix 4. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 10.

Table 10– Level of support – Q.4

Question 4) Community Recycling Centres	Response	# Subs	% Subs
	Strongly disagree	140	7%
	Disagree	23	1%
	Neutral	91	5%
	Agree	526	27%
	Strongly agree	1122	59%
	Don't know	18	1%

Overall, there was a high level of support from submitters for council's approach to Community Recycling Centres (CRCs). Eighty-six per cent of submitters 'Strongly agree' (59%) or 'Agree' (27%) with this approach. Eight per cent of submitters 'Disagree' or 'Strongly disagree'.

4.2 Themes emerging

4.2.1 Submissions agreeing with proposal

The general opinion from submitters that agreed or strongly agreed (86%) with council's plan to provide seven more CRCs by 2024 was that, if CRCs make it easier for people to reuse and recycle, then they should be supported.

Many submissions mentioned the need for education. This included the need for council to do a better job to raise awareness about the existence of the centres themselves: *"This is a good approach however I wasn't aware of these Community Recycling Centres so the communication of this initiative needs improving."* Submitters also mentioned the need for better waste minimisation education overall: *"I hate not knowing what to do with unwanted stuff! Better education and support please! I absolutely believe so much more could be diverted from landfill."* There were also suggestions that the CRCs could be hubs for waste minimisation education.

There were suggestions around CRCs providing an opportunity for the repurposing of items: *“I'm a fan of any dump shop. Recycling is not the solution though, it would be great if each centre also had a Repair café...the council has a role in encouraging a change in mindset from buy cheap and replace - to buy well and repair. I feel a little cynical that all the onus is being put on individuals to make change - which is why I'm so pleased to hear you plan to work with commercial businesses. “*

Many submitters suggested that there should be more CRCs, preferably one in every suburb to ensure it is convenient for the community and to ensure that maximum recycling and waste diversion occurs: *“The more there are, the easier they are to access; the easier they are to access, the easier it is to recycle. It's THAT simple.”*

Some submitters felt that CRCs would remove some of the barriers that lead to illegal dumping, although several expressed the feeling that 12 CRCs would not be enough to have a genuine impact: *“At the moment it's pretty much either your standard rubbish/recycling or the dump which is too expensive so people leave items on the side of the road.”*

Submissions were received with specific requests that CRCs be established in the following areas to stem illegal dumping: Clevedon, Papakura, Ardmore, New Lynn, Titirangi Beach, Torbay, Waitakere Ranges, Manurewa and south Auckland.

There were several comments that mentioned the multiple benefits of CRCs (social, economic and environmental), particularly job creation. Comments also discussed the opportunity for people to have more local visibility and ownership of their unwanted goods by seeing them being processed at the CRCs: *“From what I have seen of the Community Recycling Centres, when communities are allowed to be involved there is a huge mind shift to helping and taking ownership.”*

About half of the submissions from the waste and resource recovery industry were in support. Junk Run states that *“This is an excellent concept and needs to be expanded to include licensed commercial operators. The concept needs to be expanded to include items from commercial businesses and demolition and building sites.”*

4.2.2 Submissions disagreeing with proposal

Fewer than 20 submissions stated that they would prefer to have the old inorganic collection reinstated: *“The inorganic collection that was operating in the past took care of this problem and minimizes fly tipping”. “Waste of council money. Op shops do this already. The scheme will deprive charities of income... Bring back inorganic collections so individuals can scavenge to provide income, recycle, minimise waste - all those things you are trying to encourage, you have stopped by stopping inorganic collections.”*

Northland Waste opposes CRCs, asserting that *“... community groups incur greater expense and achieve lower levels of waste diversion than efficient private operators.”* Waste Management NZ Ltd considers that *“...Auckland is already appropriately serviced by private resource recovery and recycling centres.”*

Q5 - Product stewardship

We want to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where drink containers such as plastic, glass bottles and cans include a refundable deposit when returned for recycling. This would encourage more recycling and help to shift the costs of recovery from council and ratepayers to the producers and consumers of beverages. What do you think of this approach and why?

5.1 Level of support for proposal

An analysis of the overall level of submitters' agreement with the question is given in the table below. Only those submissions that answered the question have been included in the analysis. A breakdown of levels of support by Local Board is given in Appendix 5. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 11.

Table 11 – Level of support – Q.5

Question 5) Product stewardship	Response	# Subs	% Subs
	Strongly disagree	147	8%
	Disagree	47	2%
	Neutral	84	4%
	Agree	442	23%
	Strongly agree	1172	61%
	Don't know	31	2%

Eighty-four per cent of submitters 'Agree' (23%) or 'Strongly agree' (61%) with the proposal and state that council should encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. Ten per cent of submitters 'Disagree' (2%) or 'Strongly disagree' (8%).

5.2 Themes emerging

5.2.1 Submissions agreeing with proposal

Of the submitters who made comments on product stewardship, the comments were overwhelmingly in support of a scheme being introduced (84% agreed or strongly agreed). *"Really great way to get more people to recycle. I think this is one of the best ideas the council has had in a long time!!"*

Most people commented on the specifics of a container deposit scheme (CDS) rather than Product Stewardship. Reasons for supporting CDS included the increase in recycling and reduction in littering this would be expected to cause. *"All the research we've seen shows that this is the best way to increase recycling and reduce littering. We have a big problem with littering in our area and with plastic containers getting into the waterways. We think that*

the public would really get behind this as a way of earning pocket-money and fundraising. We hope it would also pave the way for other products to be included in product stewardship schemes.”

Many comments referred to the success of such schemes overseas. *“Let’s do this already! It is extremely tiring that we are still dragging our feet on this one when case studies all over the world prove that this actually works.”*

Some criticism of central government came through in the comments, such as *“Overseas experience has strongly supported this approach. The “hands off” approach by previous governments is deplorable in the face of this evidence.”*

A number of submissions stated a clear understanding of and support for Extended Producer Responsibility, discussing the need for incentives for both consumers and producers to not purchase or manufacture wasteful goods. *“I think this is a great way to incentivize consumers and also make manufacturers/companies think twice about the materials they’re using.”*

“Large polluters like McDonalds and CocaCola, who’s products are a notable feature of rubbish littered across the city, should have a levy added on to the price of products, paid for by the consumers purchasing them (and irresponsibly disposing of them), to help contribute to the cost of cleaning up their products which are littered all over the city.”

“When companies have to take responsibility for their packaging waste they make more socially responsible decisions. Local government and ratepayers should not have to absorb the cost of this disposal while producers privatize the profits gained from irresponsible business practices.”

“Litter from drink bottles is a problem in the community where I live. They end up in drains and in the local streams. Having a bottle deposit would tidy up our streets and provide a little pocket money for locals. This would also send a message to the manufacturers. It is time for NZ to live up to its clean and green image and catch up environmentally with the rest of the developed world.”

There was widespread support for product stewardship from the waste and resource recovery industry. Tyres, e-waste, and batteries were specifically mentioned as requiring the support that product stewardship schemes would provide.

Waste Management NZ states that product stewardship schemes *“shift the cost of recycling waste to the consumers of products, and away from commercial waste industry operators (which in turn assists these operators to provide other low-cost waste services to ratepayers).”*

5.2.2 Submissions disagreeing with proposal

Of those who were against product stewardship schemes (10% disagreed or strongly disagreed), the majority of comments stated that a scheme would cost too much or wouldn’t make a difference. *“They don’t work. And the huge cost of a vast bureaucracy to manage them will just mean more expense for the ratepayer.”*

A wide range of reasons were stated as to why people felt CDS wouldn't work, from the volatility of plastic markets, to a lack of faith that people would use the scheme when they can already recycle through the kerbside system. Some comments assumed that council would run the scheme and they were not confident that this was appropriate *"You can't be trusted to get this right"*, *"This is just another business that council will not run efficiently. End up with a large number of managers being paid more in an ever expanding bureaucracy."*

There were also a number of submitters that disagreed with CDS as they preferred to see a reduction in the use of plastics *"Better to reduce use of plastic at source"*, *"So thing needs to be done but a ban on single use plastic drinking bottles would be better. Leave fossil fuels in the ground. Stop global warming!"*

Overseas examples of CDS were not seen as successful by all submitters. *"I think there are serious issues with container deposit schemes (CDS) as implemented. Recently NSW introduced CDS, and awarded the entire (lucrative) contract to a single (monopoly) provider who promptly installed their (quite old) technology across the state, leading to lengthy queues of homeless people putting other people off using the scheme. I don't believe we want recycling to be the domain of desperate people and a form of welfare - we want everyone participating because it is the right thing to do."*

The Packaging Forum operates two voluntary product stewardship schemes and does not agree with the draft WMMP supporting a mandatory container deposit scheme based on the perception that drink containers are being recycled at a low rate and causing a major litter problem. The Forum *"suggested to Auckland Council officials that we identify the true beverage container recycling rate in Auckland"*.

The Packaging Council of New Zealand disagrees with the draft WMMP using the terms 'product stewardship' and 'extended producer responsibility' interchangeably. *"Of particular concern is the freedom using the term 'stewardship' interchangeably with 'extended producer responsibility' gives to Council and consumers to 'opt out' of their share of responsibility for waste prevention and management."*

Q6 - Hauraki Gulf Islands

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

6.1 Level of support for proposal

An analysis of the overall level of submitters' agreement with the question is given in the table below. A breakdown of levels of support by Local Board is given in Appendix 6. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 12.

Table12 – Level of support – Q.6

Question 6) Hauraki Gulf Islands	Response	# Subs	% Subs
	Strongly disagree	70	4%
	Disagree	15	1%
	Neutral	282	16%
	Agree	438	24%
	Strongly agree	496	27%
	Don't know	516	28%

A large number of submitters didn't express an opinion about the proposed *Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan*, with 28% of submitters stating that they 'Don't know' what they think of the plan and a further 16% remaining 'Neutral'. Just over half of respondents (51%) either 'Agree' (24%) or 'Strongly agree' (27%) with the plan, while five per cent 'Strongly disagree' or 'Disagree'.

A number of submitters stated in their comments that they did not have enough information to comment on the draft WMMP.

6.2 Themes emerging

6.2.1 Submissions agreeing with proposal

Many submitters agreed that the Hauraki Gulf Islands are unique and require a unique plan. There were numerous comments about the ecological significance of the gulf and the islands, and the need to keep them pristine for generations to come. The importance of protecting the marine environment was also mentioned in many submissions.

There were a number of comments about the different needs of the Hauraki Gulf Islands, and the challenges due to the cost of transporting waste and recyclables to the mainland.

A number of pro-forma submissions were received with the following comment - *“Yes, it is unique and it is important to get it right on Waiheke island or else our marine environment becomes even more polluted. 1 - Our situation as an island is unique because we have always dealt with the entire waste stream. 2 - We face natural tariff barriers in freight, which limits our options. We have to be smarter with on island solutions. 3 - Our community has proved time and time again that it really cares about this issue and wants a satisfactory answer, the thousands of submissions to the Royal Commissions on the governance of Auckland demanding local control of our waste stream is evidence of this.”*

The need for local solutions was referred to in a number of submissions, especially with reference to Waiheke.

Some requested stronger goals from council: *“The idea to address the island/gulf-specific waste management needs is great! It's also impressive to see it framed from a community & iwi engagement focus. That said, the plan can be stronger by setting quantifiable goals for waste to landfill minimisation (e.g. "divert 80% of organic waste from landfill by 2022" instead of "divert 'more' organic waste...").”*

A minority of submissions from the waste and resource recovery industry supported council's approach in the draft HGI draft Plan.

6.2.2 Submissions disagreeing with proposal

Ten submitters provided comments disagreeing with the draft WMMP. The comments were varied, from not wanting user-pays to requesting that Waiheke waste collection not become fortnightly.

A small number of submitters disagreed that the Hauraki Gulf Islands required a separate plan or should be treated differently.

Low Impact, the manufacturer of a vermicomposting system, disagrees with the kerbside services included in the HGI draft Plan, specifically organic waste collection. *“If a proper evaluation had been done at the time, the answers to some very basic and common sense questions regarding the proposed kerbside pick up of organic waste would be in the public realm. They are not, and I believe it is because the Council has not answered them before committing to the kerbside pick up.”*

Waste Management NZ Ltd stated *“Waiheke Island has a significant seasonal population fluctuation and should remain as part of the Auckland waste system”*. Waste Management also submits that it *“has developed a transfer station and resource recovery facility on Waiheke Island for the Council. This is a model that could be used on other Hauraki Gulf Islands”*.

6.2.3. Island-specific submissions

A small number of submissions are specific to individual islands. These are summarised below:

Waiheke

- A number of submitters from Waiheke noted how much their community cares about waste, the island's strong waste minimisation culture, the effectiveness of how the community used to be responsible for the entire waste stream and finding innovative uses for 'waste' material, and the need for local control of the waste stream. "*Let Waiheke make their own decisions*".
- Three submitters noted the success of dealing with food scraps through local composting initiatives and how this could be up-scaled.
- One submitter opposed the move to fortnightly rubbish collections and the impact this would have on weekend residents and holiday makers.
- A local community recycler strongly advocated for a community-run resource recovery park that manages and controls all waste on Waiheke. They state that this could see a reduction in at least 30% of waste taken off the island and remove any need for a ratepayer "subsidy". They also believe that it's unsustainable to continue free green waste disposal on Waiheke, when it's charged for everywhere else, and that any solution for Waiheke needs to ensure maximum waste is diverted on the island and not shipped off.

Kawau Island

- One submitter noted the overflowing bins at Sandspit while another noted the problems with inorganic waste and the cost and difficulty of removing it from the island.
- One submitter noted the need for more recycling facilities to be available at the boat club and for a free recycling pick up because too many glass bottles are going to landfill. One submitter supported the recycle bins at Sandspit.
- One submitter stated that Kawau residents should pay for their own rubbish and not just dump it at Sandspit wharf.

Great Barrier

- One submitter stated they should have source-separated recycling on Great Barrier because comingled recycling leads to the loss of integrity of the recyclable material.
- "*I don't see an advantage in having to pay for green waste to be disposed of at the tip as this is an asset to be made into compost that can be sold. I would like to see the building material made from scrap go ahead as it would use up a lot of landfill materials. I would like to see people able to go ahead and drop off recycling for free at the tip. I would like to see the inorganic waste collection and reuse and rebuild shop develop as planned. Though the current location of this shop is not widely known. I agree more effort needs to be to educate people about what can be recycled and I think co-mingling process makes this harder for people to get it right. I still fret that recyclables are wasted due to contamination. We had a great system here in the past where we employed people at the tip to sort recyclables and people*

would also sort them at their gates. I am not sure how you are going to get the tourists and boaties waste managed. But good on you for having the ambition.”

Q7 - Other feedback

Do you have any other comments about the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan?

Question 7 offered an opportunity for submitters to provide comment on any other aspects of the draft WMMP that were not covered in the previous six questions.

A wide range of topics were mentioned in the comments provided under Question 7. All comments that did not refer to the six specific questions in the council submission feedback form are included in the analysis under Question 7. A range of comments is provided in Appendix 13.

The two largest pro forma submissions (EcoMatters and Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance) include comments that are captured in this section.

7.1 Waste levy

The Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance submitted 4,605 pro forma submissions that opposed council advocating for an increase in the national waste levy. *"I submit that you do not use ratepayers' money to lobby government for an increase to the National Waste Levy. An increase will just increase costs for ratepayers on top of your proposed regional fuel tax, and increased rates"*.

Apart from the ARA pro forma submissions, 249 submitters included a comment about the waste levy. A majority of these expressed strong support for an increase in the levy. *"Strong government lobbying is required to ensure the waste levy is increased to something approaching average international levels. Only with a financial disincentive will companies start looking at other options."*

While most businesses and waste industry players who commented on the waste levy were in support of an increase, it was also suggested that any increase needs to be well-signalled, with staged increase or at a lower maximum level.

The 195 EcoMatters pro forma (see section 9.1) stated that *"I want to see a gradual increase in the landfill waste levy from \$10/tonne to \$140/tonne"*.

Both EnviroWaste Services Ltd and Waste Management NZ Ltd support the expansion of the waste levy to include all types of disposal sites.

Northland Waste questions the research used by council to support increasing the waste levy. *"We invite councillors to question the motive behind this initiative very clearly, and examine without prejudice, the cost implications on this initiative to the average Aucklanders."*

Green Gorilla *"disagree with the extent of the suggested landfill levy proposals and support a shift to say \$50 tonne over 5 years. Higher rates will produce some perverse avoidance outcomes and risk being a financial burden without actually increasing diversion"*.

Oji Fibre Solutions do not consider *"any increase in Auckland's waste disposal cost as a result of an increase in the waste levy helpful or justified as a solution to solid waste"*. Their

view is that "*Recycling of commodities unavoidably generates some waste*" and that "*the waste levy needs to be seen as an unavoidable cost, a reduction in long term profitability*".

7.2 Fortnightly waste collections

The Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance submitted 4,605 pro forma submissions opposed to a "reduction in collection services at an increased cost", presumably relating to the move to fortnightly waste collections.

"I oppose the draft plan that would see my collection service reduced, but at an increased cost." "In addition, any increase to Council's provision of waste services should only be done if it leads to better service at a lower cost to ratepayers – not for ideological reasons."

There were a small number of other submissions that opposed a move to fortnightly waste collections. *"I oppose the move to fortnightly rubbish collection. We moved to small rubbish bins and now we have rubbish bags being dumped everywhere. This will only get worse with fortnightly collection. It is absolutely ridiculous that this is being suggested. In south Auckland households are much larger and so have more rubbish and they can least afford paying for more rubbish bins. So people will just dump stuff in parks."*

A few submissions supported the move to fortnightly waste collections. *"I strongly agree with moving to a fortnightly, user-pays system across the region. It is my view that ensuring residents face the true cost of waste is the most effective way of encouraging behavioural change."*

7.3 Organics

There were approximately 1,100 comments made on organic waste, principally around the food scraps collection and composting.

Many comments were made about food scrap collections with the majority of submissions giving qualified support for the service. Most people strongly support the concept of diverting food away from landfill, though some question the universal charge for it, mentioning how they already compost, worm-farm or bokashi at home. A number want to be able to opt out of the service and not be charged for it. *"We are concerned about the new service coming to households, as there is an increase to come in our rates to pay for this service, when we already compost our food waste. So, we should be able to opt out of some of the service."*

EcoMatters Trust pro forma submissions support a short-term targeted rate to set up the service but for it to be a user-pays service in the future. They also support decentralised processing and community composting. *"I support a food waste collection in Auckland. I support a short-term targeted rate to pay for the initial coordination of food waste management, but would like a pay-as-you-throw food waste collection within five years. I support investment into decentralised community composting hubs as the primary way to manage food waste in Auckland, with community garden facilitators funded to support composting."* A small number of submissions supported providing households with vermicomposting bins or in-sink waste disposal units rather than introducing a council food waste collection.

“The food scraps service has been one I have utilised over the last two years, as my area has been lucky enough to have the trial run. This is a great service, and a straight forward way for local residents to make a difference. It has reduced our general waste noticeably. With the food scraps and recycling services in place, residents are really able to reduce the amount of household waste going to landfill. Such a positive change!”

Some submitters see the service as a way to address climate change. *“Think it’s important to have a food scraps collection to help address climate change..... Please bring food waste bins and have a facility to process it and turn into compost in Auckland!!”*

Other submitters are impatient to receive the service. *“Personally I just want to know how this will affect me. We currently pay Econowaste for our rubbish collection service as the council doesn’t provide this service to our area. Will the foodscraps initiative be heading our way. The sooner the better as a HUGE amount of our waste is food scraps. I find the council incredibly slow to implement these changes.”* Māori submitters strongly support the food scraps collection, particularly submitters from the south. *“We need food bins in South Auckland to educate Whanau in food/leai waste/para.”*

Waste Management NZ Ltd strongly opposes the proposal for a kerbside food scraps collection. In their view *“...the Council’s methodology of measuring foodwaste tonnes to landfill is flawed and misleading and is likely to result in the unnecessary development of highly inefficient alternative technologies”* and also *“... disagrees that organic waste contributes to the level of carbon dioxide emissions described in the Draft WMMP”*.

The Bioenergy Association notes that *“The use of food waste to produce energy is used internationally as a means of reducing waste disposal to landfill”* and that *“Extending the household food waste collections to small businesses (cafes etc) should also be considered to achieve economies of scale and collection efficiencies”*.

7.4 Education

Over 330 submitters commented specifically about waste education or communication. A common theme was support for more waste education and communication, or investment in education on waste reduction, often suggested via schools. A few submitters took this point further to suggest council should provide more information to residents on product life cycles.

Some submitters thought education should be undertaken through community groups that can connect schools with what is happening locally.

Respondents also commented that council should provide more information on what/where/how to recycle, and what happens to the recycling collected.

There is little comment from the waste and resource recovery industry regarding education. Waste Management NZ Ltd states that *“Waste Management is of the view that the Council should focus on minimising the amount of waste that is generated at source, as this is an area where it is able to add value through education”*.

7.5 Zero Waste

Many submissions (mostly pro formas) mention ‘zero waste’ specifically (*“I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040”*), and the concept/vision was implicit in many comments recorded.

There was a handful of comments that New Zealand's clean green image is either a fallacy, or is under threat from our bad waste habits, and therefore we need to move towards zero waste.

7.6 Community Recycling Centres (CRCs)

There was a significant level of support for Community Recycling Centres. Over 260 submitters included additional comments about CRCs. The idea of funding local or community solutions rather than creating a centralised collection was supported by many submitters. *"I feel that there should be more emphasis on a community empowerment model - fund the community to identify local solutions where possible."*

There was a moderate number of comments (mostly from pro forma submissions) regarding Community Recycling Centres requesting that the network be completed. Some pro forma submissions also requested that CRCs be used as composting hubs.

There were a number of submitters that stated that they did not know that there was a CRC network in Auckland.

The re-establishment of a community-run CRC on Waiheke was requested by a number of submitters.

7.7 Product Stewardship

Over 240 submitters included additional comments about product stewardship. There was a significant level of support for a container deposit scheme, with many people talking about their positive experience of this while overseas, or when they were a child.

Support shown was predominantly for a community based or non-profit CDS - many comments in support were from pro forma submissions *"I want to see a non-commercial bottle deposit scheme for beverage containers, where proceeds go into recycling education."*

There was much support, mostly from pro forma submissions, for mandatory product stewardship schemes for e-waste, batteries, tyres and packaging.

Banning single-use plastic bags and packaging was mentioned in a large number of submissions, with a smaller number suggesting a levy should be used to reduce their use.

7.8 Public Place Recycling

More public place recycling was requested by approximately 45 submitters, particularly at events and in public places, including parks.

7.8 Hazardous materials

Several submitters requested that council provide better systems or facilities for the handling of domestic hazardous wastes such as e-waste and batteries.

Interwaste and Upcycle Battery Recycling focused their submissions on possible improvements to the draft WMMP's handling of hazardous wastes.

8 - Analysis of submissions by group

8.1 Views of Māori

Overall, there was strong support for the draft WMMP from Māori submissions, in particular for the Māori priorities and actions that were identified through the pre-engagement process.

There were 214 submissions received from Māori (12% of submissions when ARA pro formas are excluded) – three from Para Kore Marae and the others predominantly from Māori residents. Five were video submissions received – four from rangatahi at Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hoani Waititi Marae and one from Matariki Marae. No submissions were received from mana whenua.

Key areas of support were for an increase of the waste levy, resources and support for Māori initiatives, the food scraps kerbside collection (particularly from south Auckland respondents), Community Recycling Centres and local jobs, advocating for product stewardship (particularly a container deposit scheme), and a focus on construction and demolition waste. A number of submissions also commented on illegal dumping, advocating for reducing the use of plastic, and banning single-use plastic bags.

Videos from Hoani Waititi Kura Kaupapa emphasised care for Papatuanuku and the environment, Māori health and wellbeing, eliminating landfills, food waste collections, and the importance of product stewardship.

“We are impressed with the Māori perspective and content. Pai ano. Prioritise Māori Action Plan.”

“The earth is precious and I want to do anything to protect it.”

“I've read the following proposal & wholeheartedly agree with it. As a consumer & small business owner I would happily recycle my waste & love the idea of that also benefiting my local community. The more people who speak up, the better. “

“Need to tackle how much we produce not just how we dispose of it.”

“I would love to see more education and implementing if schemes with our schools a must have! More community groups tackling local issues and funding available for these groups. More support systems in place for families who do not understand recycling and zero waste. Ability to plant fruit trees everywhere to feed our communities.”

“For the sake of the planet, we must take action wherever we can. If it's do-able, it should absolutely be done.”

“I believe there needs to be a community recycling centre for every local board area. Each local board area has enough people to sustain its own centre, and by dealing with waste locally, we are able to see what we're creating and be connected with its end-life. This would create local employment opportunities and ensure that the community benefits from having such a centre.”

“We need; ongoing support and education for communities on how to reduce waste, including increased funding for schools to implement waste minimisation programmes and educate our children.”

8.2 Views of business

There were 28 submissions received from businesses not directly involved with the waste and resource recovery sectors. Business submissions generally agreed that businesses need to focus on reducing waste. They commented that regulatory tools and cost incentives such as the waste levy and product stewardship could help with motivating businesses to reduce waste. This corresponded with comments suggesting businesses may not separate rubbish from recycling as it is easier or cheaper to put rubbish and recycling in the skip bin to landfill.

“This is the perfect way to go. With the waste itself being a huge issue for businesses, council support will help encourage them to reduce their waste.”

There were several comments about the need for education for businesses and the public, including simple key messages on how to reduce and recycle. *“We struggle with public literacy being so low. We have events with recycling centres and the public that are so appalling that everything has to go into a container for landfill because it is so mixed....”*

Several business submitters showed support for product stewardship and responsibility for end-of-life solutions during product design and development. Many submitters mentioned product stewardship schemes working overseas and those countries having higher recycling rates and lower litter issues. There were also comments stating the best option is reduce or eliminate products at source that cannot be recycled.

There was a comment about the need for regulation to stem the import of sub-quality products designed for a short life span as they are non-repairable.

There was some support for an increase of the waste levy. *“We also support Council asking central government for an increase in the Waste Levy beyond \$10 per tonne provided the revenue is ‘ring fenced’ to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure waste is diverted from landfills and that any increase is phased in over a well signalled time period.”*

One business voiced concern over the economic implications of a waste levy on cleanfill and managed fill. The business stated that the beneficial re-use of inert materials should not attract a financial penalty, and that any increase in the levy should be restricted to landfills.

Construction and demolition (C&D) waste was mentioned by several submitters, and the need for developers to be responsible for the waste they produce and import.

“Business owners, developers and construction companies must be accountable for the landfill waste they produce. The developer should be considering how much waste is being produced by cutting cost and importing building products that are over packaged. The developer should be taking notes on how many tonnes of landfill the building is producing.”

Support was voiced for the need for the plastic recycling industry to grow in New Zealand.

Several submitters requested a service to collect and process compostable packaging, potentially in the proposed food scraps collection. *“On average we pay three to four times more than our competitors to offer a compostable packaging option - we do this as we believe it is important to offer viable alternatives to soft plastics and mixed grade plastic/foil*

that would otherwise go to landfill. We believe a collaborative approach between council and business is key in changing habits and creating new consumer habits that encourage composting at home or via council collections.”

Submitters commented on the benefits of Community Recycling Centres (CRC) that engage people around waste issues, and are convenient and accessible. Other comments supported the centres taking a wide range of items.

A small number of submitters raised concerns over CRCs dealing with hazardous waste.

A small number of business submitters disagreed with more Community Recycling Centres as the private industry and charitable organisations already recycle some items.

One business raised concerns that reducing the frequency of collections will increase illegal dumping in parks, shopping centre rubbish bins and private property.

Long form submissions were received from Progressive Enterprises and Housing NZ Corporation.

Progressive Enterprises was generally supportive of the draft WMMP. Key points that they submitted include a recommendation that *“When advocating for an increased waste levy that the Auckland Council should consider advocating for incremental levy increases over a period of years to allow opportunity for alternate diversion and end of life options and infrastructure to be developed and implemented.”* They also advocate for an outright ban on single use plastic carrier bags.

Housing NZ Corporation generally support the strategic direction of the draft WMMP. However, they are opposed to a change from weekly to fortnightly refuse collection, due to the potential for H&S issues with tenants with special needs and requirements which rely heavily on the service.

They also request that they be consulted early about introduction of proposed initiatives that affect their assets and tenants.

8.3 Views of community organisations

Forty submissions were received from community organisations. These were mostly themed around supporting initiatives that result in outcomes that enable community groups to own, operate and be involved in designing and delivering waste solutions.

Overwhelmingly responses agreed the real gains in waste minimisation sit with the commercial sector and stated it was fair that business must be made to do their share to reduce waste. Most supported business being given more actual legislated responsibility for waste minimisation and reduction in consumption of resources. Groups felt local government was not best placed to make the necessary level of change and indicated central government must play a stronger role, and the private sector itself was well-placed to create and manage solutions.

Most community organisation submitters felt that commercial organic waste and, to some degree, C&D waste were lower-hanging fruit than the overuse of plastics, which continues to be problematic. Raising the landfill levy and giving industry the same waste minimisation

responsibilities as local authorities under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 was supported by approximately half of the community submissions.

Several community organisations commented on the food scraps service, with a diverse range of views. Transition Towns Point Chevalier supported a network of local composting facilities instead of a large industrial plant because of the opportunities for local enterprise to get involved in building sustainable, connected communities. Grey Lynn 2030 and Mahurangi Waste Busters recognised that the service needs to meet the needs of the wider public. There was generally support for a gradual shift to user-pays for all waste streams to enable those who do home compost to benefit.

All community organisations supported Community Recycling Centres. Most mentioned the positive outcomes as a result of bringing community together and providing education, training, and job opportunities. Most comments also mentioned that there needs to be more than 12 CRCs, to ensure they are conveniently located and people actually use them.

There was strong support for a container deposit scheme in the community organisations' submissions; however some submitters felt a different strategy was needed to deal with problematic plastic waste that has a limited recycling lifespan. Many submitters wanted the scheme to be led at a local/community level.

Only three groups, Transition Towns Point Chevalier, Sustainable North Trust and Mahurangi Wastebusters Trust, discussed the features of product stewardship more broadly and advocated for the management of other consumer goods such as electronics, batteries, tyres, treated wood, whiteware and nappies using a Product Stewardship approach.

Onetangi Beach Ratepayers Association was the only community group to disagree with a container deposit scheme saying they "*just don't think it would work*".

Many community organisations were not familiar enough with the Hauraki Gulf Islands Plan to comment. Those who did comment supported local solutions that respond to the unique features of the Gulf Islands such as addressing the freight and transport barriers and developing on-island solutions.

A not-for-profit catering organisation submitted: "*We need food safety rules that not only allow but encourage us to place food into people's washed containers. I know this is a massive hygiene and insurance issue but we need industrial and legal solutions now! We are having a permanent wash against waste station at our food truck but the cost and time has to be covered by our sales which puts strain upon us. We need cheaper access to the food control plan and an even more simplified plan.*"

A number of community organisations commented about the Zero Waste Vision, strongly supporting the targets set by the WMMP, and calling for more work to be done higher up the waste hierarchy to avoid and reuse waste rather than recycle it.

Increased waste minimisation education was called for, including more highly visible awareness programs that are multi-lingual and delivered through multiple media channels.

8.4 Views of waste and resource recovery sector

As shown in Table 2, there were 22 submissions classified as being from the waste and resource recovery sector. This compares to 60 in the 2011 draft WMMP consultation process.

The submissions contained a range of views, with only product stewardship receiving widespread support. Waste Management NZ Ltd, one of the largest waste company that owns waste infrastructure and provides services, strongly disagreed with all of the proposals in the draft WMMP, other than product stewardship. EnviroWaste Services Ltd, another large waste company that owns waste infrastructure and provides services, did not disagree with any of the proposals and indicated support for product stewardship and reducing the three priority commercial waste streams.

Many of the small to medium size waste companies focused their submissions on their own specific business interests. Other than Northland Waste Ltd, which disagreed with most of the initiatives proposed in the draft WMMP, the smaller waste and resource recovery organisations generally supported or were neutral about all of the proposals. Several of the organisations expressed interest in working with council on achieving the objectives of the draft WMMP.

Waste Management NZ Ltd and Northland Waste Ltd expressed opposition to many aspects of the draft WMMP. Waste Management stated concerns over council taking a more active role in the commercial waste sector, and questioned whether this breached New Zealand competition law.

Waste Management NZ Ltd was concerned that a number of assumptions in the draft WMMP are based on incorrect information, or are not supported by any cost/benefit analysis. They accept that this is due, in part, to the fact that not all of the private waste industry is willing to share commercially sensitive data with council due to the potential that council could use this information to achieve a competitive advantage.

Waste Management acknowledge Community Recycling Centres have been useful in repurposing waste items from inorganic collections. However, *“In our view Auckland is already appropriately serviced by private resource recovery and recycling centres.”*

Waste Management support the application of the waste levy to all disposal sites in a two-stage process by first implementing it universally across the sector and then progressively increasing it over time to allow industry to invest and adjust.

With regards to council proposing to enter the Rodney kerbside market, Northland Waste states *“This is an incredibly alarming reality for any business faced with the knowledge that not only will council enter a market that is working currently to compete with the private sector under the veil of ‘standardisation’, but to also be told that it will do this by subsidised rates funding if it is not market competitive”*.

They made several mentions of Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 in their submission, questioning many of the proposed activities in the draft WMMP on the basis of

their alignment (or lack thereof) with Section 17A. Section 17A requires local authorities to “review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district”.

Northland Waste is also opposed to a food waste collection that does not have an opt-out option for residents. Northland Waste strongly disagrees with the expansion of the Resource Recovery Network, due to what they consider unfair and possibly illegal procurement processes to secure operators for the resource recovery sites, which they believe could be operated more efficiently and effectively by the private sector.

EnviroWaste was supportive of council addressing priority commercial waste streams and continuing a transition to consistent kerbside waste and recycling systems. EnviroWaste also expressed their support for an extension of the waste levy to all classes of landfills and the introduction of product stewardship, particularly for tyres and lithium ion batteries.

Green Gorilla are supportive of council regulation and education and support an increase in the landfill levy to \$50/tonne over five years to encourage the commercial sector to embrace landfill diversion. They also strongly agree with the three priority waste streams.

OJI Fibre Solutions request a greater focus be given to the cost/benefit analysis of council’s past and proposed waste minimisation activities. They believe council expenditure should be restricted to activities where there is a clear public good and no commercial interest in the supply of services.

They do not support an increase in the waste levy, unless bona fide recycling operations be exempt or rebated levies on solid waste generated from the reprocessing of materials on a commercial basis.

OJI request that council focus on maintaining or improving the value of collected recyclable materials, to eliminate or minimise the risk of cross-contamination. They recommend this be achieved by phasing out MRF-based recycling and encouraging commercial source-separated collections.

The Scrap Metal Recycling Association of New Zealand were generally supportive of the draft WMMP. They expressed concerns that an increase in the waste levy would make the recycling of some materials uneconomical and recommended that *“materials generated through a recycling process, such as shredder floc and granulator waste, should be exempted from any increases to the levy”*.

They are supportive of product stewardship, including for rubber tyres and aluminium cans, however concern was expressed over the potential cost of product stewardship for certain products such as household alkaline batteries, and it was recommended that the economic implications of the Basel Convention be thoroughly explored. They oppose any product stewardship initiative that competes with privately owned businesses. They offered their assistance in creating effective schemes to collect data on metal exports.

EcoStock Supplies Limited and the Bioenergy Association support council expanding its waste minimisation efforts to include commercial and business waste, and believe a regulatory approach is required, particularly with regards to organics. They suggest council

create and enforce bylaws to require source separation of food waste, support organic recovery infrastructure and eventually ban organics from landfills. EcoStock also request clear signals from council on procurement and investment to give investors and private operators confidence.

The Bioenergy Association believe the draft WMMP misses the waste-to-energy opportunities offered by anaerobic digesters. The Association suggests that anaerobic digestion is the best method for treating organic waste residues and offer their assistance to investigate anaerobic digestion as a tool to achieve zero waste to landfill.

Low Impact strongly agree with the draft WMMP, but believe council should re-examine kerbside food scrap collections due to recent changes in the political and economic landscape. They request support from council to increase use of their household vermicomposting system, Hungry Bins, in Auckland, and believe the green waste industry has been protected in designing the food waste collection, but that Low Impact hasn't.

Croxley Recycling are supportive of product stewardship. *“Product Stewardships are an accepted part of business in many other countries. Without their implementation NZ will continue to drift along and lurch from one missed opportunity to the next. Product Stewardship needs to be driven by both Local & Central Government. Along with Product Stewardship there needs to be licencing of recyclers and auditing against appropriate AS/NZS standards.”*

Kiwi Cleaning Rag Limited are concerned that an increase in the waste levy will cripple their recycling industry. They also disagree with the expansion of the CRC network *“...in our industry of clothing recycling there are over 500 jobs (private company) that the current WMMP puts at risk. Hundreds of tons are exported. How are we expected to compete with recycling centres that pay token rents, are subsidized and do not pay commercial landfill rates...”*

Kiwi Cleaning Rag strongly disagreed with plans for food scrap collections, stating that home composting is more environmentally friendly, and that home composters should not bear the cost of a collection service they do not require.

Interwaste Ltd is a nationwide provider of waste collection, treatment, and disposal services to the quarantine and medical waste sectors. Interwaste identifies a number of specific waste management trends with significant health and safety impacts that are not addressed by the draft WMMP and recommends that the household hazardous waste strategy, which is an action of the draft WMMP, specifically addresses household medical waste, sharps and syringes, pharmaceuticals, mercury from fluorescent tubes, and sanitary waste.

8.4.1 Views of Community Recycling Centres

Submissions were received from several organisations currently, or previously, associated with Community Recycling Centres. These organisations include: Waiuku Zero Waste, Global Action Plan Oceania, MPHS Community Trust, Island Waste Collective, Waiheke Resource Trust, Zero Waste Network, Sustainable North Trust, and Helensville Community Recycling Centre.

The organisations that answered the questions in the online submission form either agreed or strongly agreed with all of them (one submitter appeared to incorrectly enter “Strongly disagree” when the comments clearly agreed with the proposal). All of the organisations prioritised “Creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries” as an important outcome of the draft WMMP.

Two of the organisations focused their responses on Waiheke Island issues.

The Island Waste Collective considers that: *“Waiheke needs to have a fully community operated waste facility operating from the existing transfer station as a resource recovery park. IF all waste on island is managed by a local community group (like island waste collective) then waste minimisation is incentivised and waste stays on island as a resource and savings can be made to ensure ratepayers and council don’t carry full burden of cost for businesses and 30,000 visitors a year.”*

With regards to the draft WMMP assertion that council only has direct influence over 20 per cent of the waste stream, Waiheke Resources Trust stated that *“On Waiheke, council has control over 100% of the waste stream as it manages the only waste facility on the island we need to be clear on this as this statement is not a true reflection of Waiheke (or Great Barrier).”*

Replying on the same assertion, Global Action Plan Oceania commented that focusing on business and commercial waste *“is key to success, without tackling business waste a target of zero waste by 2040 is not achievable. ... key to success is understanding businesses and their waste and how to gain support within a business for transformational change. A specific scheme designed by professionals and the industry together will work best”*.

With regards to construction and business waste, Global Action Plan Oceania stated *“C&D waste can be solved with early engagement, focus on regulatory solutions like unitary plan and RMA. when waste is created it’s too late”*.

Sustainable North Trust *“strongly agrees with the directive to tackle the 80% of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities. Commercial waste is not only the largest percentage of materials going to landfill but it is increasing. SNT strongly believes addressing commercial waste is important because all sectors of NZ need to take responsibility for their waste. SNT believe the legislation needs to change to spread the responsibility from local government to importers, manufacturers, business, industry and the waste industry itself”*.

Zero Waste Network took a broad view of some of the issues: *“The focus of the 2012 plan limits the Council's ability to achieve zero waste. Effective waste reduction requires a whole system approach that needs to be backed with practical action and clear audit trails.”*

Zero Waste Network also commented on some specific issues: *“We are very supportive of a renewed focus on developing a strategy for household hazardous items. We receive a high volume of calls from residents wanting information and better disposal options for things they know are hazardous - particularly batteries, chemical/ paint containers and lightbulbs.”*

8.5 Views of industry associations

Submissions were received from a range of industry associations, including business associations and sector-specific associations. Industry associations directly related to the waste and resource recovery sector are included in section 8.4.

The Panmure Business Association commented that many smaller businesses do not understand how to dispose of their waste and do not understand the concept of separating out their recycling.

AKBID (Business Improvement Districts of Auckland) stated the business improvement district model is an excellent way for council to partner with the commercial sector to find ways to reduce and divert waste from landfills, and asked that council use the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund to partner with BIDs and business sectors to maintain and enhance these waste minimisation initiatives.

Heart of the City stated *“We also support council asking central government to introduce a container deposit scheme for plastic/glass bottles and cans, and product stewardship schemes for hard to dispose products like tyres and e-waste.”*

The Sustainable Business Network (SBN) supports an increase in the waste levy and states that this has wide support from their membership. They strongly support partnering with industry to identify alternatives to landfill, and support promoting best practice and celebrating business success.

With regards to construction and demolition (C&D) waste, the SBN recommends working with the construction and demolition sector to determine what research and support is required and looking at innovation and technology to support the industry, including a waste brokering service. They also suggest waste minimisation plans be required for new developments. Other issues mentioned include the importance of council procurement in promoting waste minimisation, and the importance of providing funding through the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for projects that accelerate NZ towards becoming a circular economy.

The Packaging Forum was supportive of the draft WMMP with the exception of the container deposit scheme. Having commissioned a national litter survey, they assert that beverage containers are not a significant litter problem in New Zealand.

The Motor Trade Association (MTA) supports the draft WMMP, and strongly supports a focus on organic waste, the elimination or responsible recycling of single use plastics, and product stewardship.

The Packaging Council of NZ is critical of the draft WMMP and believes council has missed the opportunity to advance its thinking on circular economy concepts. Their submission also criticizes the lack of reference to the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

They question whether cost/benefit analyses have been undertaken to support council focusing on waste minimisation in the commercial sector and are concerned this will increase costs for Auckland's ratepayers.

The Packaging Council of NZ agree that improvements could be made to the waste levy. They suggest that mandatory product stewardship schemes should be considered, and are supportive of the development of a Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan but suggest that this should be part of a national strategic plan.

The Employers and Manufacturers Association don't support an increase in the waste levy and are concerned about the lack of a "*quantified analysis of the full costs*" of the draft WMMP.

9 - Pro forma and informal submissions

9.1 Pro forma submissions

There were 4,840 pro forma submissions received. The pro formas were initiated by the following organisations:

- Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance - 4,605 submissions
- EcoMatters Trust - 195 submissions
- Kaitiaki of Newton Reserve (Waiheke) - 31 submissions
- Devonport Community Recycling Centre and Reuse Shop - 9 submissions.

The feedback from all pro formas has been included in the general analysis in this report. While not all pro forma submissions provide feedback on all six key questions asked in the council feedback form, where appropriate they have been coded to provide feedback on the questions to which they do refer.

The following table provides the support received for each question from non-ARA pro forma submissions.

Table 2 – Level of support from pro formas (excluding ARA pro formas)

Question 1) Importance of waste outcomes – based on non-ARA pro forma submissions							
Pro forma	Value for money	Reliability	Reducing waste & carbon	Reducing pollution	Tidy public places	Creating jobs	Other
# of subs	3	2	49	44	6	8	33
% of subs	2%	1%	34%	30%	4%	6%	23%
Question 2) Expand efforts to include business and commercial activities – based on non-ARA pro forma submissions							
Pro forma	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	
# of subs	3	0	1	2	45	0	
% of subs	6%	0%	2%	4%	88%	0%	
Question 3) Reduce commercial C&D, plastic, and organic waste – based on non-ARA pro forma submissions							
Pro forma	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know	
# of subs	2	0	0	335	14	0	
% of subs	4%	0%	0%	69%	27%	0%	

Question 4) Community Recycling Centres – based on non-ARA pro forma submissions						
Pro forma	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
# of subs	2	0	1	3	45	0
% of subs	4%	0%	2%	6%	88%	0%
Question 5) Product stewardship – based on non-ARA pro forma submissions						
Pro forma	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
# of subs	3	0	0	3	45	0
% of subs	6%	0%	0%	6%	88%	0%
Question 6) Expand efforts to include business and commercial activities – based on non-ARA pro forma submissions						
Pro forma	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
# of subs	0	0	2	36	10	2
% of subs	0%	0%	4%	72%	20%	4%

Key comments and requests received on pro forma submissions include the following:

- **EcoMatters Trust support:**
 - A food waste collection in Auckland, 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.
 - Investment into decentralised community composting hubs as the primary way to manage food waste in Auckland, with community garden facilitators funded to support composting.
 - Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040.
 - Mandatory product stewardship schemes for e-waste, batteries, tyres and packaging.
 - A non-commercial bottle deposit scheme for beverage containers, where proceeds go into recycling education.
 - A gradual increase in the landfill waste levy from \$10/tonne to \$140/tonne.
 - Completion of the Resource Recovery Network so that Community Recycling Centres across Auckland can divert useful inorganic resources from landfill. I would like to see them become community composting hubs too.

- **Kaitiaki of Newton Reserve**
 - The Hauraki Gulf is unique and it is important to get it right on Waiheke Island or else marine environment becomes even more polluted.
 - Our situation as island is unique because we have always dealt with the entire waste stream.

- We face a natural tariff barrier in freight, which really limits our options. We just have to be smarter with on island solutions.
- Our community has proven time and time again that it really cares about this issue and wants a satisfactory answer, the thousands of submissions to the Royal Commission on the governance of Auckland demanding local control of our waste stream is evidence of this”
- **The Devonport Community Recycling Centre:**
 - Request “Continued support and development of the Devonport Community Recycling Centre and its facilities to the local community”
- **Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance pro forma**
 - The Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance website provided three submissions relating to council’s 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and the draft WMMP. One submission was to “submit on the Council’s failure to tackle wasteful spending and the plan to break pre-election promises on rates”. The second submission was to “submit against the proposed regional fuel tax” and the third to “submit on the proposed Auckland-wide waste management system which will see refuse collection halved for most Aucklanders”.
 - The three pro formas were received from 4,605 unique individuals, with most individuals submitting more than one of the submissions. The pro formas and the issues addressed are shown below, with issues relating to the draft WMMP being underlined.
 - 2,293 ARA pro formas were submitted that address:
 - Wasteful spending and limiting rates to no more than 2%
 - Oppose regional fuel tax
 - Oppose introduction of water quality targeted rate
 - Oppose introduction of environmental levy
 - Focus on core services, deliver value for money)
 - Oppose Council advocating for increase in the national waste levy
 - 3,442 ARA pro formas were submitted that address:
 - Focus on core services, deliver value for money
 - Oppose reduced collection services at an increased cost
 - Oppose Council advocating for increase in the national waste levy
 - 1,908 ARA pro formas submitted that address:
 - Oppose regional fuel tax
 - Focus on core services, deliver value for money

9.2 Informal submissions

9.2.1 Submissions with no contact details supplied

There were 98 informal submissions that were submitted on the standard form, but for which no contact details were supplied. The submissions are analysed, by question, below.

Q1 – Waste Outcomes

All 98 submissions responded to this question. The greatest areas of support were: delivering value for Auckland ratepayers (23), creating tidy public places (22), reducing waste to landfill (18) and reducing environmental and marine pollution (20).

Q2 – Business and commercial waste

The majority of submitters agreed or strongly agreed with trying to tackle the 80 per cent of business and commercial waste that is contributing to high volumes to landfill. Specific comments were made around businesses having the financial resources to manage their waste better, and so should take more responsibility.

Q3 – Focusing on commercial organics, plastic and construction and demolition

The majority of submitters agreed or strongly agreed with focusing on the three significant waste streams, and specific comments were made about working with architects to design out waste during the building design phase, identifying opportunities for construction and demolition waste to be reused, making industry responsible for the waste they produce, and banning polystyrene from packaging. One submitter said council should first continue to work on getting domestic waste systems right.

Q4 – Community Recycling Centres

The majority (31) of submitters agreed or strongly agreed with the creation of Community Recycling Centres while four disagreed or strongly disagreed. Some of the submitters who commented called for council to be more visible in publicising the CRCs, and mentioned the opportunities to provide repair stations, educate people, enhance recycling, and provide bargains for people in the community. A few comments called for the old inorganics service to be reinstated.

Q5 – Product Stewardship

There was strong support for product stewardship, although all comments referred specifically to a container deposit scheme. Most who commented referenced an awareness of the success of the program in South Australia. Three submissions disagreed or strongly disagreed with a container deposit scheme.

Q6 – Hauraki Gulf Islands

Half of the submitters (20) who answered the HGI question said they either didn't know enough about the topic to comment, or were neutral on the approach outlined in the HGI Plan. Five agreed and six disagreed. Comments included that council should take care of the Gulf Islands because they are unique and their requirements are different from the rest of Auckland.

Q7 – Other comments

The 14 further comments all generally concurred with the wider submissions.

9.2.2 Have Your Say and Drop-in events

Informal feedback received on the waste plan at akhaveyoursay and Drop-in events were generally similar to formal submissions. Of the 449 comments recorded the following broad themes emerged:

- Some did not want to pay for the food scraps collection, as they compost at home. There was also a preference for a decentralized community-composting solution.
- There were a number of comments regarding waste on Waiheke Island, with a strong preference for a local on-island solution. Some concern was expressed regarding how council should manage waste from boat users.
- Others commented on the need for more waste education, especially in schools.
- Plastics and plastic packaging was cited as a real issue. Feedback centred around the need for businesses to do more to reduce packaging, or council to regulate plastics and plastic packaging.
- Illegal dumping and litter issues were common concerns, often specific to a particular location, e.g. a local park. There were also a number of comments about the need for better enforcement and larger fines for dumpers.

9.2.3 Videos

The five video submissions received are described in section 8.1.

9.2.4 Drawings

Ninety-one drawings were submitted by school children. The topics covered by the drawings are described below.

Bins

The drawings received stated they wanted more compost bins and more worm bins. Some drawings talked about reusing the refuse bins.

Plastics

Many drawings stated that all new plastic production should be stopped. Many of the drawings talked about taking reusable bags shopping. Using biodegradable bags and compostable packaging (made of potato or cardboard) was also mentioned. Two drawings said that if you do use plastic bags, to wash and reuse them and/or plastics could be donated to schools to make art. A few drawings stated there should be a charge on bags or a ban to stop using them altogether.

Organics

Some drawings mentioned that the food scraps collection was coming and that people should use it.

Litter

Some drawings said it is important not to litter and to pick up litter on the beach. It was mentioned that signs about 'putting litter in the bin' could be used. It was suggested that people doing community service should pick up litter or people should be paid to pick up rubbish of the roads

Other

Some drawings stated that old toys, blankets and clothes should be donated or given to the homeless.

“Auckland is full of waste. Just remember that the time has come to put on our waste free thinking hats. Reuse plastic bags at the shop or supermarket, take your shopping home in a reusable bag or basket. Recycle aluminium cans and all the metal tins, apple cores and banana peels go in the compost bins. Put cardboard and paper in the recycling bin or box. In the clothing bin goes the old t-shirts and socks.”

“Zero waste story: Hello people of NZ. Plastic is killing animals and when we go fishing and we catch fish with plastic in them, we're going to end up eating plastic. It is making me lose my mind. So you can see I want to stop it and I don't know if this is already invented? But instead of metal detector we could make a plastic detector so we can catch lots of plastic and sort it into the right bins. The end.”

“We have to make sure recycling factories are not putting bad smoke into the air.”

“Hey world, stop using plastic. Why? Soft plastic is drilled from the earth and soon there will be no more oil left! And remember to clean your recycling before you put it in the bin. My idea of ideal home is anyone who does not care about cleaning and putting rubbish in the correct bin we install a little alarm on the bins. And if the item that goes in the recycling bin that has not been cleaned the alarm will go off and will not stop until it has been cleaned, the alarm will go off if wrong thing goes in the wrong bin.”

Appendix 1 - Question 1 - Analysis by Local Board

Question 1) Importance of waste outcomes - based on 5197 responses - submitters were requested to choose 3 priorities								
Local Board	# of Subs	Value for money	Reliability	Reducing waste & carbon	Reducing pollution	Tidy public places	Creating jobs	Other
Albert-Eden	432	13%	9%	28%	29%	10%	9%	2%
Devonport-Takapuna	225	9%	7%	29%	30%	13%	11%	1%
Franklin	161	13%	12%	27%	24%	12%	9%	2%
Great Barrier	20	15%	10%	35%	20%	15%	5%	0%
Henderson-Massey	235	17%	9%	23%	25%	14%	11%	1%
Hibiscus and Bays	310	17%	9%	26%	29%	11%	7%	1%
Howick	448	20%	10%	21%	23%	15%	9%	2%
Kaipātiki	244	18%	9%	25%	27%	11%	7%	2%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	144	6%	6%	28%	28%	13%	17%	1%
Manurewa	279	12%	14%	24%	18%	20%	10%	2%
Maungakiekie-e-Tāmaki	280	15%	10%	23%	25%	14%	11%	3%
Not Supplied	286	16%	11%	26%	23%	16%	6%	1%
Ōrākei	236	16%	8%	28%	28%	14%	5%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	112	28%	15%	14%	14%	16%	11%	2%
Outside Auckland	59	10%	5%	32%	25%	8%	17%	2%
Papakura	185	17%	9%	24%	23%	17%	9%	1%
Puketāpapa	105	16%	9%	25%	21%	17%	10%	3%
Rodney	511	12%	8%	27%	27%	13%	11%	2%
Upper Harbour	149	21%	9%	25%	25%	15%	5%	0%
Waiheke	211	7%	2%	31%	30%	5%	7%	18%
Waitākere Ranges	234	12%	9%	26%	28%	11%	9%	4%
Waitematā	302	11%	9%	29%	29%	10%	9%	3%

Question 1) Importance of waste outcomes - based on 5197 responses - submitters were requested to choose 3 priorities

Local Board	# of Subs	Value for money	Reliability	Reducing waste & carbon	Reducing pollution	Tidy public places	Creating jobs	Other
Whau	214	13%	9%	26%	29%	11%	10%	2%

Appendix 2 - Question 2 - Analysis by Local Board

Question 2) Expand efforts to include business and commercial activities – based on 1865 form submissions							
Local Board	# Subs	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Albert-Eden	152	11%	2%	4%	26%	55%	1%
Devonport-Takapuna	80	9%	1%	4%	23%	61%	3%
Franklin	56	4%	2%	9%	18%	68%	0%
Great Barrier	7	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%
Henderson-Massey	85	11%	2%	5%	32%	47%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	110	5%	0%	3%	27%	65%	1%
Howick	167	4%	4%	7%	41%	43%	1%
Kaipātiki	86	9%	0%	0%	28%	63%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	51	12%	4%	4%	8%	67%	6%
Manurewa	105	6%	3%	7%	33%	47%	5%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	93	5%	3%	5%	20%	66%	0%
Not Supplied	117	12%	2%	12%	36%	32%	6%
Ōrākei	81	6%	2%	1%	33%	56%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	49	4%	8%	14%	35%	33%	6%
Outside Auckland	21	14%	5%	5%	10%	62%	5%
Papakura	66	8%	2%	8%	18%	64%	2%
Puketāpapa	33	3%	3%	0%	33%	58%	3%
Rodney	176	2%	2%	5%	23%	67%	2%
Upper Harbour	54	11%	2%	6%	30%	50%	2%
Waiheke	70	4%	1%	4%	16%	74%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	80	9%	3%	5%	15%	68%	1%
Waitematā	107	6%	3%	2%	21%	68%	0%
Whau	77	1%	0%	9%	23%	66%	0%

Appendix 3 - Question 3 - Analysis by Local Board

Question 3) Reduce commercial C&D, plastic, and organic waste – based on 1855 form submissions							
Local Board	# Subs	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Albert-Eden	153	11%	1%	2%	19%	66%	1%
Devonport-Takapuna	78	12%	0%	5%	14%	67%	3%
Franklin	56	0%	0%	7%	23%	68%	2%
Great Barrier	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Henderson-Massey	85	9%	0%	2%	39%	48%	1%
Hibiscus and Bays	106	8%	1%	1%	24%	66%	1%
Howick	166	5%	2%	10%	33%	46%	3%
Kaipātiki	84	8%	0%	1%	24%	67%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	51	8%	2%	4%	8%	75%	4%
Manurewa	106	6%	1%	8%	31%	53%	2%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	94	5%	1%	3%	23%	67%	0%
Not Supplied	116	9%	1%	2%	46%	41%	2%
Ōrākei	82	6%	0%	1%	30%	62%	0%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	49	2%	0%	29%	35%	33%	2%
Outside Auckland	21	14%	0%	5%	10%	67%	5%
Papakura	67	4%	0%	6%	19%	69%	1%
Puketāpapa	33	3%	0%	3%	27%	64%	3%
Rodney	175	6%	1%	0%	24%	67%	2%
Upper Harbour	54	13%	2%	2%	28%	54%	2%
Waiheke	70	7%	0%	1%	56%	36%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	78	9%	0%	3%	13%	73%	3%
Waitematā	107	8%	1%	1%	21%	69%	0%
Whau	77	0%	0%	5%	23%	71%	0%

Appendix 4 - Question 4 - Analysis by Local Board

Question 4) Community Recycling Centres – based on 1860 form submissions							
Local Board	# Subs	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Albert-Eden	148	11%	0%	3%	22%	64%	1%
Devonport-Takapuna	80	14%	0%	3%	23%	61%	0%
Franklin	56	5%	0%	4%	21%	70%	0%
Great Barrier	7	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%
Henderson-Massey	86	12%	0%	1%	41%	45%	1%
Hibiscus and Bays	108	4%	1%	4%	29%	63%	0%
Howick	170	7%	1%	6%	41%	44%	1%
Kaipātiki	84	10%	1%	5%	27%	57%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	51	14%	4%	6%	10%	65%	2%
Manurewa	107	7%	2%	6%	29%	55%	2%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	93	8%	1%	3%	26%	62%	0%
Not Supplied	116	9%	1%	4%	42%	43%	0%
Ōrākei	82	7%	1%	5%	34%	50%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	49	8%	4%	2%	59%	22%	4%
Outside Auckland	21	10%	5%	0%	19%	62%	5%
Papakura	67	7%	1%	10%	21%	58%	1%
Puketāpapa	32	3%	3%	6%	25%	63%	0%
Rodney	176	3%	1%	2%	21%	71%	1%
Upper Harbour	52	12%	2%	8%	31%	46%	2%
Waiheke	71	4%	1%	3%	11%	80%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	80	6%	0%	9%	16%	68%	1%
Waitematā	107	4%	2%	8%	21%	64%	1%
Whau	77	3%	1%	8%	19%	69%	0%

Appendix 5 - Question 5 - Analysis by Local Board

Question 5) Product stewardship – based on 1861 form submissions							
Local Board	# Subs	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Albert-Eden	153	12%	1%	4%	22%	61%	1%
Devonport-Takapuna	80	11%	1%	4%	21%	59%	4%
Franklin	56	4%	0%	5%	21%	70%	0%
Great Barrier	7	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%
Henderson-Massey	86	13%	3%	0%	24%	58%	1%
Hibiscus and Bays	110	5%	1%	6%	24%	64%	0%
Howick	171	7%	2%	5%	32%	54%	1%
Kaipātiki	86	9%	5%	3%	27%	56%	0%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	49	12%	2%	12%	14%	59%	0%
Manurewa	107	5%	2%	5%	26%	58%	5%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	92	5%	1%	5%	26%	62%	0%
Not Supplied	117	7%	3%	9%	35%	39%	7%
Ōrākei	80	9%	6%	4%	31%	49%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	49	6%	2%	4%	16%	63%	8%
Outside Auckland	19	16%	0%	0%	16%	68%	0%
Papakura	66	8%	3%	3%	12%	70%	5%
Puketāpapa	33	3%	6%	3%	27%	61%	0%
Rodney	176	4%	3%	3%	22%	67%	1%
Upper Harbour	53	19%	2%	4%	21%	55%	0%
Waiheke	71	7%	4%	3%	11%	75%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	78	12%	3%	4%	14%	67%	1%
Waitematā	107	6%	2%	4%	18%	71%	0%
Whau	77	1%	4%	4%	17%	74%	0%

Appendix 6 - Question 6 - Analysis by Local Board

Question 6) Hauraki Gulf Islands – based on 1759 form submissions							
Local Board	# Subs	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Albert-Eden	146	10%	0%	14%	17%	23%	36%
Devonport-Takapuna	76	7%	0%	14%	22%	26%	30%
Franklin	52	0%	0%	15%	27%	29%	29%
Great Barrier	7	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	0%
Henderson-Massey	78	5%	0%	10%	31%	17%	37%
Hibiscus and Bays	101	4%	0%	11%	24%	27%	35%
Howick	161	2%	2%	22%	28%	20%	26%
Kaipātiki	72	6%	0%	14%	29%	28%	24%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	47	11%	2%	15%	13%	43%	17%
Manurewa	103	3%	1%	14%	26%	25%	31%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	86	2%	1%	15%	26%	33%	23%
Not Supplied	110	1%	2%	20%	28%	21%	28%
Ōrākei	77	3%	1%	19%	21%	29%	27%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	48	2%	10%	44%	17%	13%	15%
Outside Auckland	19	16%	0%	21%	16%	37%	11%
Papakura	66	2%	2%	23%	14%	23%	38%
Puketāpapa	30	3%	0%	13%	30%	30%	23%
Rodney	168	2%	0%	8%	26%	38%	27%
Upper Harbour	51	2%	0%	18%	18%	22%	41%
Waiheke	70	6%	0%	7%	59%	24%	4%
Waitākere Ranges	73	4%	0%	10%	10%	32%	45%
Waitematā	101	5%	0%	21%	19%	29%	27%
Whau	74	0%	0%	11%	20%	43%	26%

Appendix 7 - Question 1 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"Cost and ease of waste disposal for all Auckland"

"No more one use plastics or packaging going to landfill such as nappies, sanitary products, chip bags, containers, polystyrene and plastic wrap."

"Affordable prices for rubbish bags in Papakura"

"Look after and the empty the bins in public places more frequently"

"Return to kerbside recycle separation!!! Glass/plastics/tin/paper/card."

"Prioritising waste minimisation over waste management"

"Rubbish collection needs to come out of rates paid"

"Based on Māori traditions and values e.g.. caring for Papatuanuku"

"Consulting with the public on what suits them i.e. size of bins appropriate to household size"

"community owned, managed and operated full waste solution"

"Wheelie bins for everyone!"

"NOT CREATING SERVICES WE DO NOT NEED!!!"

"Resource recovering in every local board"

"Conservation of material resources"

"No more taxes for waste collection"

"Full lifecycle waste management, packaging, sale, recycling, education and processing locally - people take responsibility for their own behaviours and environment"

"The economics of all proposals"

"Adherence to waste hierarchy, and link it to spending, ie spend most on avoidance and not disposal."

"Give waste operation back to our community - it worked well before you messed with it."

"Removal of single use plastic"

"Treating ALL SUBURBS EXACTLY the SAME. NOT as at present where some suburbs eg Manurewa have free collection & all of North Shore & north of bridge PAY & have limiting restrictions on it. The first is PARAMOUNT. The rest secondary"

"Avoid buying fruit, vegetables and other products from supermarkets and other outlets that are packaged in plastic."

"Interaction with the elderly. A place to feel useful & needed"

Appendix 8 - Question 2 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"While individuals have a role to play on both the creation and solutions to waste issues; the role of corporations and industry for both of these is far greater. I strongly support a greater focus on business and commercial activities."

"Builders waste fills skips!!! Food retailers could compost and put fresh food in methane system."

"Malls, commercial businesses and all food outlets have a lot of waste."

"Everyone - businesses and individuals - need to do all possible to reduce waste (NZ is not clean)."

"80% generated by companies, they should be responsible i.e. product stewardship."

"This is essential. It will drive behavior towards less packaging, and compostable packaging."

"80% speaks for itself."

"Construction waste needs a plan for resource recovery. Businesses need waste audits to help reduce waste to landfill and given options for dealing with organic waste through commercial composting."

"This is the bulk of the waste that goes to landfill. Not sure why the focus has been on Residential waste rather than the 80% commercial waste?"

"When compostable waste goes in to landfill it creates a myriad of issues for now and the future. I think nz needs to get super savvy on recycling and composting and massively reducing plastic and textile landfill!"

"They have more access to be able to access more people. Sharing knowledge."

"If it is good enough for us, then it should be good enough for them. Small and industrial businesses have more wastage."

"I see so much soft plastic waste at my work as well as other businesses going into landfill, at home I recycle a lot but at work I can't take that much soft plastics to the recycling bin at the supermarket as it's a waste of company time, if businesses had the option of more recycling options which were easily accessible then they would recycle more."

"Because businesses need to up their game. The level of waste generated by businesses is shameful"

"Take up less space with the rubbish so compaction also reduce amount of package materials"

"Worry on worse local neighbourhood hygiene Rate is planned to increase year after year, yet plan appears to reduce service frequency and didn't talk about saving cost from rate payer perspective Does changing to Pay as you throw mean separating out garbage"

collection cost from council rates? The plan Leave rate payers to become stressful in worrying about cost - pay as your throw. Inconvenient and not worry-free system. Worry that people will abuse system eg putting rubbish in others bin, not sorting rubbish properly, leaving rubbish inside their property for too long creating hygiene problems for neighbourhood Current recycling bins are successful because it's simple and idiot proof. The proposal is going backward."

Appendix 9 - Question 3 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"Green waste needs to be separated out from the other stuff that can be recycled. Again, this needs to be a priority otherwise we all lose. We waste too much."

"There is huge room for improvement on this front. Increase the landfill waste levy to business."

"It seems the managers of construction sites are often concerned with cost, and tell their builders to leave the rubbish as they don't want to pay them to tidy up each day. A builder at the end of our street told me this when I asked why so much styrofoam was blowing down the street onto our properties. We are getting stringer winds more frequently, so these materials are travelling further if left lying around a site."

"We need to reduce waste and the biggest parts of such a big creator of waste need to be addressed."

"Some waste needs to be reduced at the producer end of the chain, and this is not happening enough. In other instances alternatives need to be found for the house wrap plastic; hay bale plastic; food waste from the food industry and supermarkets; less use of polystyrene for packaging, etc."

"They need to be aware and held accountable of how their processes and products are packaged, used and disposed of. I feel a lot of waste is generated because of obsolete processes that could be changed."

"Consultation always good as part of the process."

"Providing it does not impose additional costs on businesses or rate payers."

"You should be working with the community (not big business) to compost food and organic waste in the community in order to feed the city on scraps, which used to be the Councils goal and for inexplicable reason appears to have been abandoned. Diverting it from landfill is secondary. Further it is apparent that the decision has already been made to AD is outside the city after a very narrow exchange with 2 businesses only"

"YES! Definitely agree with working with businesses to reduce waste. Definitely needed."

"Diversion needs to be made easier and create further benefits for those who participate (financial, reputational, etc) and avoid a financial barrier."

"Council must emphasise 'resource-minimisation' also, and work actively with waste processors and users to increase the conversion and take up of recycled waste to marketable products. (For example, NZTA must start substituting crushed materials for aggregates in roading as is done overseas.)"

"Council must lobby government to amend the Waste Minimisation Act to give industry the same responsibility as local authorities 'to promote effective and efficient waste management'. This must include minimising the use of plastic packaging by NZ-based goods producers and also considering imported goods."

“Enforce waste sorting and make people convert their waste.”

Appendix 10 - Question 4 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"We need every home and business to make a conscious informed effort to educate the family on how to do this better"

"But bring back kerb side inorganic collection"

"Depends where they are located. Not near our green spaces or homes. Prevent smells"

"People need to have a place nearby to get rid of recyclable items."

"Need much more than 12. At least 1 per Local Board area minimum. Optimistically 4 per Local Board area so more accessible."

"As a community we need to think about out consumption."

"Run and operated by locals/job ops."

"Yes - keeps the employment and approach local and known."

"It needs to be easy for people or they won't be bothered. Encourage use of social media for people to pass on unwanted goods locally as well, I see it on our local Facebook page. Maybe communal collection of unwanted goods to go to a depot as well, not everyone has transport or the right sort of vehicle to drop thins off. Maybe an initiative for socially minded groups such as Lions"

"Reusing and recycling items no longer needed creates less waste."

"North Shore had a recycling plant as part of the transfer station 20 plus years ago. This was very successful but knee jerk clap trap about Health & Safety closed it down. North Shore urgently need a free drop of centre"

"For a city the size of Auckland it is a drop in the bucket. Also, I live here and have never heard of their existence, despite googling at various times for ways to get good of good quality 'stuff'"

"We need to have at least 21 Recycling centres (1 per local board) and more where geography and local support call for them. Council must work with local community organisations to support the ongoing operation of the centres - 20 years ago there was a good locally supported recycling centre on Waiheke which Council closed! Follow other cities."

"Cost of recycling goods which are not suitable for the recycling bin is prohibitive. The inorganic waste months were great. It is much more environmentally friendly to reuse than recycle!"

"Re-using is win-win but recycling should not be seen as an excuse to keep producing one use packaging in glass or plastic."

"This is great and will perhaps reduce people dumping waste."

"We need more so people stop dumping there unwanted household goods down country roads, it's so bad in Clevedon and Ardmore."

Appendix 11 - Question 5 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"Other countries are already doing this and i can't see why we shouldn't. It is not difficult to manage and can encourage reduced waste."

"This idea will definitely encourage people to dispose of item responsibly so it doesn't end up in our waterways, but will it encourage them to reuse rather than keep buying? It might encourage more spending on plastic items rather than encourage people to change their lifestyle."

"This makes the producers of product to be more responsible for what they produce, sell and profit from and purchasers think twice."

"Would help with public space cleanliness."

"This scheme is a no-brainer, having been successful in other countries for decades. This is another area where collaboration with commercial sector will be vital to get buy-in from producers. "

"Bottled water is a curse"

"This is SUCH a good idea. It's been proven to reduce waste and litter in cities all over the world. Let's do this already!"

"Look at Sweden Denmark they have machines that encourage people to recycle. Even in Hong Kong their are people that collect cans so that they can earn money for recycle."

"Great, in Holland you take these items back to the supermarket and post clean reusable containers or recyclable ones into a hole at back, a receipt is printed out so you can use it at the checkout to receive a discount, this works extremely well."

"Good idea also to tax non- biodegradable packaging to stop the problem before it starts. This is next best idea."

"It might encourage producers to come up with greener packaging choices in the first place."

"Though not sure of the impact on current recycling of drink containers through recycling bins - i.e. will there be unintended consequences such as people going through recycling bins where residents choose to use their bin rather than collecting the refundable deposits themselves?"

"I've seen how well this works in various parts of the United States. It does, sometimes, encourage dumpster divers who are looking to make a bit of pocket money, but it keeps this type of waste out of landfills and off the streets/beaches"

"Government should set an example"

"I'd prefer the focus to firstly be on stopping businesses from using unsustainable packaging (i.e. I've heard plastic can only be recycled a finite number of times, so isn't really ideal even if it can be recycled), but I guess encouraging people to dispose of the packaging responsibly is the next best thing."

Appendix 12 - Question 6 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"Haven't looked at it but I am sure its ok. I would support more community run and owned waste strategies as I know Waiheke used to run a good system some time in the past but was not supported by council. I think the local board is usually pretty good at reflecting their community needs."

"Don't know enough about it"

"The rubbish that is going into the oceans and [cannot read] up the world is staggering. Minimizing pollution in this area can START and continue with MOTIVATION & EDUCATION"

"These are fragile and generally unspoilt environments, lets keep them that way."

"Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan' : it's a very long name for a plan, and my life experience proves me that more long the name is for a plan, less effective it is...!"

"The area needs a specialized plan due to its unique environment."

"Waste management should be fitted to the community it is taking place in. This includes areas of poverty where people cannot take to the dump!"

"This is a solid plan. Many parts could be used in Rodney, Auckland"

"Smaller islands need solutions that work for locals."

"Yes it is unique and it is important to get it right on Waiheke Island or else marine environment becomes even more polluted. 1 - Our situation as island is unique because we have always dealt with the entire waste stream. 2 - we face a natural tariff barrier in freight, which really limits our options. We just have to be smarter with on island solutions. 3 - our community has proven time and time again that it really cares about this issues and wants a satisfactory answer, the thousands of submissions to the Royal Commission on the governance of Auckland demanding local control of our waste stream is evidence of this"

"We have not read this plan."

"Keep Oirkai, keep Tangaroa free of plastic and waste."

"This should be led and implemented by the respective islanders"

"As long as community is part of the solution and not seen as a small part player. Waiheke needs to lead by example again as it has done in the past. Island waste collective are capable of running all waste operations on Waiheke and maximising diversion from landfill."

"Not sure. Waiheke island is an island but in the suburban Auckland areas people don't take so much pride in most areas."

"These plans are essential to these islands as they are safe havens for many species of plant and animal and are also pest free. A long term plan is important in order to maintain a

beautiful natural habitat for our animals and plants as well as ourselves and our environment.”

Appendix 13 - Question 7 - Submitters' comments

All of the comments in this section have been chosen at random. The range of comments is not intended to represent any particular viewpoints or be statistically representative of all comments.

"We use a hungry bin for the vast majority of our food waste. We do not agree that all householders should pay for a separate service when so many (up to 30%) already use compost/worm farms to deal with their food waste."

"I already compost my food waste so don't want to pay extra for a new food waste service that I don't need."

"Increased public place recycling. Public place recycling in Belmart please"

"There needs to be food/green bin: grass etc., illegal dumping of grass is constant."

"Prioritize Māori Action Plan"

"Carry on taking bags from kerbside, not just bins. Tonnage of waste going to landfill should cost hundreds of dollars. 2027 target should be 75% diversion. Let's be bold. Incentives for those recycling all their organic/kitchen waste."

"New plastic bins for households perhaps too big. We may look at sharing a bin with neighbours (one small full bin each week)."

"Future proofing for the good of New Zealand and hopefully becoming a world leader and example of economical and effective waste reduction."

"I want to see a non-commercial bottle deposit scheme for beverage containers, where proceeds go into recycling education."

"Yes. I object to charging every household \$67 for food waste when many households already handle this themselves (and have done so for many years). So many households have worm farms, compost bins, bokashi buckets or even animals that dispose of the waste and also generate fertiliser etc. for their own gardens. If introducing this kind of fee, then it needs to be a pay as you go service/opt in. Otherwise you're basically encouraging people to stop doing what they are currently doing and manage this themselves. Plus you won't get a clean 'food only' collection, there will be wrappers, stickers, sticks etc. all dumped in which will make the disposal of it problematic and uneconomical. At least people who process food waste themselves take care of what goes in their Worm farm etc."

"The waste management policy is seriously flawed. Rather than try to force everyone to a zero waste policy, council needs to make it free and easy. Educate and encourage people to reduce waste and recycle, indeed yes. Why? Look at the dumping of rubbish wherever people think they can do it - overseas studies show that this approach does not work, costs thousands to clean up the mess, and is bad for the environment. In fact in cases I have read, where the policy making waste collection expensive was reversed and even "free", the city was cleaned up in no time."

"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 oppose the move to fortnightly rubbish collection. We moved to small rubbish bins and now we have rubbish bags being dumped everywhere. This will only get worse with fortnightly collection. It is absolutely ridiculous that this is being suggested. In South Auckland households are much larger and so have more rubbish and they can least afford paying for more rubbish bins. So people will just dump stuff in parks."

"Greenwaste and food waste needs to be composted. It should never end up in the landfill. It is unacceptable that it is so difficult to recycle other products that cannot be recycled. Can we look at options such as bermside composting? Communal compost bins. Food waste is only waste if it ends up in landfill and people need to know this. We should not pay to have food waste and green waste put in a landfill as it does not belong there. We need to recycle soft plastic packaging as taking it to the warehouse once a week is excessive. My rubbish bin only goes out once every 3 weeks since we have been recycling soft plastic voluntarily. There are 5 people using the same bin. We only use 3 compost bins which also covers all of our green waste. It never smells and we never look after it. Business should be required to compost and expecting them to do so voluntarily is ridiculous."

"Plastic bags. I would love to see here what they do in the UK where people are charged 5p for every single use plastic bag they buy, not just from the big supermarket chains but the gift shop and the dairy too. Let's be the first city in NZ to put on this "tax" on EVERY single use plastic bag to stop them being used so much."

"I don't agree with the move to pay-as-you-throw and the targeted rate for kerbside collection of household food scraps."

"Require businesses to be more environmentally responsible & provide service for ratepayers"

"EVERYTHING that is not organic and biodegradable should be being recycled. We need to use resources more wisely. Governing bodies should have a legally enforceable obligation of responsibility toward the environment and therefore the future citizens of the world."

"There should be support for low income earners."

"Will this help create jobs as well?"

"Increase Waste Levy to at least \$100.00"

"More education of community"

"We need to recycle soft plastics NOW. Since my household discovered that some supermarkets and the warehouse have taken an incentive to recycle these, our house of 5 people can hardly fill the bin once a month (obviously composting makes a big difference, too). Why on earth are we sending these to landfill? Also we need more community compost areas, if no one is going to collect food waste its the very least that needs to be done. Thanks!"

"I don't feel I should have to pay more for the collection of organic/food waste as I already compost and have a worm farm, as do many households in Auckland. I already pay per bag to have my rubbish collected, despite urban areas having wheelie bins and they don't have to pay extra. I recycle far more than I dispose. Make it fair for all ratepayers please!"

“I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040. It’s a smart goal in the context of climate change and the challenges of growing landfill. I think it needs to go further to include discouraging shops using packaging. We all need to be sustainable and work together towards a sustainable future if humanity is going to survive the challenges of the ecological crisis we are now in.”