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1.0 Tāmaki’s Parks and Open Spaces
1.0 TĀMAKI’S PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Open Space Network Plan covers the Tāmaki regeneration area. It includes land in both Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Ōtāhīte Local Board areas.

PURPOSE

The Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan sets out the actions needed to deliver a sustainable quality open space network for the Tāmaki area. It will respond to the anticipated growth and provide the community with access to a range of recreational, social, cultural, and environmental experiences.

The plan assists the local board prioritise spending on parks and open space. Projects will be prioritised through local board plans, Long-term Plan and Annual Plan processes.

Tāmaki is a major growth area. The population in Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is expected to rise from 78,002 people in 2013, to 86,000 people in 2031. This will place pressure on the open space network.

- It is important that council makes the most of existing open space.
- Gaps in provision of open space for neighbourhood parks have been identified. Parnmore town centre lacks a central civic space to enhance current open space. An open space provision gap exists in Gisborne Lines and Jallack Road. There is also a shortage of sportfields for training and competition.
- Local boards have an advocacy role in the provision of open space and its development.

There is room for improvement in the quality of the parks and open space network.

- Parts of the open space network away from the coast suffer from safety and poor surveillance issues. Reconfiguring these spaces would improve utilisation and enhance safety.

The Tāmaki Regeneration Company’s redevelopment programme offers an opportunity to improve the open space network through land exchange.

- A series of land exchanges are proposed by the Tāmaki Regeneration Company to improve the configuration of the open space network. The local boards have an advocacy role in the land exchange process and acquisition of open space. The community will be formally consulted on any land exchange proposal.

There is limited visibility of the Mana Whenua cultural landscape within the open space network.

- Tāmaki has a rich Māori history. There is an opportunity for cultural expression as part of future development works.

There are gaps in the variety of play provision and a lack of informal recreation infrastructure.

- Inclusive, accessible play promotes equity and social cohesion between people of different ages, cultures, abilities and abilities. Parks have been identified where there is an opportunity to diversify the playgrounds and provide for informal recreation to cater for a broader range of users.

Water quality is poor and ecological restoration is required to improve biodiversity.

- Riparian ecological planting provides many benefits, including stabilising the banks and improving water quality. The ecological quality affects users’ experience and the overall ecological value. Parks have been identified that would benefit from additional planting.

The open space network lacks connectivity with public transport, community facilities and amenities.

- Gaps in the path network and cycle routes restrict the access to the open space network. Priority links have been identified to improve connectivity.
1.0 TĀMAKI'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

1.2 INTRODUCTION

The Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan has three sections:
- Analyses the qualities of the current network of parks and open spaces
- Analyses how drivers of community preferences and values can relate to opportunities in Tāmaki’s parks and open spaces
- Identifies future strategies for Tāmaki’s open space network in terms of vision, spatial form, functions and facilities
- Integrates parks and open space development with housing and regeneration
- Identifies a process for coordinating the review of proposed new open space in Tāmaki

The Open Space Network Plan allows the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Orakei Local Boards to respond to open space development and the Point England Development Enabling Act 2017. It also provides a framework to consider land exchanges proposed by the Tāmaki Regeneration Company.

1.3 IMPLEMENTATION

The Open Space Network Plan will be implemented over the next 15 years. There is currently no additional funding in the Long-Term Plan 2015-2025 to implement projects in the Open Space Network Plan beyond renewal of existing assets and planned capital expenditure.
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1.4 CONTEXT

Tamaki is located on the eastern edge of the Auckland isthmus. The area takes its name from the river estuary that defines its eastern boundary. The broader area known as Tamaki includes the suburbs of Point England, Glen Innes and Pakuranga, with town centres in the latter two.

The Tamaki Estuary has defined the stories of the people who lived here from the earliest days of Māori settlement. The productive rich soils around Maungata (Mount Wellington) and sheltered waters in Tamaki drew people to these shores. The estuary formed a key part of Māori society, transport routes and culture in this area of the North Island.

Today, the people of Tamaki benefit from proximity to the city’s central business district and other employment centres. Modern transport modes which serve the area include electrified rail to the central business district and direct road links to the nearby motorway network.

Tamaki’s coastal location provides leisure attractions, with the nearby beaches treading into the Miuraki Gulf, protected nature reserves and considerable recreational and sporting reserves.
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The Tāmaki open space network plan area comprises a land area of 908 hectares.

There are 41 parks within the Tāmaki area which provide a total of approximately 188 hectares of open space. There are a total of 36 parks within the Maungakiekie - Tāmaki Local Board area and 5 parks within the Orakei Local Board area.

---

**Figure 1:** Demographics in Tāmaki (Tāmaki Reference Plan 2018)
1.5 STRATEGIC CONTEXT

PARKS AND OPEN SPACES STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN

The Auckland Plan sets out the vision for Auckland. The Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan sets out what needs to happen to Auckland’s parks and open space network to implement the Auckland Plan.

The Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan identifies four areas of focus. These focus areas are used to create the network of parks and open spaces required to achieve the outcomes identified in the Auckland Plan.

- Treasure our parks and open spaces
- Connect our parks and open spaces
- Utilise our parks and open spaces
- Enjoy our parks and open spaces

The Tamaki Open Space Network Plan is future focussed and a key tool for implementing the Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan. Network plans map the aspirations for our parks and open spaces at a local level.

Reserve management plans prepared under the Reserves Act 1977 have been approved for many of Tamaki’s parks. Future development must align with these plans.

The purpose of reserve management plans is to “provide for and ensure the use, enjoyment, protection and preservation, as the case may require, and to the extent that the administering body’s resources permit, the development as appropriate of the Reserve for the purposes which it is classified” (Reserves Act 1977).

Figure 2 Strategic Context

Auckland Plan: 30-year vision and strategy for Auckland

- Non-statutory strategies, plans and legislation
  - e.g. The Reserves Act, The Conservation Act, Tamaki: In Nature Management Strategy (TINMS), etc.

- Long-term Plan
  - Queen’s 10-year plan budget and action plan

- Local board plans
  - 3-year plans of 21 local boards

- Local board agreements
  - Annual budgets of 21 local boards

- Parks and open spaces strategic action plan
  - Auckland City Plan
  - Tamaki City Plan
  - Tamaki: In Nature
  - Tamaki Greenways
  - Tamaki Heritage Plan

- Tamaki Open Space Network Plan
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NT ST T

The current state of open space in the Tāmaki area has been researched and analysed through desk top research, user surveys and site visits.

Tāmaki has approximately 168 hectares of open space and 41 parks, 36 parks within the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area and 5 parks within the Orakei Local Board area.

The analysis is summarised into the four key focus areas as outlined in the Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan:

- Treasures
- Play
- Connect
- Lighten.
2.1 TREASURE

Maungakiekie has a rich cultural landscape with important features including the Tamaki River, Mokioia Pa and connections to Maungakiekie - Mt Wellington and Parnawa Stream. These features defined the original landscape prior to European arrival.

The area as a whole is highly significant to Mana Whenua and there is a rich history throughout. Māori occupied the area for the last 800–1000 years centred around several key sites including Maungakiekie, the Parnawa Stream and the Tamaki River. There is limited visibility of the cultural landscape within Tamaki urban sprawl.

General Observations:
- There is a rich network of culturally important sites including Mokioia Pa and To Tumrama – Purchas Hill
- Some parks display examples of cultural expression
- Mana Whenua values and traditions are not widely represented in the current open space network.

Until the 1940's the area was used for agriculture, including market gardening and tanning.

The majority of parks in the study area were created when the area was subdivided by the Crown for housing in the 1940's and 1950's.

COASTLINE AND WATERWAYS

The Tamaki River forms the eastern boundary of the study area and the Omahu Creek flows through many of the parks in the Tamaki area.

There is an excellent network of open spaces connecting people to and along the Tamaki River.

Water quality is very poor. The 2014 State of Auckland Freshwater Report Card for Maungakiekie-Tamaki was an F grade.

The water from the streams and creeks in Tamaki flow into the Tamaki River impacting on the quality of the marine environment.

Many segments of the Omahu Creek have species which clog the waterways, preventing good water flow and oxygenation.
2.2 ENJOY

Nearby parks and open spaces can meet the needs of our growing population.

Tamaki has a population of approximately 20,000 people (2013 Census).

The area is culturally diverse with 23 per cent of residents identifying as Māori, 45 per cent as Pacific Island peoples and a growing Asian population.

A third of Tamaki residents are under 18 years of age.

POPULATION GROWTH

The Tamaki area is a key growth area in the Auckland region.

By 2031, Māungakiekie-Tāmaki’s population is expected to rise from 70,002 people (2013) to 100,000 people. Substantial parts of this growth are expected to occur in Tamaki as well as neighbouring areas.

There are 2800 social houses in the Tamaki area and the Tamaki Regeneration Company has been mandated to replace 3900 social houses with a minimum of 7500 mixed tenure houses over a period of 15 years. This would increase the overall density of housing within the same area. This includes land in the mixed housing urban, terraced housing and apartment zones in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

The Auckland Unitary Plan provides zoning for intensified land use for residential dwellings in the Tamaki area.

Population growth and increasing housing densities will put pressure on parks and open spaces.

SPORTS

The Sport New Zealand Insights Tool shows jogging, dance, boxing, touch rugby, and basketball are key sports in the network plan which have high participation rates compared to the national average.

Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve, the Colin Maiden Precinct and Point England Reserve provide for cricket, rugby and football. There is a variety of different turfs types including soil and artificial fields. Football is also provided at Bill McIntyre Park.

As with most of central Auckland, the Tamaki area has a shortage of sports fields, particularly for training. The number of teams using sports fields is expected to grow by 36 per cent by 2025 as the population increases.

The Colin Maiden Park precinct provides for outdoor sports such as cricket, Australian rules football, netball and tennis.

Parnure Wharf Reserve provides access to the Tamaki Estuary for water sports such as water skiing, rowing and sailing.

Recreational boat ramps are provided at Parnure Wharf and Point England Reserves.

Small watercraft like rowing skiffs, water skis and kayaks can be launched from Parnure Wharf. The wharf also provides for recreational fishing and swimming.

The master plan for the Colin Maiden Park Precinct provides for indoor sports like netball, basketball, gym sports and indoor training for cricket and rugby. The Tamaki Recreation Centre and Lagoon Stadium Parnure provide for a variety of indoor sports including football and basketball.

The Tamaki area is well provided for swimming with community swimming pools in Parnure and Glen Innes.

PARK USER RESEARCH

In 2015, research to understand people’s thoughts about parks and the way they use parks in the Māungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area was undertaken. The research identified the following:

+ 73 per cent of respondents felt that the neighbourhood parks played some or a large role in their overall recreational mix. They noted that parks provided open, outdoor spaces for the community to use for relaxing, for children and/or adults to socialise at and meet other people from their community, and for people to use for leisure and recreation including exercise, sport, walking, and use of a playground.

+ Others noted that parks provided free entertainment, and were safe places for children and adults.

VISITATION

+ 89 per cent of respondents living in the Māungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area visit a neighbourhood park.

+ Compared to the overall average (82 per cent visitation), Pacific peoples (100 per cent) were more likely to visit a neighbourhood park. Nga Puhi (97 per cent) were slightly less likely to visit neighbourhood parks.

+ The 75+ age group were less likely to visit parks (37 per cent) compared to the overall average.

+ 47 per cent of respondents visited their closest neighbourhood park as well as other parks in the Māungakiekie-Tāmaki local board area. The main reasons for visiting other parks were for a change of scenery, because the parks had better playgrounds, because the parks were larger or better suited to their needs, or that the parks were good options for walking dogs.

ACTIVITIES

The main reasons for not visiting their closest neighbourhood parks were that it didn’t meet their needs. For example it was small, lacked facilities, or they preferred other locations.
2.0 CURRENT STATE ANALYSIS

TOP SPORTS BY DEMOGRAPHIC AND LIFESTAGE

The following graphs show the top ten activities by demographic and lifestage in the Tāmaki redevelopment area. This area includes the following census area units: Panmure Basin, Tāmaki, Mount Wellington Domain, Point England, Glen Innes West and Glen Innes East.

Figure 3: Top sports by gender (Sport New Zealand’s Insight Tool)

Figure 4: Top sports by ethnicity (Sport New Zealand’s Insight Tool)

Figure 5: Top sports by lifestage (Sport New Zealand’s Insight Tool)
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SATISFACTION

86 per cent were satisfied or very satisfied with their neighbourhood park. During summer respondents were more likely to be satisfied or very satisfied (91 per cent) compared to those visiting in spring (81 per cent). Those satisfied respondents stated their neighbourhood parks were well maintained and that they provided somewhere for children to play.

Only four per cent were dissatisfied. The main reasons stated for this were that there was a lack of maintenance or facilities, or that the park was unappealing.

Respondents visiting to participate in organised sports were generally less satisfied with the neighbourhood park they visited than those undertaking other activities at the park.

15 to 24 year olds were more likely to be dissatisfied.

Those respondents who identified themselves as being of Māori, Pacific or Asian backgrounds were less satisfied with the neighbourhood park(s) they visited than other ethnic groups, however their suggestions for improvement were similar to overall findings.

Families with children under five years old in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area were generally less satisfied with the neighbourhood park they visited.

Suggested improvements to the network of parks included:

+ Updating the playgrounds to make them more suited to younger age groups
+ Updating park facilities such as providing more rubbish bins and park benches, more toilets
+ Increased shade and seating areas
+ Increased maintenance

People who visit parks in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area enjoy the activities outlined in figure 5.

![Figure 6: Purpose for visiting their Neighbourhood Park](image)

Source: Capheateke research and communication Auckland Council Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board neighbourhood parks research results, March 2018.
OPEN SPACE PROVISION

The Open Space Provision Policy 2016 sets out the distribution, quantity and configuration of open space for neighbourhood and suburb parks.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PARKS
Neighbourhood parks provide basic informal recreation and social opportunities within a short walk of people's homes.

In high and medium density areas, the Open Space Provision Policy target is to provide access to a neighbourhood park within a 400 metre or five minute walk of every household.

SUBURB PARKS
Suburb parks provide a variety of informal recreation and social experiences for residents from across a suburb. The Open Space Provision Policy target is to provide access to a suburb park within a 1000 metre walk in medium density residential areas and within 1500 metre walk in all other residential areas.

CIVIC SPACES
Civic Spaces provide places for meeting, socialising, play and events in Auckland’s urban centres. They encompass a network of public space including squares, plazas, green streets and shared space. The Open Space Provision Policy target is to provide one or more small civic spaces of less than 1000m² within a town centre, and a medium sized civic space.

CURRENT OPEN SPACE PROVISION

The Auckland Unitary Plan provides for considerable growth in the Tāmaki area. Based on this growth there will be gaps in open space provision. Acquisition of open space could address gaps in provision, subject to funding and available land.

General observations:
+ The majority of Tāmaki residents are within 400 metres (around five minutes walk) of open space.
+ Coastal areas are particularly well served with regard to open space.
+ There are five locations where increased provision could be provided in response to growth.
+ There is no civic space provision in Parnell Town Centre. Provision could help create a community focal point.
+ There are some small areas near to the coast which are not within 400 metres of open space, though they are served by the visual and recreational amenity that the coast provides.
+ The Auckland Eastern Line Rail Corridor forms a barrier to access some open space.
CURRENT OPEN SPACE QUALITY

- There is a lack of useable flat areas for informal recreation. The Tamaki area features a number of drainage reserves, which are steep and characterised by poor access, surveillance and connectivity.
- There are very few opportunities for informal recreation in the study area. The play spaces are of a similar design and age and do not provide for a wide range of age groups. There is little other recreation infrastructure in the parks.
- Many of the open spaces in Tamaki have poor street frontage and are surrounded by high fences, which is not consistent with crime prevention through environmental design principles. Anti-social behaviour occurs in these areas as evidenced by burnt out rubbish bins, tagging, vandalism of park assets and broken glass in the parks.

There are three main factors that decrease the quality of open space in Tamaki:

1. Location and configuration
   Many of Tamaki's parks are poorly located with respect to the built environment around them. For example, many parks are located behind private residential properties. These parks generally have little street frontage, small play area type entrances and are surrounded by high, solid fences. As a result, much of the open space in Tamaki is hidden from public view, making it isolated and unsafe.

2. Shape and topography
   The shape and topography of much of the open space restricts its usefulness for recreation activities. Many of the parks consist of sloping ground, are fragmented by creeks and are of a narrow, linear shape. Many open spaces also serve a drainage function and as a result become boggy during wet periods, reducing access and useable space.

3. Network strategy
   There is generally an uncoordinated approach to the provision of amenities such as playgrounds and walkways within Tamaki. The varying quality of existing assets, missing sections of the path network, and poor surveillance of many parks greatly reduce the recreational potential of Tamaki's uniquely connected network of open spaces.
SAFETY AND SURVEILLANCE

The subdivision pattern within the Tamaki area has resulted in a number of parks that have very poor safety and surveillance. There is, however, an excellent network of parks on the coast which have good street frontage and visibility from adjacent housing. The aim is to provide high-quality parks which are safe, inviting and provide a range of activities, uses and experiences for people of all ages and abilities.

General observations:
+ Parks are poorly located with limited street frontage.
+ Houses back onto parks with high fences, limited access and visibility.
+ Parks are long and narrow tailoring waterways and have little useable space and therefore limited activity.
+ There is a general lack of lighting provision throughout park network.

Figure 7: Vegetation prevents clear visibility within Boundary Reserve.

Figure 8: An alleyway to Manurewa West Reserve with limited surveillance.
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PLAYGROUND PROVISION
There is currently a lack of variety in play provision in Tāmaki. There are thirteen playgrounds, most of which are of a similar age and design. The playgrounds cater for a narrow range of users and many are in need of upgrade.

General observations:
- Current playground provision is for able-bodied children three to seven years of age.
- Lots of parks have mature trees, bush areas and beaches that provide opportunities for nature play.
- Playgrounds are of a similar age and design, there is no hierarchy of play provision.
- There is a lack of pedestrian accessways in Tāmaki connecting people to parks, schools and shops, the pedestrian accessways and street network provide opportunities for play along the way.

INFORMAL RECREATION
The community enjoy volleyball, picnics and informal ball games. There are very few flat spaces for informal ball games and there is a lack of informal recreational infrastructure, such as basketball and volleyball courts.


2.3 CONNECT

Creating a green network across Auckland by linking parks, open spaces and streets.

WALKING AND CYCLING NETWORKS

A key outcome in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board plan is transport that meets the communities' and businesses' needs and encourages more people to walk and cycle for work or for recreation. Key local board actions to support this outcome are:

- Delivering on the greenways plan to create ecological walking and cycling corridors across Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, with a focus on making it easy for people to walk and cycle safely and efficiently between local destinations
- Supporting the delivery of the Auckland Cycle Network and advocate for improved connections for cyclists between major road networks
- Exploring partnership opportunities between stakeholders who share a similar vision for creating more cycling and walking options.

There are existing walkways along the Tāmaki River and the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board is currently in the planning phase to extend the walkway and provide for cycling between Princes Wharf Reserve and Waitāki Bay.

The diagram on the right shows the greenways path network, both current and future, and shows how it links into other connections and public transport links.
CURRENT STATE ANALYSIS

CURRENT STATE

Tamaki boasts a rail connection, a long stretch of coastline and large open spaces orientated east to west. There is currently a lack of connectivity between these both in terms of access and infrastructure.

General observations:
+ Missing segments of path network contributes to poor connectivity through many of the linear reserves
+ Lack of hierarchy of trails, in particular shared path and cycle routes
+ Lack of network strategy in terms of linking open space with public transport, community facilities and amenities
+ Many off-street pedestrian connections.

MAUNGAKIEKIE TAMAKI GREENWAYS

The Maungakiekie-Tamaki Greenways plan creates ecological, walking and cycling corridors across Maungakiekie-Tamaki with a focus on making it easy for people to walk and cycle safely and efficiently between destinations.

The Maungakiekie-Tamaki Greenways Plan seeks to improve both internal park circulation and ‘topmost’ connections between parks. The outcomes sought from the greenways are safe, high-quality walking and cycling connections, improved ecological and stormwater connections, and increased recreational opportunities.

There are a large number of benefits that will come from developing the greenways, including: recreational, environmental, social, health, educational, and economic benefits.

The Maungakiekie-Tamaki and Orakei Local Boards have prepared greenways plans to connect pedestrians and cycle routes to employment, shops and recreation opportunities. This plan provides the opportunity to implement the greenways plans and to identify further greenways connections, including opportunities to connect to the new Titahi Kai Ohki Tai shared path.

Figure 2: The greenways path network is proposed along the Tamaki Estuary coastline at Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve.
2.4 UTILISE

Using our parks and open spaces to create a green, resilient and prosperous city with thriving communities.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Reserves and maritime areas with a key ecological function include Waitakere Reserve and its connection to Tahuna Torea Nature Reserve, Point England Reserve and reserves along the Omahu Creek.

Water quality is very poor. The 2016 State of Auckland Freshwater Report Card for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki was only an F-grade. The water from the streams and creeks in Tāmaki flow into the Tāmaki Estuary impacting on the quality of the marine environment.

General observations:
- Some reserves have clusters of mature trees which provide potential habitat and corridor functions
- Potential to enhance connections to habitat beyond Tāmaki, for example Maungatere adjoining the study area to the west, and to Kepa Bush Reserve and Onetahutu Basin to the north-east.
- Low habitat quality due to poor water quality
- Many segments of the stream have plant species which clog the waterways, preventing good water flow and oxygenation
- Local community groups are working to improve the stream and creek environments by planting the edges to reduce erosion and regular rubbish clean ups.

Figure 10. Tahuna Torea Nature Reserve is a recognised significant wetland area

TĀMĀKI OPEN SPACE NETWORK PLAN

AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN
- Significant Ecological Areas - Marine 1
- Significant Ecological Areas - Marine 2
- Significant Ecological Areas - Land
- Streams
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OPEN SPACE STRENGTH CATEGORIES

The degree to which the park provides varied opportunities for
play, including play structures, mature play and flat zones for
informal play.

The park is activated by organized community and
sport clubs, with opportunities for community to interact and
utilise public facilities.

Cultural and heritage values acknowledged
and expressed in the open space, for example educational
facilities – e.g. Waitemata park, place names or cultural
signage.

The degree to which the open space supports community
sports requirements. Larger sports fields should, for example,
provide flexibility for tournaments and larger events and
provide sufficient parking.

Successfully the park supports biodiversity and
ecological values, for example open space with high
biodiversity will contain a wide range of plant species
providing food, habitat, and movement corridors for a variety
d of fauna.

OPEN SPACE QUALITY CATEGORIES

SAFETY AND SURVEILLANCE

A

CONNECTIVITY

FUNCTIONALITY AND FLEXIBILITY

open space is fit for purpose as well as the degree of flexibility

Figure 11: Model Street Old Boys Rugby Club at Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve

Figure 12: A senior citizen entrance at Maungakiekie War Memorial Reserve

creating personal safety perception issues
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PROJECTS IN TĀMĀKI

There are currently a large number of projects underway or planned for the future in Tāmaki. These projects will influence and open up opportunities within the open space network. The projects which have been approved are shown in the diagram to the right.
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3.0 KEY MOVES

WHAT ARE THE KEY MOVES?

The plan identifies six key open space moves in response to the strengths and challenges facing the existing open space network. They respond to the issues and opportunities identified through the current state analysis:

- Improve open space quality
- Provide for play and informal recreation
- Improve safety and surveillance
- Reaffirm and revitalise the mana whenua identity
- Improve biodiversity and water quality
- Improve connectivity.

The key moves provide the framework for future development and management of the Tāmaki open space network over the next ten to fifteen years.

Figure 13. Improving open space quality through improved sports field provision and quality such as in the Colin Maiden Freestock Reserve.

Figure 14. Nature play at Onetea Regional Park, providing for play and informal recreation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY MOVES</th>
<th>ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>LOCAL BOARD PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Open Space Quality</strong></td>
<td>• Increase open space provision in areas of poor provision.</td>
<td>• Improve quality of open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase access to open space.</td>
<td>• Investigate opportunities for pocket parks within future development areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase sport field quality.</td>
<td>• Improve quality of open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide for growth.</td>
<td>• Retain Marton Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase areas of usable open space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide for Play and Informal Recreation</strong></td>
<td>• Few flat spaces.</td>
<td>• Network of play opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited informal recreation infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Playgrounds of a similar age, quality and design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No provision of activities for youth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No network of play opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Safety and Surveillance</strong></td>
<td>• Poor park configuration.</td>
<td>• Improve safety and surveillance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anti-social behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor street frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaffirm and Revitalise Mana Whenua Identity</strong></td>
<td>• Reinstate the area (pathways/connections) between the mosaic of significant cultural sites and planned (Tūwha).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reaffirming the oral traditions and histories of Mana Whenua through appropriate place names and Māori urban design responses within the built environment and open space (Whakapapa).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fostering mutual understanding through the sharing of stories and interactive design outcomes that provide a focus on cultural narrative (Māhi iwi).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a unique point of difference and sense of community by acknowledging the importance of the cultural landscape and placemaking in the regeneration of the open space network (Kotihanganga).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Biodiversity and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>• Limited native planting.</td>
<td>• Improve ecological corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No water sensitive design in parks.</td>
<td>• Improve ecological quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement Tāmaki Stormwater Management Plan.</td>
<td>• Improve ecological quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treat and improve stormwater.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plantings that provide food and habitat for wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>• Improve access to the coast.</td>
<td>• Provide a network of play opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement greenways plan.</td>
<td>• Improve connectivity to Māngere (Mt Wellington).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide a network of play opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide for jogging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 KEY MOVES

3.1 IMPROVE OPEN SPACE QUALITY

It is important to invest in the park network to provide high quality open space. Parks need to be developed with species that are flexible and provide for many recreation experiences.

There are many opportunities to improve the network and respond to future growth including:

- Increase open space provision in areas of poor provision
- Providing usable flat spaces and improving street frontages of parks
- Sportsfield provision.

The development proposed by the Tāmaki Regeneration Company and other developers provides opportunities for Auckland Council to respond to specific open space needs.

INCREASE OPEN SPACE PROVISION IN AREAS OF POOR PROVISION

The open space network is not able to provide for all the future open space needs in the Tāmaki Area. More open space land may need to be acquired. Increasing the quality connectivity and level of service of existing open space will also help to meet future needs.

Auckland Council’s Parks and Open Spaces Acquisition Policy and the Open Space Provision Policy set out how Auckland Council will assess whether land should be acquired for new parks and open space.

The open space needs currently identified in the Tāmaki area are:

- An opportunity to provide a civic space in Panmure
- An open space provision gap in northern Glen Innes
- An open space provision gap alongside Jallaroo Road
- A shortage of sportsfields for training and competition.
CIVIC SPACE PROVISION FOR PANMURE

Panmure does not have a civic space. A civic space could provide an area close to the centre of Panmure for a range of different activities such as community events, markets, informal recreation and flexible space for people to gather or relax.

The Open Space Provision Policy target for a base centre is to provide one or more small civic spaces (less than 1000m²) and a medium space (1500m² to 2000m²). These can be squares, plazas, greens and shared spaces. This is subject to land availability and funds.

NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD PARKS

The development of new neighbourhoods through the Tamaki Regeneration Programme may provide opportunities to obtain pocket parks at no capital cost enabling children play, informal recreation and amenity. These parks will need to conform to the Open Space Provision Policy.

There are two large open space provision gaps which have been identified. The first of which can be found in the north of Glen Innes, just south of West Tamaki Road. The second is in the south-west of the study area along Waitakere Road. Land acquisition for open space could be considered if suitable land was available.

INCREASE AREAS OF USEABLE OPEN SPACES

Providing usable flat spaces and improving street frontages of parks.

The land away from the coast, which is often used as open space is mostly made up of drainage reserves. Many of these are steep and characterised by poor access, surveillance and connectivity. Parts of Tamaki lack usable flat areas for informal recreation. Some of the land owned by the Tamaki Regeneration Company and subject to redevelopment is next to open space which is poorly configured.

The Tamaki regeneration project provides the opportunity for Auckland Council to exchange land with the Tamaki Regeneration Company to improve park configuration, release landlocked parks, and provide usable flat areas and improve street frontage.

Eight parks have been identified as being able to be improved by potentially exchanging land with the Tamaki Regeneration Company to provide better street frontage and usable flat spaces.

POINT ENGLAND DEVELOPMENT ENABLING ACT 2017

The Point England Development Enabling Act 2017 removes 11.69 hectares from the Point England Reserve and zones that area for housing development.

The balance of the reserve (32.91 hectares) remains land vested in Auckland Council and subject to the Reserves Act 1977.

The new configuration of the reserves is reflected in the maps in this plan.

The area taken for housing extends across 3.1 hectares of existing sports fields. The Act amends the management plan for the reserve to require Auckland Council to replace the last 3.1 hectares with new sports fields elsewhere in the reserve as soon as practicable.

The Auckland Council position is that the market value of the open space land taken for housing through the Act must be reinvested in the open space network in Tamaki. Detail of how this will happen is yet to be agreed with the government. Reinvestment should include a mixture of acquisition of further land and improvements to the quality of existing open space.

ACQUISITION OF NEW OPEN SPACE IN TAMAKI

- Is there land available to be satisfied by reconfiguring existing space or improving existing space?
- Does the land proposed for acquisition meet the Auckland Council parks and open spaces acquisition and provision policies?
- Does land proposed for acquisition meet a specific need identified in the Tamaki open space network plan?
- Can the need be met by land owned by Auckland Council which is not currently being used for open space and is identified as a non-service asset, or which has been identified for other uses or disposal?

Where a decision is made to accept open space land which does not meet the open space acquisition policy, the governing body has made it conditional on the local board allocating ongoing maintenance funds from its Local Discretionary Initiative Budget or otherwise securing ongoing maintenance funding from other sources.
3.0 KEY MOVES

RESERVES ACT 1977 LAND EXCHANGE PROCESS

Section 15 of the Reserves Act prescribes the process to be followed to undertake a land exchange between reserves and other land. This process comprises the following four key steps:

- The administering body (in this case the Auckland Council) publicly notifies its intention to undertake the land exchange and calls for objections in writing, allowing a period of at least one month for objections to be received.
- After a period of at least one month following public notification the administering body considers all received objections to the proposed land exchange.
- The administering body passes a resolution supporting the land exchange if it considers it appropriate to do so in light of all objections received.
- A copy of the resolution supporting the land exchange is forwarded to the Department of Conservation along with all the objections for authorisation under delegation from the Minister of Conservation.

Mata whenua must be consulted when Auckland Council is performing its functions and duties under the Reserves Act 1977.

A comparable process will also be followed for land held as too simple under the Local Government Act 2002.
3.2 PROVIDE FOR PLAY AND INFORMAL RECREATION

There are many opportunities to improve the network particularly by providing more variety of play, nature play and access to flexible space including:

- Provide for youth
- Provide flexible flat spaces
- Provide for informal recreation.

PROVIDE A NETWORK OF OPPORTUNITIES

Good quality spaces are those that facilitate a range of play opportunities and are welcoming and inclusive of all ages and abilities.

Play does not have to happen entirely in the playground. Where feasible, opportunities for unstructured play can be designed in parks and in places such as streets and civic spaces. For example, letting grass grow longer, and providing play-along-the-way.

Connections have an important role in providing access to play. The provision of a safe accessible street environment with play-along-the-way opportunities to connect people to play opportunities will provide better access to play.

Many of Tāmaki’s parks have coastal and stream edges which create play opportunities and contribute to providing linkages and connections to communities.

Inclusive accessibility of space promotes equity and social cohesion between different ages, cultures, ethnicities, abilities and deprivation status. This is important as the Tāmaki area has an ethnically diverse population with areas of high deprivation.

Tāmaki has a high youth population and there are few opportunities for informal recreation and play for youth. Providing a play space for youth in the Otakuhenu town centre would meet these needs.

DESTINATION PLAY SPACES

Destination play spaces provide for large numbers of users, and cater for all ages and abilities. People often visit these play spaces for an extended period of time and may travel from across Auckland. They also provide ancillary amenities such as facilities, shade, barbecues and parking, and are well connected to public transport.

The eastern part of the Auckland isthmus does not have a destination play space. Point England Reserve and Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve have been identified as potential locations for a destination play space.
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PROVIDE FOR YOUTH

A third of Tāmaki residents are under 18 years of age. The park user research identified that 15 to 25 year olds were likely to be dissatisfied with their community parks. There are few opportunities for informal recreation and play for youth in Tāmaki.

The provision of play and recreation opportunities for youth can be included in all parks by taking an inclusive approach to the design of parks. For example, park design welcomes and provides for all ages, genders, cultures and abilities.

Providing a play space for youth in Maybury Reserve in the Glen Innes town centre would meet the specific play and recreation needs of youth. Local youth should be closely involved in the design of the space to ensure it meets their needs.

PROVIDE FLAT FLEXIBLE SPACES

In Tāmaki many parks lack the flat, flexible areas for kick around and other informal sports. Flat spaces in parks provide for a variety of functions including activities such as kick around, touch rugby, markets, fairs and concerts. As dwellings become smaller, parks provide public open space for activities which were previously undertaken at home.

Exchanging land with the Tāmaki Regeneration Company could provide the opportunities to create more flat areas.

PROVIDE FOR INFORMAL RECREATION

Parks provide for a variety of informal recreation. They provide for informal sports, walking, socialising and observing nature.

The park user research identified the need for increased shade, and seated areas and a need to upgrade existing park amenity. The provision of seating, shade, picnic areas and fitness trails, valley seal courts and barbecues will provide for a variety of recreation opportunities and needs to be considered as part of the development of open space.
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3.3 IMPROVE SAFETY AND SURVEILLANCE

Parks that are attractive and well-connected with the surrounding environment both visually and physically with clear networks, will make people feel safe and allow for greater activation of open space. A variety of activities will provide opportunities for use by a wide range of people. Wide street frontages and clear sightlines will contribute to safer environments.

Some of the interventions to improve safety and surveillance are relatively easy to achieve, such as maintenance and removal of existing vegetation. There are a significant number of parks that require major reconfiguration and development to address the current issues within Tamaki’s open space.

Proposed actions include:

- Reconfigure parks to create better spaces and street frontage
- Provide open entrances to improve legibility and sightlines
- Clear existing vegetation to improve sightlines
- Where possible develop properties facing onto the park
- Design and develop parks and adjacent land uses following Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles.

Figure 26. Passive surveillance can be increased by the development of housing which fronts onto open space, as in this image at Bluestone Park in Stonefields.

Figure 27. Many of the coastal parks have great street frontage and visibility such as at Dunott, Manurewa.
3.4 REAFFIRM AND REVITALISE MANA WHENUA IDENTITY

There are many sites of value and significance to Mana Whenua identified in Tamaki. This creates an opportunity for cultural expression as part of future development works.

Proposed actions include:
- Consult Mana Whenua to establish potential opportunities for cultural expression and narratives
- Collaborate with them during the design and development of open space
- Align key actions to Te Aranga Principles
- Recognition and expression of narratives of Manuaina and Molokia Pī

TE ARANGA PRINCIPLES

The Te Aranga Principles have been used to identify potential sites of opportunity and cultural significance with Mana Whenua.

MANA
- Mana Whenua to contribute to the decision making process to maximise design outcomes across the Tamaki open space network.
- Acknowledge primary and wider Mana Whenua interests across the network.
- Understand the potential opportunities from Mana Whenua's point of view.
- Explore both the short and long term (legacy) interests for Mana Whenua.

WHAKAPAPA
- Consistent with Mana Whenua and research the use of correct ancestral names, including macron.
- Use of appropriate names to inform design processes.
- Recognition of traditional place names through signage and way-finding. Sequence storyboards that tell kōrero (narrative) of Tamaki whakapapa and significant ancestors.

TAIAO
- Protect, restore and enhance the biota which feeds into Omaha Creek - both aquatic & terrestrial ecology.
- Protect, restore and enhance all natural environments to allow sustainable Mana Whenua harvesting, for example, incorporating hākena planting in parks that encourages active Kākāriki.
- Support and preference endemic flora and fauna significant to Mana Whenua within the project area.
- Seek to protect, restore and enhance both physical and ecological connectivity, particularly through reserves and waterways.
- Consider the relationship to the Tamaki Estuary and tidal influences.
- Explore how seasonal variations can be highlighted and celebrated across the network.
- Resource management and ongoing environmental assessment plans can be established to ensure the environment is cared for and well looked after.

MAHI TOI
- Celebrate local and wider unique cultural heritage and community characteristics that reinforce sense of place and identity - community arts groups (Tamaki Putauaki - Mid Awe Community Organisation) and Tamaki College.
- Enhance the presence of Tamaki Stream through interpretative signage and integrated cultural design elements such as retreating the existing pedestrian bridges or creating new crossings.
- Opportunities for integration of wai / haaro narratives and themes into paving surfaces, bridges, walls, murals, etc.

TOHU
- Recognise and integrate views (Maungarei) allowing visual connection to significant sites to be created, preserved and enhanced.
- Promote enhancement and sustainable management of the length Omaha Creek and its tributaries.
- Potential for future recognition of tohu through heritage trails, markers and interpretation boards.
- Archaeological sensitivity during construction works.

AHI KA
- Access to natural resources (weaving species, mahoe, kahikatea, waterways, etc) facilitates, maintains and enhances Mana Whenua ahi ki and kaitiakitanga.
- Civic / iwi joint venture developments ensure aki ki and sense of place relationships are enhanced through participation in design process, interaction with the water and future maintenance and monitoring (lines with Maau Tu).
- Future projects will seek to engage and design with community arts programmes and planting and maintenance days.
3.5 IMPROVE BIODIVERSITY AND WATER QUALITY

Many of parks within the study area serve a stormwater function. This function will need to be expanded to provide for growth. Opportunities to layer functionality can be used to maximise synergies between water quality, ecology, education and amenity values.

The creeks and streams in Tāmaki flow into the Tāmaki River. Improvements to parks which include water sensitive design and planting can help to treat and clean stormwater before it enters the Tāmaki River.

PROPOSED ACTIONS

Increase native planting:
- Strengthen existing ecology and biodiversity through management of existing and new native corridors.
- Consider succession and legacy planting to ensure mature trees and habitats within parks in the future.
- Explore opportunities to enhance bird roosting and nesting environments, including provision of dog-free areas.
- Assess viability of grazing arrangements.

Include water sensitive design in parks:
- Utilise water sensitive design principles to improve water quality.
- Build on opportunities within the Omuru Creek Stormwater management plan.
- Improve opportunities for the community to access and interact with waterways.

Implement the Tāmaki Stormwater Management Plan:
- Encourage community groups who are working to improve water quality.
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Figure 33. Planting to revegetate the stream at Johnson Reserve

Figure 24. Example of open space with an aesthetic function at La Rosa Gardens Reserve

Figure 25. Example of open space with an aesthetic function at La Rosa Gardens Reserve
3.6 IMPROVE CONNECTIVITY

Many of Tāmaki's reserves can be linked to form a continuous string of open space. Key considerations are ensuring the path networks are in place, improving quality of that connective space and improving access into the open space network.

Proposed actions include:
+ Provide a hierarchy of cycle and pedestrian pathways through reserves
+ Connect play and informal recreation areas within the open space network
+ Connect people to public transport, community facilities such as schools, and link with other pathways outside the study area
+ Give consideration to existing strategic pathway proposals, for example greenways and heritage trails.

PROVIDE A HEIRARCHY OF CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PATHWAYS THROUGH PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Greenways Plan creates ecological, walking and cycling corridors across Maungakiekie-Tāmaki. There is a focus on making it easy for people to walk and cycle safely and efficiently between destinations.

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Greenways Plan seeks to improve both internal park circulation and on road connections between parks. The outcomes sought from the greenways are safe, high-quality walking and cycling connections, improved ecological and stormwater connections, and increased recreational opportunities.

There are a large number of benefits that will come from developing the greenways, including recreational, environmental, social, health, educational, and economic benefits.

Figure 38. One example of a crossing described within the Local Paths Design Guide is a pedestrian refuge, which reduces the time a pedestrian is exposed to traffic. This diagram is indicative only and the layout of the street may be variation of the above.
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Figure 27: Hopscotch and other playful ideas on paths, such as this example from Sandbury Reserves, could be provided as play along the way.

CONNECTING PLAY AND INFORMAL RECREATION

- Proposed play or informal recreation areas
- Connections linking play or informal recreation (within open space)
- Opportunity for linking play or informal recreation (not within open space)
- Play along the-way network

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
4.0 Actions and Priorities
4.1 ACTIONS

Actions have been identified that will contribute to the local boards delivering a quality open space network. These actions respond to the anticipated growth and provide the community with access to a range of recreational, social, cultural and environmental experiences.

The actions have been focussed on individual reserves.

PRIORITISATION PRINCIPLES

The following principles have been considered when prioritising actions:

- Existing capital works programme and contractual obligations
- Local board priorities
- Healthy Waters priorities
- Tamaki Regeneration Company development priorities

The timelines outlined indicate when actions are likely to be started, rather than how long they will take to deliver completed reserves.

Reserves which are not designated as a priority (beyond several years) may have some actions carried out within a shorter timeframe, particularly if the action spans multiple reserves such as Greenways paths.
4.2 RUAPOTAKA RESERVE

Actions and Priorities

- Development of a walking and cycling path along the Ruapotaka Reserve.
- Rehabilitation of the existing Ruapotaka Reserve, including the creation of a community garden and playground.
- Preparation of a management plan for the reserve.
- Potential for new seating and landscaping opportunities.

Radar frame: 1.5 years

Existing:
- Existing pathways
- Existing seating
- Existing landscaping

Proposed:
- Improved water quality
- Improved access
- New pathways
- New seating
- New landscaping

Future development:
- Potential new seating and landscaping opportunities.
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4.3 MAYBURY RESERVE - WEST

Note: A connection between town centre and coast with destination and youth play amenity

- Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path connecting between Tanwha Street and Point England Reserve.
- Provide a shared path connecting to Glen Innes town centre.
- Provide a new bridge crossing Omaru Creek to improve access.
- Potential land exchange to replace housing with reserve and provide a connection from Talbot Park to Maybury Reserve.
- Provide a new destination playground to provide for all ages, including youth.
- Provide a 30x30m flat flexible space suitable for informal activities.
- Potential land exchange to remove one block of housing on south side of Tanwha Street to improve visibility and access.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to revegetate Omaru Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of streams and native ecosystem (Taiao & Maui Tai).
- Opportunities for Whakapapa.

Timeline: 1-3 years
4.4 TANIWHA RESERVE

Role: A reserve with connectivity and stormwater functions

- Implement Greenways priority link path network providing a shared path between Lorne Road and Tamihana Street.
- Provide a pedestrian path and bridge from Lorne-Epping Neighbourhood into reserve and desire line to town centre.
- Build another new bridge that allows people to loop around the northern or southern half of the reserve.
- Provide a safe connection between Taniwha and Maybury Reserves.
- Increase road frontage to Epping Street and open up views to Maungakiekie.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to re-vegetate Omārau Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Tāko & Kauri Tu).

Opportunities for Whakapaia.

Timelines: 1-3 years
4.5 EASTVIEW RESERVE

Relic: A Neighbourhood Park designed by the community, with nature play amenity and stimulating function

- Prepare a master plan with the community and mana whenua to identify ways to improve the reserve.
- Provide a new nature play playground associated with proposed Omahu Creek enhancements.
- Provide 300m flat flexible space suitable for informal activities.
- Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path between Ariki Avenue and Line Road.
- Maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve.
- Provide a safe corridor between Eastview and Takapuna Reserves.
- Revitalise Omahu Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Tīnaki & Māori Tu).
- Opportunities for Whakapapa.

Timeframe: 1 to 3 years
**4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES**

**4.6 COLIN MAIDEN PRECINCT**

*Role: A Destination Sports Park with recreational and play amenity*

- Implement Colin Maiden Precinct Masterplan.
- Opportunities identified in Colin Maiden Precinct Masterplan, such as
  dual nature, ecological restoration, communal gardens, heritage trails and
  cultural narratives (Mara, Whakapapa, Taiaro, Mau Tu, Mali Toi, Te
  Huu & Api Kid).

*Timeframe: 1.3 years*
4.7 TE TAUOMA (PURCHAS HILL)

Relate A reserve with scientific and heritage function providing passive recreation amenity value.

- Provide for outing.
- Provide interpretative material for example on geology, Māori heritage and quarry history.
- Opportunities for cultural narratives and expression (Mana, Whakapapa, Te Ao, Māori Toi, Māori Tū, Tumu & Ahu Kā).

Timeframe: 1-3 years

In September 2013, the Strategy and Finance Committee approved the acquisition of Colin Maiden Park. In order to meet some of the costs of acquisition, the committee also approved the sale of council owned land at Watatua Reserve, Merton Reserve and 84 Merton Road (37/2013/102).
4.8 RIVERSIDE RESERVE

Role: A coastal reserve connecting between destination parks and providing recreational amenity

- Implement Greenways priority links shared paths along coast
- Provide additional pathways to improve connectivity along coast
- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.
- Provide a new fitness trail looping around Riverside and Dunkirk Reserves and along coast.
- Investigate opportunity for programming of fitness activities
- Implement sea wall upgrades.
- Enhancement of coastal ecosystems (Tīao & Maun Tū)
- Potential opportunity for Maunara Pā narrative (Mehi Tū)
- Opportunities for Whakaplaka.

Timeline: 1-3 years
4.9 DUNKIRK RESERVE

Role: A coastal reserve connecting between destination parks and providing recreational amenity

- Implement Greenways priority links along coastal path.
- Provide additional pathways to improve connectivity along coast.
- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.
- Provide new fitness trail looping around Riverside and Dunkirk Reserves and along coast.
- Investigate opportunity for programming of fitness activities.
- Implement sea wall upgrades.
- Enhancement of coastal ecosystems (Tāiao & Māori Tu)  
- Potential opportunity for MāuiMarina Pā narrative (Māhi Rō)  
- Opportunities for Whakapapa

Timeframe: 1-2 years
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.10 MT WELLINGTON WAR MEMORIAL RESERVE

Role: A Destination Park with sports, recreational and play amenity.

- Upgrade existing local playground to a destination playground.
- Implement Greenways priority links shared path along coast and at Dumbled Road.
- Implement Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve Concept plan.
- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.
- Enhancement of coastal ecosystems (Tīao & Mau Tū). (Potential opportunity for Maumau Pā narrative (Mahi Tūi).)
- Opportunities for Whānau app.

Timeframe: 1-3 years

[Diagram of Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve with key plan]

EXISTING
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing pedestrian crossing
- Existing sports fields
- Existing club or leisure centre

PROPOSED
- Improve entrance visibility
- Ecological planting
- Proposed path
- Proposed cycle connections
- Upgrade to destination playground
- Reserve Proposal
- Future greenway network
- Future cycle network

Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan
4.11 PANMURE WHARF RESERVE

Role: A reserve with sports and recreational amenity

- Implement Greenways priority links shared path along coast and to connect to Aminen and Kings Roads.
- Implement Panmure Wharf Reserve Concept plan.
- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.
- Enhancement of coastal ecosystems (Tīkao & Maui Tui).
- Potential opportunity for Maunga Re claim narrative (Mai Tua).
- Opportunities for Wairapapa.

Timeline: 1-3 years
4.12 NEW PARK

Role: A Park with recreational amenity

Timetable: 1-3 years

PROPOSED

- Improve access
- Install fitness equipment
- Planting

EXISTING

- Existing playground
- Existing seating area

New Park:

- Location
- Size
- Potential access points
- Potential landscaping
- Future tree and shrub plantings
4.13 POINT ENGLAND RESERVE

Title: A Destination Park with sports fields, play, beach amenity, and ecological/environmental function

Subject to the Point England Development Enabling Act 2017

- Upgrade existing playground to a destination playground.
- Improve quality of remaining sports fields.
- Light remaining sports fields.
- Implement ‘greenways’ path network and maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve for passive recreation, including around housing development land and adjacent to Omahau Creek.
- Work with MBIE and future developer of housing development land to provide for direct physical and physical path linkage between Glen Innes Town Centre and the Tamaki Estuary.
- Integrate Point England Pond improvement project with revegetation of Omahau Creek by re-planting planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.
- Cease grazing to comply with Point England Development Enabling Act 2017 requirements and implement alternatives to maintain and enhance bird nesting and feeding environments, including provision of dog-free areas and enhanced pest control.

- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Takaro & Maire Tai).
- Opportunities for recognition and expression of cultural sites (Takaro & Maire Tai).
- Integration by good design of proposed Local Marine Reserve (under a future Ngati Poa Treaty Settlement) with wider reserve (Matai).
- Opportunities for waiataapa

Timeline: 1-3 years +
4.14 MAYBURY RESERVE - EAST

Role: A connection between town centre and coast with destination and youth play amenity.

- Implement Greenways priority links paths network providing a shared path connecting east-west between Taniwha Street and Point England Reserves and other path connections to Rosetta Crescent and Maybury Street.
- Potential land exchange to improve connection to Pt England Reserve.
- Remove disused buildings with potential land exchange to open up park connection to community buildings on Maybury Street.
- Provide a safe connection across Elstree Avenue, between Maybury and Point England Reserves.
- Provide new bridges crossing Oneru Creek to improve access.
- Potential land exchange to remove housing along Rosetta Crescent at northern edge of reserve to increase street visibility and access.
- Potential land exchange along northern edge of reserve to provide development fronting onto park and increase surveillance.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to revegetate Oneru Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Te ao & Ma ty tu).
- Opportunities for Whatacara.

Timetable: 3-5 years

**EXISTING**
- Bush area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing pedestrian crossing
- Rail line
- Local board boundary

**PROPOSED**
- Potential land exchange into reserve
- Potential land exchange into development
- Improve entrance visibility
- Ecological planting
- Proposed path
- Proposed safe connection
- Future greenways network
- Future cycle network
4.15 WIMBLEDON RESERVE

Role: Wimbledon North - A reserve with connectivity and stormwater functions
Wimbledon South - A Neighborhood Park with play amenity

- Potential land exchanges to reorganise reserve and adjacent housing to create two parks with better connections and visibility.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Provide a shared path between Paddington Street and Botanic Avenue.
- Maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve.
- Provide a new bridge stream crossings to improve access.
- Regenerate stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Provide a new local playground adjacent to Wimbledon Crescent.
- Provide a 30x30m flat flexible space suitable for informal activities.
- Provide new basketball or volleyball court
- Renaturalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Takaro & Maruia Tu).
- Potential for cultural naming of stream and reserve (Whakapapa).

Timeframe: 3-5 years
4.16 PROPOSED NEW PARK

Actions and Priorities

- Prepare planting with Pupu Park and Stanley Reserve.
- Design a 500 year flood crossing point along the way, to connect to Maungakiekie Reserve and Tamaki Drive.
- Start with Sustainable Management: Plan, once complete to promote ecological function and connect Creek with native planting to produce resilient floodplain vegetation.
- Replacement of stream and valley vegetation (Tamaki & Manukau).
4.17 TAURIMA RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park with play and recreational amenity

- Upgrade playground to renew play equipment and provide for all ages.
- Potential land exchanges on eastern and southern edges of reserve to provide housing and street frontage improving passive surveillance.
- Maintain existing pathways.

Timeframe: 5-7 years
4.18 TORINO RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park with play and recreational amenity

- New path connection from Trippel Road to Boundary Reserve.
- Provide play along-the-way to connect to new playground in Boundary Reserve.
- Potential land exchange to allow fundamental changes in adjacent strategic open space corridor, and also provide surveillance for proposed path connection. Open space function transferred to Boundary Reserve.

Timeline: 5-7 years
4.19 BOUNDARY RESERVE

Role: A Neighborhood Park providing play and recreational amenity and connectivity and stormwater function

- Provide a new local playground at western end of the reserve.
- Recontour north facing slopes to provide a 30x30m flat flexible space suitable for informal activities.
- Potential land exchange to transfer former Waitakere Sea Scouts land into development.
- Potential land exchanges to widen entrances which will improve sightlines and access to the street.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Implement Greenways priority link path network providing a shared path east-west through the reserve in addition to connections to Torino Street, Onak Road and Sanda Road.
- Provide a new bridge stream crossing to improve access.
- Provide a safe connection at Frank Rd to connect the east and west sections of Boundary Reserve.
- daylight existing piped stream and vegetate with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Reintroduction of stream and native ecosystem (Tawata & Māori Tapu).
- Potential opportunities for farming of streams (Whakapapa).
- Potential opportunity for Mātauranga Pā narrative.

Timeframe: 5-7 years

[Diagram of Boundary Reserve with annotations and symbols]


4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.20 JOHNSON RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park providing play and recreational amenity and connectivity and stormwater function

- Provide a new local playground with visibility to Tripoli Road.
- Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path connection between Tripoli and Dunkirk Roads in addition to other path connections within the reserve.
- Provide a safe connection between Johnson and Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserves.
- Provide new bridge stream crossings to improve access.
- Potential land exchange to widen entrances and provide a usable space and visibility to the street.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines within reserve.
- Revitalise stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Taiao & Mauti Tu).
- Potential opportunities for naming of stream (Wihakapapa).
- Potential opportunity for Mauiramta Pā nameplate (Mah Taio).

Timeframe: 5-7 years
4.21 COURT CRESCENT RESERVE

Note: A Neighbourhood Park providing recreational amenity

- Potential land exchanges to improve visibility by opening up park to the street and developing housing fronting park to the rear.
- Provide a 30x30m flat flexible space suitable for informal activities.
- Potential opportunity for Maunainia Pā narrative (Mahi Toi).

Timetable: 5-7 years

Needs to meet the minimum neighbourhood park size.
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.22 POTENTIAL OPEN SPACE PROVISION

Role: Potential civic space to provide for a variety of social and cultural activities

- Investigate potential sites suitable for a new civic space for Panmure town Centre.
- Potential for civic space to have cultural significance (Maori Tai),
- Potential for cultural art and naming (Maori Tai & Whakapapa).

Timeline: 5-7 years

[Map of Panmure Town Centre with annotations]
4.23 POTENTIAL OPEN SPACE PROVISION

Role: A potential Neighbourhood Park with passive recreation function

- Investigate the potential to provide a new park and enable better provision in areas of need.

Timeline: 7 years

**Attachment A**

Item 16
4.24 HOMESTEAD POCKET PARK

Actions and Priorities

- Revise A Place: Park offering planting and visual amenity

Context:
- Existing reserve
- Existing garden
- Existing pathway
- Existing rail line
- Local board boundary

Proposed:
- Proposed reserve
- Proposed rail line
- Future greenway network
- Future cycle network
- Proposed pathways

Notes:
- No change proposed
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.25 ELSTREE NORTH RESERVE

Reretana: A Neighbourhood Park with play and recreation stormwater functions

- Upgrade existing local playground to provide amenity for all ages.
- Provide a safe connection between Elstree North and Leybourne Circle Reserves.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines within reserve.
- Revegetate stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Integrate path and stream network with Tāmaki Stream Daylighting Project.
- Provide a shared path between Elstree Avenue and Leybourne Circle.
- Include a new bridge stream crossing to improve access.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Teaero & Maua Tu).
- Opportunities for Whakapapa.

Timeframe: 7 years+

EXISTING

- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing stream crossing
- Rail line
- Local board boundary
- Existing public courts

PROPOSED

- Improve entrance visibility
- Ecological planting
- Proposed path
- Proposed safe connection
- Play along the way opportunities
- Play along the way network
- Updated local playground
- Future greenways network
- Future cycle network

\[\text{Attachment A, Item 16}\]
4.26 WEST TĀMAKI RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park with play amenity

- Maintain existing playground.
- Provide new, wider path connections within the reserve.

Target age: 7 years +
4.27 TALBOT PARK

Actions and Priorities

- Redevelop a green corridor in Point England Road between Tāmaki Park and the proposed new park to the south.
- Add and upgrade amenities such as playparks and playgrounds.
- Add new paths and trackways.
- Add new green areas and parks.

Timetable: 7 years
4.28 KOTUKU PARK

Role: A Neighbourhood Park with a recreational function and a buffer from neighbouring industry.

- Maintain existing amenities such as fitness equipment and pathways.
- An opportunity for programming of fitness activities.

Timeline: 7 years.

**EXISTING**
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing pedestrian crossing
- Bike
- Local board boundary
- Existing fitness trail

**PROPOSED**
- Improve entrance visibility
- Proposed path
- Proposed safe connection
- Play along freeways opportunities
- Play along freeway network
- Future greenways network
- Future cycle network

---

**TĀMAKI OPEN SPACE NETWORK PLAN**
4.29 APIRANA CORNER RESERVE

Actions and Priorities:

- New shared path through reserve to connect with future cycle network.

Proposed:
- Improved access and safety
- Project safe connections
- Playway and pathway opportunities
- Flowering native network
- Future cycle network

Existing:
- Playway
- Pathway
- Existing path
- Existing cycleway
- Cycleway

Transform: 7 April
4.30 MAYFAIR PLACE CIVIC SPACE

Role: A small civic space offering seating, visual amenity and space for small events

- Integrate Mayfair Place Civic Space strategy with Future Glen Innes Town Centre Development
- Provide opportunities for play
- Provide opportunities to host small events

Timeframe: 7 years+
4.31 APIRANA RESERVE

Note: A reserve with an ecological and stormwater function as the headwater of the Omuruanui Creek.

- Re-establish with native planting to improve the ecological function of the reserve as an urban forest.
- Re-establish Omuruanui Creek with riparian planting.
- Provide maintenance paths to manage the planting.
- Discontinue horse grazing on the reserve.
- Implement Greenways priority links path network connecting park with existing access points.
- Revitalisation of headwater of Omuruanui Creek and native ecosystem, and strengthening of water ecological links (Teioa & Mauki Tu).
- Opportunities for Whakapapa.

Timeframe: 7 years+
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.32 WAI-O-TAIKI RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park with play and recreational amenity, and ecological and connectivity functions

- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.
- Upgrade existing local playground to provide amenity for all ages.
- Potential to implement ‘Greenways’ path network along the coast to provide greater access and connectivity within the open space network and beyond.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Enhancement of native ecosystem, and strengthening of wider ecological links (Tān-le & Mount Tān-le).

Timeframe: 7 years+
Attachment A

4.33 MARTIN RESERVE

43 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

44 Rule A Pocket Pool grading & visual amenity

- No change recommended.
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.34 HOBSON RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park play and recreational amenity

- Maintain existing amenities such as playground and pathways.

EXISTING
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing pedestrian crossing
- Footpath
- Local board boundary
- Existing real playground

PROPOSED
- Improve accessibility
  - Improved access
  - Improved pathways
  - Proposed safety connections
- Play-along-the-way opportunities
- Play-along-the-way network
- Future greenways network
- Future cycle network
4.35 ELSTREE CORNER RESERVE

Actions and Priorities

Four A Pocket: Park offering seating and visual amenity.

- No change recommended.

Key Plan

- Proposed
- Study area
- Study site
- Project
- Project site
- Existing works
- Existing infrastructure
- Buffer
- Buffer area
- Existing works
- Existing infrastructure
- Future works
- Future infrastructure

Attachment A
In September 2013, the Strategy and Finance Committee approved the acquisition of Cooks Merton Park. In order to meet some of the costs of acquisition, the committee also approved the sale of council owned land at Waiatarua Reserve, Merton Reserve and 54 Morrin Road (SP/2013/103).

In June 2016, the Orakei Local Board supported the East City BMX Club’s preference to remain at Merton Reserve (OA/016/168).
4.37 MORRIN RESERVE

Actions and Priorities

- Refer to reserve with a connectivity function.
- Expand path to connect through length of park to future development zone to the north.
- Manage migration to improve safety at entrance and within reserve.
- Nature play opportunity with large stabilised tree.

Transform: 5 years
4.38 LEYBOURNE CIRCLE RESERVE

Role: A reserve with connectivity and stormwater functions.

- Provide new, wider path connections within the reserve.
- Provide for play-along-the-way to connect to playgrounds at West Tamaki and Thames North Reserves.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Re-establish stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Provide a safe connection between Tamaki and Maybury Reserves.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Takao & Maori Tu).
- Opportunities for Whakapapa.

Timeframe: 7 years+
4.39 PADDINGTON RESERVE

Role: A reserve with connectivity and stormwater functions

- Provide a shared path between Lini Road and Paddington Street.
- Maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve.
- Provide a safe connection between Paddington and Wimbledon Reserves.
- Provide new bridges and stream crossings to improve access.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrances and within reserve.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to revegetate stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystem (Tītāio & Maunu Turu).
- Potential for cultural naming of stream (Whakapapa).

Timeframe: 7 years.

EXISTING
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing streams
- Existing path
- Existing pedestrian crossing
- Mail line
- Local board boundary

PROPOSED
- Improve pathway visibility
- Ecological planting
- Proposed path
- Proposed safe connection
- Stormwater management plan proposals
- Future greenways network
- Future cycle network
4.40 MAUINAINA RESERVE

Role: A reserve providing passive recreation and stormwater function

- Potential land exchanges to open up park and improve visibility to Remuera Road.
- Implement Greenerways priority links path network providing a shared path connection between Dunkirk and Remuera Roads.
- Maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve.
- Provide a safe connection between Maunainain and Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserves.
- Potential opportunity for Maunainain Pā narrative (Mahi Toi).

Timeframe: 7 years+
### 4.41 ALLENBY RESERVE

*Note: A reserve providing passive recreational value.*

- Provide a new pathway connecting between Riverew Road and Allenby Road.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Opportunity to improve amenity by adding new seating for example.

**Timetables:** 7 years

#### EXISTING
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing pedestrian missing

#### PROPOSED
- Improve reserve visibility
- Emergency planning
- Proposed path
- Proposed safe connection
- Future greenways network
- Future cycle network

---

**TÄMÄKI OPEN SPACE NETWORK PLAN**
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.42 MAUINAINA WEST RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park providing play and recreational amenity close to the Panmure Town Centre

- Provide a new local playground to activate the centre of the reserve.
- Employ a community co-design process to plan the layout and facilities offered at the reserve, including the usability of existing and any new facilities.
- Potential land exchanges to increase provision and vehi e entrances which will improve sightlines and access to the street.

Timeframe: 7 years

[Map showing existing and proposed elements of the reserve]
4.43 CLIFTON COURT

Ref: A pocket park providing playground seating

- Continue to provide opportunities for play
- Expand the play provision to provide for more age groups

**EXISTING**
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing playground
- Existing paths
- Existing pedestrian crossings
- Road line

**PROPOSED**
- Ecological planting
- Proposed paths
- Future greenway network
- Future cycle network

KEY PLAN
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.44 DOMAIN RESERVE

Role: A Neighbourhood Park providing play and recreational amenity as part of Panmure Basin circuit

- Maintain existing amenities such as skate park and pathways
- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value

Timetable: 7 years+

EXISTING
- Study area
- Reserve
- Existing stream
- Existing path
- Existing level crossing
- Rail line
- Existing youth play
- Existing sports or leisure centre

PROPOSED
- Existing planting
- Proposed paths
- Future openways network
- Future cycle network

Panmure Basin
4.45 FENCIBLE HISTORIC

Relic A reserve providing visual amenity

- No change proposed.
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.46 SUNSET VIEW RESERVE

Role: A reserve providing visual amenity

- No change proposed.
4.47 POTENTIAL OPEN SPACE PROVISION

Investigate the potential to provide a new park and create better provision in areas of need.

Timetable: 2 years
4.0 ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

4.48 BILL MCKINLAY PARK

Role: A reserve exclusively for sports

- No change proposed.
### ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

**PARK NAME** | **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIONS**
--- | --- | ---
RUAPOTAKA RESERVE | 1-2 years | - Provide a shared path connecting east-west between Glen Innes town centre and Maungakiekie
- Integrate Ruapotaka Reserve including the Glen Innes Library, Ruapotaka Marae, and the Community Hall to improve visibility, activity and functionality.
- Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path between Taniwha Street and Point England Reserve.
- Provide a shared path connecting to Glen Innes town centre.
- Provide a new bridge crossing Omara Creek to improve accessibility.
- Provide new access to public toilets.
- Potential land exchange to replace housing with reserve and provide a connection from Tavon Park to Maungakiekie Reserve.
- Provide a new destination playground to provide for all ages including youth.
- Provide a 30m 30m flat lookout space suitable for informal activities.
- Potential land exchange to remove one block of housing on south side of Taniwha Street to improve visibility and access.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to upgrade Omara Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystems (Takes & Mau Tu) Opportunities for Whaiapapa.

MAYBURY RESERVE - WEST | 1-2 years | - Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path between Taniwha Street and Point England Reserve.
- Provide a shared path connecting to Glen Innes town centre.
- Provide a new bridge crossing Omara Creek to improve accessibility.
- Potential land exchange to replace housing with reserve and provide a connection from Tavon Park to Maungakiekie Reserve.
- Provide a new destination playground to provide for all ages including youth.
- Provide a 30m 30m flat lookout space suitable for informal activities.
- Potential land exchange to remove one block of housing on south side of Taniwha Street to improve visibility and access.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to upgrade Omara Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystems (Takes & Mau Tu) Opportunities for Whaiapapa.

TANIWHA RESERVE | 1-2 years | - Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path between Line Road and Taniwha Street.
- Provide a pedestrian path and bridge from Line-Epping highlighted into reserve and desire line to town centre.
- Provide another pedestrian bridge that allows people to loop around the northern or southern half of the reserve.
- Provide a safe connection between Taniwha and Maungakiekie Reserves.
- Increase road frontage to Epping Street and open up views to Massey.
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to upgrade Omara Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystems (Takes & Mau Tu) Opportunities for Whaiapapa.

EASTVIEW RESERVE | 1-3 years | - Prepare a master plan with the community and mana whenua to identify ways to improve the reserve.
- Provide a new nature play playground associated with proposed Omara Creek enhancements.
- Provide a 30m 30m flat space suitable for informal activities.
- Implement Greenways priority links path network providing a shared path between Alice Avenue and Line Road.
- Maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve.
- Provide a safe connection between Eastview and Taniwha Reserves.
- Revitalisation of stream and native ecosystems (Takes & Mau Tu) Opportunities for Whaiapapa.

COLIN MAIDEN PRECINCT | 1-2 years | - Implement Colin Maiden Precinct Masterplan.
- Opportunities identified in Colin Maiden Precinct Masterplan, such as cultural naming, ecological restoration, commercial parks, heritage trails and cultural narratives (Māori, Whaikapua, Tāmaki, Mau Tu, Mahi Ro, Tohu & Anukatu).
### ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TE TAUOMA (PURCHASED HILL)</strong></td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>- Provide for waiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide interpretative material for examples on geology, Maori heritage and quarry history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for cultural narratives and expression (Mata, Whakapapa, Teal, Maua Toi, Mahi Toi, Tai Tu &amp; Ariki).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVERSIDE RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>- Implement Greenways priority links shared path along coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance TL3 to encourage more diversification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigate opportunities for programming of fitness activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for Whakapapa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUNKIRK RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>- Implement Greenways priority links shared path along coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance TL3 to encourage more diversification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigate opportunities for programming of fitness activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for Whakapapa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MT WELLINGTON WAR MEMORIAL RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>- Implement Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve Concept plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Upgrade existing local playground to a destination playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement Greenways priority links shared path along coast and at Dunkirk Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhancement of coastal ecosystems (Teal, Maua Toi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential opportunities for Manuwha Pl narrative (Mati Toi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for Whakapapa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PANMURE WHARF RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>- Implement Panmure Wharf Reserve Concept plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhancement of coastal ecosystems (Teal, Maua Toi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential opportunities for Manuwha Pl narrative (Mati Toi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for Whakapapa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACTIONS AND PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POINT ENGLAND RESERVE</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>- Upgrade existing playground to a destination playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve quality of remaining sports fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Light remaining sports fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement Greenways' path network and maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve for passive recreation, including around housing development land and adjacent to Omahua Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Work with MBIE and future developer of housing development land to provide direct physical and physical path linkage between Glen Innes Town Centre and the Tāmaki Estuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Integrate Point England Pond improvement project with rejuvenation of Omahua Creek by riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enhance existing coastal planting to strengthen ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cease grading to comply with Point England Development Enabling Act 2017 requirements and implement alternatives to maintain and enhance bird roosting and nesting environments, including provision of dog-free areas and enhanced pest control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rehabilitation of stream and native ecosystem (Taiao &amp; Mauri Tu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYBURY RESERVE - EAST</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>- Implement Greenways priority bike path network providing a shared path connecting east-west between Takanu Street and Point England Reserve and other path connections to Rosera Crescent and Maybury Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential land exchange to improve connection to RI England Reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Remove dociled buildings with potential land exchange to open up park connection to community buildings on Maybury Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a safe connection across Takanu Avenue, between Maybury and Point England Reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide new bridges crossing Omahua Creek to improve access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential land exchange to remove housing along Rosera Crescent at northern edge of reserve to increase street utility and access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential land exchange along northern edge of reserve to provide development limiting onto park and increase surveillance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to rejuvenate Omahua Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rehabilitation of stream and native ecosystem (Taiao &amp; Mauri Tu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunities for Whaiaapa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIMBLEDON NORTH RESERVE</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>- Potential land exchanges to reorganise reserve and adjacent housing to create two parks with better connections and visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIMBLEDON SOUTH RESERVE</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a shared path between Fielding Street and Station Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintain and improve other path connections within the reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a new bridge over stream to improve access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rejuvenate stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a new local dogpark adjacent to Wimbledon Crescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a 20×20m flat flexible space suitable for informal activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide new basketball or volley ball court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rehabilitation of stream and native ecosystem (Taiao &amp; Mauri Tu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potential for cultural naming of stream and reserve (Whaiaapa).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Actions and Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposed New Park  | 3-5 years | - Integrate planning with Roseneath and Maybury Reserves.  
- Provide a safe connection at Maybury Street between Maybury Reserve and the proposed new reserve to the south.  
- Provide play-scape-way to connect to Maybury Reserve and Taitokerau Park playarea.  
- Work with Stormwater Management Plan proposals to revegetate Omame Creek with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.  
- Reinstatement of stream and native ecosystem (Tane & Māori Tu).  
- Potential opportunities for naming of stream (Whakapakaka). |
| Taurima Reserve    | 5-7 years | - Upgrade playground to enable play equipment and provide for all ages.  
- Potential land exchanges on eastern and southern edges of reserve to provide housing and street frontage improving passive surveillance.  
- Maintain existing pathway. |
| Torino Reserve     | 5-7 years | - New path connection from Tripoli Road to Boundary Reserve.  
- Provide play-scape-way to connect to new play area in Boundary Reserve.  
- Potential land exchange to allow fundamental changes in adjacent strategic open space corridor, and also provide surveillance for prepared path connection.  
- Open space function transferred to Boundary Reserve. |
| Boundary Reserve   | 5-7 years | - Provide a new local playground at western end of the reserve.  
- Recountour north-facing slopes to provide a 150m flexible space suitable for informal activities.  
- Potential land exchange to transfer former Maumau Site Subsite land into development.  
- Potential land exchanges to widen entrance which will improve sightlines and access to the street.  
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines at entrance and within reserve.  
- Implement Greenspace priority links path network providing a shared path east-west through the reserve in addition to its connections to Tontis Street, Glen Road and Sandle Road.  
- Provide a new bridge over stream exiting to improve access.  
- Provide a safe connection at Tripoli Road to connect the west and north sections of Boundary Reserves.  
- Overlight existing unserved stream and vegetate with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.  
- Reinstatement of stream and native ecosystem (Tane & Māori Tu).  
- Potential opportunities for naming of stream (Whakapakaka).  
- Potential opportunity for Maumaua Pā narrative. |
| Johnson Reserve    | 5-7 years | - Provide a new local playground with visibility to Tripoli Road.  
- Implement Greenspace priority links path network providing a shared path connection between Tripoli and Quinckes Roads in addition to other path connections within the reserve.  
- Provide a safe connection between diamond and Maungakiekie War Memorial Reserves.  
- Provide new bridge stream crossings to improve access.  
- Potential land exchange to widen entrance and provide a usable space and visibility to the street.  
- Manage vegetation to improve sightlines within reserve.  
- Revegetate stream with riparian planting to improve ecological function and resilience against flood events.  
- Reinstatement of stream and native ecosystem (Tane & Māori Tu).  
- Potential opportunities for naming of stream (Whakapakaka).  
- Potential opportunity for Maumaua Pā narrative (Maumaua). |
| Court Crescent Reserve | 5-7 years | - Potential land exchange to improve visibility by opening up path to the street and developing housing fronting path to the rear.  
- Provide a 300m flexible space suitable for informal activities.  
- Potential opportunity for Maumaua Pā narrative (Maumaua). |
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## 5.1 COMMUNITY LEASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEASEHOLDER</th>
<th>PROPERTY NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Mt Wellington Football Club Inc.</td>
<td>Bill McKenzie Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Mt Wellington Awanui Football Club Inc.</td>
<td>Bill McKenzie Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scout Association of NZ - Waiwera Scout</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes Youthtown (Youthtown Police and Citizens Club Inc.)</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland University Cricket Club</td>
<td>Colin Maiden Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland University Rugby Football Club</td>
<td>Colin Maiden Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Netball</td>
<td>Colin Maiden Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opunohu Football</td>
<td>Colin Maiden Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penruun Square Racquets Club Inc.</td>
<td>Domain Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Model Aircraft Club Inc.</td>
<td>Edward North Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Model Aeronautic Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Edward North Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Wellington Bowling Club</td>
<td>Johnson Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Army Cadets</td>
<td>Mangere West Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes Adult Literary Centre Inc.</td>
<td>Maybury Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kā Mau Te Wera Chevalier Trust</td>
<td>Maybury Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East City BMX</td>
<td>Motaro Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Brothers Old Boys Rugby Club Incorporated</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Wellington Tennis Club Inc.</td>
<td>Mt Wellington War Memorial Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmure Yachting and Boating Club Inc. (Lease)</td>
<td>Panmure Wharf Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Georges Rowing Club Inc</td>
<td>Panmure Wharf Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmure Yachting and Boating Club Inc. (Licence)</td>
<td>Panmure Wharf Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmure Yachting and Boating Club Inc</td>
<td>Panmure Wharf Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Innes Family Centre</td>
<td>Petone England Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureau - Glen Innes</td>
<td>Rangotapu Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Navy Zealand Flotilla Society/Auckland City Area Inc.</td>
<td>Rangotapu Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangotapu Marine Society Inc.</td>
<td>Rangotapu Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 LAND STATUS

Eastview Reserve

Land Status
Eastview Reserve is comprised in two lots:
(a) Lot 378 Deposited Plan 43032 (4,580 ha) is comprised in NA12299346 and NA12299345 which is held for recreation reserve and
(b) Lot 22 Deposited Plan 91028 (1,054 ha) is comprised in NA16791458 which is held for recreation reserve.

History
(a) Lot 378 Deposited Plan 43032 was previously comprised in Gazette Notice 18743 which was recorded by NA1759232. The land was:
- Originally held by Her Majesty the Queen for State Housing purposes under the Housing Act 1892.
- The Crown undertook a subdivision of this land as shown on Deposited Plan 43032.
- On 20 August 1893 Gazette Notice 18743 was recorded as Lot 378 Deposited Plan 43032 pursuant to section 82 of the Housing Act 1892 to the Crown Land subject to the Land Act 1893.
(b) Lot 22 Deposited Plan 91028 was previously comprised in Gazette Notice 904193 and NA1759232. The land was:
- Originally held by Her Majesty the Queen for State Housing purposes under the Housing Act 1892.
- The Crown undertook a subdivision of this land as shown on Deposited Plan 43032.
- On 12 August 1965 Gazette Notice 904193 was recorded as Lot 22 Deposited Plan 91028 as recreation reserve and recorded it in trust for the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland under the Auckland (City) Act 1965.

Our Comments
As this parcel of land was vested in Council as part of the Crown's state housing subdivision, Council's ownership is deemed not to have derived from the Crown because of the provisions contained in section 29(3) of the Reserves Act 1977.

Tamawhine Reserve

Land Status
There is no current title for Lot 14 Deposited Plan 43036 (1,487 ha) as it held in Gazette Notice 18031 for recreation reserve.

History
Lot 14 Deposited Plan 43036 was previously comprised in NA15692141 which was recorded by NA1006495. The land was:
- Originally held by Her Majesty the Queen for State Housing purposes under the Housing Act 1892.
- The Crown undertook a sub-division of this land as shown on Deposited Plan 43036.
- On 10 May 1915 Gazette Notice 14962 was registered which declared Lot 14 Deposited Plan 43036 to be Crown Land.

- On 12 August 1965 Gazette Notice 904193 was recorded as Lot 14 Deposited Plan 43036 as recreation reserve pursuant to the Housing Act 1892 to the Crown Land subject to the Land Act 1893.
- Certificate of Title 15692141 was issued for Lot 14 Deposited Plan 43036 on 13 November 1965 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes notice 15692141 was recorded on 11 July 1965 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 904193, page 135).

Our Comments
As this parcel of land was vested in Council as part of the Crown's state housing subdivision, Council's ownership is deemed not to have derived from the Crown because of the provisions contained in section 29(3) of the Reserves Act 1977.

Maungakiekie - West

Land Status
Lot 10 Deposited Plan 43083 (2,060.5 ha) is comprised in NA16810065 and is held as recreation reserve.

History
Lot 10 Deposited Plan 43083 was previously comprised in Gazette Notice 17084 and NA1585831. The land was:
- Originally held by Her Majesty the Queen for State Housing purposes under the Housing Act 1892.
- The Crown undertook a sub-division of this land as shown on Deposited Plan 43083.
- On 6 September 1893 Gazette Notice 17084 was registered which declared Lot 10 Deposited Plan 43083 to be Crown Land pursuant to section 63 of the Public Works Act 1901 for the purposes of the Land Act 1901 and Gazettes Notice 17084 was recorded on 5 September 1893 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 17084 was recorded on 8 September 1893 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 17084, page 125).

Our Comments
As this parcel of land was vested in Council as part of the Crown's state housing subdivision, Council's ownership is deemed not to have derived from the Crown because of the provisions contained in section 29(3) of the Reserves Act 1977.

Maungakiekie - East

Land Status
Part Lot 84 Deposited Plan 43055 (4,959 ha) is comprised in NA1080635 and is held as a reserve.

History
Part Lot 94 Deposited Plan 44295 was previously comprised in Gazette Notice 1691993 and NA1126399. The land was:
- Originally held by Her Majesty the Queen for State Housing purposes under the Housing Act 1892.
- The Crown undertook a sub-division of this land as shown on Deposited Plan 44295.
- On 16 June 1992 Gazette Notice 9999 was registered which declared Part Lot 94 Deposited Plan 44295 to be Crown Land pursuant to section 64 of the Public Works Act 1901 for the purposes of the Land Act 1901 and Gazette Notice 9999 was recorded on 13 June 1992 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 17 May 1992 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 9999, page 69).
- On 8 June 1992 Gazette Notice 9999 was registered which declared Part Lot 94 Deposited Plan 44295 as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 17 May 1992 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 8 June 1992 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 9999, page 69).
- On 17 December 1994 part Lot 94 Deposited Plan 44238 was transferred to the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 17 December 1994 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 17 December 1994 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 9999, page 69).
- On 13 November 1995 A198396 was registered as Lot 94 Deposited Plan 44295 on 13 November 1995 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 13 November 1995 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 13 November 1995 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 9999, page 69).

Our Comments
As no parcel of land was vested in Council as part of the Crown's state housing subdivision, Council’s ownership is deemed not to have derived from the Crown because of the provisions contained in section 29(3) of the Reserves Act 1977.

PI Bingin Reserve

Land Status
The reserve is currently comprised in three lots:
(a) 04002743.22 Survey Office Plan 05473 (2,460.18 hectares) as held as a recreation reserve.
(b) Lot 20 Deposited Plan 41242 (2,154 ha) as set out in Deposited Plan 41242 is comprised in NA11003124 and is held as a recreation reserve.
(c) Lot 100 Deposited Plan 41242 is comprised in NA11003124 and is held as a recreation reserve.

History
Lot 100 Deposited Plan 41242 was previously comprised in Gazette Notice 1680493 which was recorded on 9 October 1956 in the name of the Mayor and Citizens of Auckland as a recreation reserve for the purposes of the Land Act 1901 and NA11003124 was registered on 9 October 1956 in the name of the Mayor and Citizens of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and NA11003124 was recorded on 9 October 1956 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 1680493, page 159).
- On 13 November 1995 A198396 was registered as Lot 94 Deposited Plan 44295 on 13 November 1995 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 13 November 1995 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves and Domain Act 1945 and Gazettes Notice 9999 was recorded on 13 November 1995 amplifying the notice of the reasons for the recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977 (11 Gazette Notice 9999, page 69).

Our Comments
As no parcel of land was vested in Council as part of the Crown's state housing subdivision, Council’s ownership is deemed not to have derived from the Crown because of the provisions contained in section 29(3) of the Reserves Act 1977.
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41/26 and 23.3 Deposited Plan 41/24 to be Crown Land subject to the Land Act 1946 (NZ Gazette, 1946, page 1546).

- On 16 November 1992 Gazette Notice 17182 was registered pursuant to the Land Act 1946 which lies upon Lot 26 (Deposited Plan 41/26) and Lot 23.3 Deposited Plan 41/24, developing the concept of Crown Land subject to the Land Act 1946 in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area.

- On 13 July 1992 Gazette Notice 23064 was registered purporting to vest in the owner leasable interest in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Land Act 1946.

- Certificate of Dev 24920/20 was issued on 28 July 1996 for Lot 2/46 Deposited Plan 41/22 and Lot 23.5 Deposited Plan 41/24 in the name of the Mayor, Councillors and Citizens of the City of Auckland pursuant to the Reserves and Commons Act 1977.
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Vei-aloaki Nature Reserve
Lot 246 DP 14/1610 comprising 5.2732 hectares contained in NA5629/16. Held by the Crown through DOC as an unclassified recreation reserve and vested in the Auckland Council in trust, for recreation purposes. Lot 246 was vested in the council's recreation as part of the Crown's reserve contained in Section 25 of the Reserves Act.

Fencible Historic
Allotments 77 and 78 Section 3 Village of Penmarch comprising 1.97 and 0.5 square miles respectively and both contained in NA2636/55. Both held in freehold by the Auckland Council as a classified historic reserve.

Bill McKeeney Park
Allotment 55 and Part Allotment 56 Section 1 Small Lake, Nukuere Reserve comprising 1.9335 hectares and comprised in NA5604/1. Originally set apart by the Government to the Waitemata Wellington Public Domain Board and Thérèse Martyn Exchange of Land Act 1998, as a public reserve for recreation purposes and by hero part of the Waitemata Wellington Public Domain and recorded to All New Zealand Gazette. 1997, No. 20, page 1954. Currently held by the Crown through the Department of Conservation (DOC) as a classified recreation reserve and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreation purposes.

Apirana Reserve
Lot 413 Deposited Plan 66447 (7.9344ha) is comprised in NA7464/98 and is held for reserve for plantation purposes.

History
Lot 413 Deposited Plan 66447 was previously recorded in NA1800/50. The land was:
- Originally held by Her Majesty the Queen for State Housing purposes under the Housing Act 1957 as part of a larger block of 1,050 hectares (2,600 acres) held in AD01/18.
- The Crown undertook a subdivision of this land as shown on Deposited Plan 66447.
- On 23 May 1981 Gazette Notice 1322 was registered pursuant to section 38 of the Public Works (No. 2) 1981, which declared an 11.025 hectare area (66447) Morland Land subject to the Reserves Act 1967.
- On 10 October 1981 Gazette Notice 1074 was registered which vested the land in the Mayor, Councilors and Citizens of the City of Auckland in trust as reserve for plantation purposes (120 Gazette. 1991, page 106).
- Compulsory purchase notices were issued and NA7464/98 was issued to the land on 29 September 1990, and:
- On 8 February 1991 923 Notice H4/91 was registered pursuant to the Reserves Act 1967 in respect of the vesting of part of a 6.35 hectare area to the Auckland City Council, and vested in the name of the Crown in trust as a reserve for plantation purposes (122 Gazette. 1993, page 457).

Our Comments
As this parcel of land was vested in Council as part of the Crown's state housing subdivision, Council's ownership is deemed to have been derived from the Crown because of the provisions contained in Section 25(5) of the Reserves Act 1967.

Martin Reserve
Lot 197 DP 33323 comprising 2.232 square metres and contained in NA5655/18. Held by the Crown through DOC as an unclassified recreation reserve and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreation purposes. Lot 197 was vested in the council's recreation as part of the Crown's reserve contained in Section 25 of the Reserves Act.

Eiselle Corner Reserve
Sits on 105 and 109 Ellerslie Avenue and the corner of Ellerslie Avenue and P� Ellerslie Road, Lot 7 and 8 DP 409140 comprising 0.322 and 0.950 square metres and both contained in NA6777/7777/7777 (Cancelled). Held by the Crown through DOC as an unclassified recreation reserve and vested in the Auckland Council, in trust, for recreation purposes. Both were vested in the council's recreation as part of the Crown's reserve contained in Section 25 of the Reserves Act.
## 5.3 LIST OF PARKS WITH RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street address</th>
<th>Reserve management plan</th>
<th>Reserve Act status</th>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aparima Corner</td>
<td>Aparima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aparima Reserve</td>
<td>Aparima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill McKinley Park</td>
<td>Ireland Rd, Penmore</td>
<td>Bill McKinley Park 1952</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Reserve</td>
<td>Tippett Rd/Donkin Rd</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve, Court Crescent Reserve, Johnson Reserve, Martin Reserve, Maungakiekie Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Court</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma Redoubt Park</td>
<td>Matamata Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Crescent Reserve</td>
<td>Court Crescent</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve, Court Crescent Reserve, Johnson Reserve, Martin Reserve, Maungakiekie Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Reserve</td>
<td>Legion Drive</td>
<td>Domain Road Reserve Management Plan 1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin Reserve</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Park Recreation Reserve and Dunedin Road Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskdale Reserve</td>
<td>Eskdale Road/Lane Rd/Aparima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellice Crescent Reserve</td>
<td>Pt England Rd/Ellice Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District North Reserve</td>
<td>District Avenue/Pont England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmoe Reserve</td>
<td>Holmoe Drive/Court Cross</td>
<td>Holmoe Drive Reserve Management Plan 1955</td>
<td>Local Purpose community buildings</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Reserve</td>
<td>Dunedin Road</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve, Court Crescent Reserve, Johnson Reserve, Martin Reserve, Maungakiekie Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketil Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttelton Circle Reserve</td>
<td>Lyttelton Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary Reserve, Court Crescent Reserve, Johnson Reserve, Martin Reserve, Maungakiekie Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie West</td>
<td>Kai Road</td>
<td>Boundary Reserve, Court Crescent Reserve, Johnson Reserve, Martin Reserve, Maungakiekie Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybury Reserve</td>
<td>Ellice/Maybury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfair Place</td>
<td>Mayfair Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Roskill</td>
<td>Mount Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Reserve</td>
<td>Riverside Rd</td>
<td>Mount Wellington War Memorial Park Recreation Reserve and Dunedin Road Reserve Management Plan 1982</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngaivai Reserve</td>
<td>Ngaivai Reserve</td>
<td>Ngaivai Reserve 1936</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapara Reserve</td>
<td>Parapara Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnies Reserve</td>
<td>Kupa Rd</td>
<td>Parnies Reserve 1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point England Reserve</td>
<td>Bideford/Pont England Rd</td>
<td>Point England Reserve 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruaumoko/Maybury Gdns</td>
<td>Lime Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahaili Park</td>
<td>Tahaili Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taumutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawhiti Reserve</td>
<td>Tawhiti Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Street address</th>
<th>Reserve management plan</th>
<th>Reserves Act Status</th>
<th>Local Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titirangi Reserve</td>
<td>Titirangi Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakaruru Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Kamo Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tāmaki</td>
<td>Lyciumune Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiwai Valley Reserve</td>
<td>Paddington Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 16

Attachment A
Draft Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan

CONSULTATION FEEDBACK OVERVIEW FINAL REPORT

TOTAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED: 461

Plan Overview

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board want to hear your thoughts on the Draft Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan.

A sustainable quality open space network for the Tāmaki area means that future development and anticipated growth in the area will be well catered for, ensuring that the community has access to a range of recreational, social, cultural and environmental experiences.

The information in this report summarises feedback received from Tuesday 11 September 2018 to Monday 22 October 2018.

Executive Summary

- 36% of submitters enjoyed the green spaces and nature the most in parks across Tāmaki, whereas 28% of submitters thought that the facilities were the worst part of the parks due to lack of maintenance.
- 24% made it clear that by regularly maintaining and updating these facilities it would improve activities that take place in the parks.
- 338 submitters stated that by having maintained and monitored toilets in the parks that it would improve safety.
- 163 submitters stated that by implementing cycleways and improved pathways across the parks that it could encourage them to walk or cycle more.
- 297 submitters would like to see inclusive playgrounds for all ages and abilities in their local parks.
- Aveline Place and Maybury reserve had the highest amount of support for land exchanges with 81%.

Note - Te Huruhu Trust/Grace International made a submission and they stated that it included 300 members, no unique signatures were provided with this submission though.

Feedback Breakdown

Most submissions were received via hard copy feedback forms (82%), with (17%) coming from online forms and the rest coming from e-mail non-forms (1%). The Majority of submissions were from individuals (95%) but 21 submissions (5%) were from organisations.

We also received 341 comments from events held around Auckland. (These can be seen at the end of the report and the number of comments received per question is labelled ‘Other Feedback’ throughout the report).

Analysed by Auckland Insights, Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit
WHO WE HEARD FROM

The table below indicates the total number of submissions received by the local board that submitters live in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL BOARD AREA</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Otahuhu</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okei</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not supplied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables below indicate the demographic information people identified with when provided, i.e. the graphs only include a breakdown of those that provided demographic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total submitters providing data: 445 (100%)

* Includes gender diverse and not provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/Latin American/African</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander/Kiwi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total submitters providing data: 435 (NA)
CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

Q1. Please tell us what you like most about the existing parks in Tāmaki?

Submitters were asked what they liked most about the parks in Tāmaki.
(n=305 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature &amp; green spaces</th>
<th>38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational uses</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The main theme coming out of ‘Other’ was open space.

43% of comments stated easy access to open/green spaces was what they liked the most about the parks

OTHER FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 comments liked that the plant species are native and suitable for controlling run off in parks

Analysed by Auckland Insights, Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit
Q2. Please tell us what you don’t like most about the existing parks in Tāmaki?

Submitters were asked what they don’t like most about the parks in Tāmaki.
(n= 208 respondents)

* The main theme coming out of ‘Other’ was safety and security.

30% of comments stated having unclean and broken facilities is what they disliked the most about the parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 comments disliked the parking around the parks

Analysed by Auckland Insights, Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit
Q3. How could we improve activities that take place in parks in the Tāmaki area?

Submitters were asked how we could improve activities that take place in the parks.
(n= 369 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better facilities</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better accessibility</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More or improved playgrounds</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better path or cycleways</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Culture &amp; heritage</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More or improved sports fields</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The main theme coming out of "Other" was safety and security.

17% of comments stated that improved safety measures would improve activities that take place in parks.

OTHER FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 comment thought increasing areas of useable open spaces by installing BBQ’s etc would improve activities in the parks.
Q4. How do you think parks in Tāmaki could be made safer?

Submitters were asked how we could make parks safer.

(n= 338 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFETY INITIATIVES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean, secure, easily accessible toilet facilities that are maintained and monitored</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good lighting so that people can see and be seen</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance cameras for security</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General visibility of the entire space</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More houses overlooking the park</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The main theme coming out of ‘Other’ was better fences.

OTHER FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysed by Auckland Insights, Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit
Q5. What might make you consider walking or cycling to your local parks more often?

Submitters were asked what would make them consider walking or cycling to the local parks.
(n=163 respondents)

163 submitters think easier access to walking/cycle ways would make them consider walking or cycling to local parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WALKING OR CYCLING INITIATIVES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easier access to walking/cycle ways</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better lighting for safety and security</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to local businesses on the way</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths that connect destinations together</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenery and trees on the way</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The main theme coming out of ‘Other’ was improved safety.

OTHER FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 comments agreed that better accessibility to cycleways and pathways is the right way to go.
Q6. What do you want to see in the new playgrounds that are proposed as part of the Tāmaki Open Space Network Plan?

Submitter were asked what they wanted to see in new playgrounds.
(n=297 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Playground Initiatives</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive playgrounds for everyone</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade and shelter</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to toilets and drinking fountains</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds that create greater connections with nature</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting so I can use the parks in the evenings</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable seating for guardians and parents</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds that are designed for different types of play</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds that are well designed and unique</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More colours and textures</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The main theme coming out of ‘Other’ was safety and security.

Analysed by Auckland Insights, Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit
Q7a. On reviewing the draft plan and map, how do you feel about the proposed land exchanges shown in the plan for the following reserves?
Submitter were asked how they felt about the proposed land exchanges.
(n=200 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aveline Place</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybury reserve</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapotaki reserve</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Crescent reserve</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside reserve</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauninainia reserve</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantiwha reserve</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon reserve</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauninainia West reserve</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurima Reserve</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson reserve</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torino reserve</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary reserve</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 comments stated that Boundary reserve needed green spaces whilst there is heavily dense development happening in surrounding areas.
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**Q7b. If you are not satisfied with the proposed land exchanges near you, please identify the parks names and explain why you are concerned?**

Submitters were asked why they were not satisfied with the proposed land exchanges. (n=77 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESERVE</th>
<th>MAIN THEME(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aveline Place</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary reserve</td>
<td>Flood risk and concerns for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Crescent reserve</td>
<td>Loss of land and loss of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson reserve</td>
<td>Safety concerns for new reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunainia reserve</td>
<td>Loss of space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maumainia West reserve</td>
<td>Land will be too narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybury reserve</td>
<td>No benefit to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside reserve</td>
<td>Loss of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapotaka reserve</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniwha reserve</td>
<td>Location issues and too many bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurima reserve</td>
<td>Reduced park sizes and concerns for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torino reserve</td>
<td>Loss of a park and concerns for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon reserve</td>
<td>Loss of land and connectivity to wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (non reserve specific)</td>
<td>Grow green open spaces for future not shrink them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137 comments stated they did not wish to lose parks/open spaces during the land exchanges and if anything needed more open spaces
Q8. Are there any more comments you would like to share with us about this draft plan?

Submitter were asked why for any other comments about the draft plan. (n=98 respondents)

The majority of submitter comments were aimed towards creating more and developing existing green and open spaces. The reasons vary from wanting more open space for kids to play and to improve the community’s health and the need for them with the rise in population.

OTHER FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNEL</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 comments stated that the consultation period was not long enough and should have been extended further in order to read all the available information.
## APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION NUMBER</th>
<th>NAME OF ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>South Auckland Income Planning Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Island child charitable trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Waiokairi Bay Rangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tamaki Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Cornwall Cricket Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>S.P.A Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Tamaki Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Te Huruhi Trust/Grace International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Grace International Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Remuera Samoan SDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Remuera Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Tamaki Estuary Environment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Panmure Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Tamaki Residents Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Waitakere Outrigger association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Carey College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Auckland Football Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Panmure Community Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>H.Y.P.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Panmure Chinese Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Glen Innes Chinese Friendship Group Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Rock of Ages A06 Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Feedback Comments</td>
<td>No. Of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant type species that are native/suitable for controlling run off</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking - allow 4 per house as children grow up and we need parking for children and</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking - within units instead of using reserve land</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once we found out about the land exchanges real estate agents approached us about</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selling our properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities - not inviting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax plants in reserves - need to be removed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve open space quality - increase areas of useable open space e.g. install BBQs in</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks/open spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycleways/pathways - better accessibility is a step in the right direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Reserve - need green areas while there is such heavy dense developments</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happening in PT England; the aesthetics of the building will not fit with the unitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan scope of the surrounding area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkirk and Riverside reserves - need more parking for sports games</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about diminishing of open spaces - large tracts of land with no open space;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we should be aiming for an INCREASE in open spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't touch our parks!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No loss of land in Panmure</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Reserve - blocking out sunlight if build up apartments, look and feel will look</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of place in comparison to rest of Point England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Reserve - we are a young family who moved to the area to enjoy the green</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas and open spaces. Our little ones play there - PLEASE DON'T take it away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain reserves</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density - need more open space to counter corporate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Reserve - don't swap this land - facility</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't exchange land in GT for Panmure</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Crescent - cricket, no party in the exchange, needs maintenance - do not exchange</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to develop Torino and Court Crescent reserves not give it away</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmure cannot afford to lose any land in this area</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage reserves are necessary - planned, cannot afford to lose these to buildings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve connectivity - build a facility or centre that caters for multicultural groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Burmese, Pacific, etc) to enable them to fully participate, celebrate and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to the community. Network of communities learning about NZ life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC - after good solid land</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public notices for consultation - too short - not enough to let community know</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No canvassing has been done</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to be exchanged is prime real estate land - commercial gain for TRC</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please extend the closing date - we have not had sufficient time to process and digest</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this change - thank you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments create crime/look untidy/scruffy over time - do we need them?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments ruins the atmosphere of an area - make housing 2 storey only!</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If houses are built on reserves make sure there's still enough green spaces and if</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible only 2 storeys/not block existing houses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking - build parking within the units so that frees up land that would otherwise be</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used for parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend cut off date by 2 weeks</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai-o-tahi Reserve - why is it not a priority? This area is rich in birdlife (50 species of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bird in the area); wardens/volunteers look after it for council and want to see this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification will put a lot of pressure on facilities - need more open spaces to</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cater for predicted growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will PT England stay as it is or will we lose it? If it stays what will you do about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there plans to include seating and shaded areas in parks?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Feedback Comments</td>
<td>No. Of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the re-design of parks are there plans to include things that reflect multicultural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities in Tamaki?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the local board have a conservation plan for birds in Tohunga Torea Reserve and</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmure Basin?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What land was gifted by citizens to council?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are real estate agents door knocking our property to purchase for development?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: Tuesday, 9 April 2019
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 20 Feb 2019 09:04
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area who receive the service
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Investing in waste and sewage is critical. Religious organisations should be charged rates, they do well enough from central Govt tax breaks.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Better water for swimming inf More money for weeds and biodiversity.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
They say good stuff but there is not enough action.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
**Annual Budget feedback**

**Submitter details**

**Date received:** 20 Feb 2019 09:13  
**Attachment:**

---

**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

   We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

   These charges include:
   
   - a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
   - extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
   - phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
   - adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
   - not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
   - an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

   **Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:**
As a home owner I already find the rates we pay a struggle and believe religious organisations should also pay rates and not be exempt. Having been through the resource consent process I feel that unless the process is streamlined and made more efficient any further costs are unethical.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $730 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion about this proposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 20 Feb 2019 09:17
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
It's not necessary to remove rates for religious organisations, most already make large profits, and resource concepts and associated fees are already high.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Standardising rates so they reflect the property and are fair is the best solution.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
Focus should also include development of the mangrove areas and land around orakei and meadow bank that is unused.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Makes logical sense

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
for the most part they are unavoidable but in this modern day and age there is no reason to
exempt religious organisations from paying rates

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
none

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about
$700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership
of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The
resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with
other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
the council have no history is making things of this nature actually work in our (ratepayers) benefit
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 20 Feb 2019 09:21
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
No more increases. Why should religious land not be charged rates, they use all the services just like all Aucklanders

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.07 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Bad bad and more bad. Just another installment of the ever rising rates demands. Because of course the ratepayer has a bottomless pocket. What about doing what real people have to do, which is to make expenditure fit income. Cut back on the overpaid consultants, feather bedded staff numbers, junkets and slush funds; then there will be no need for rates rises.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Yes. Rein in the us governed, unaccountable irresponsible CCOs. And stop with the constant virtue signalling and leftist social engineering.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
They do the best they can. But local boards are just window dressing: no funds no power they are just there to make us despicable state foolishly imagine we have a voice in anything

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?
Do not support
Panuku is evil personified, but this proposal is just a set up for selling the assets. To provide a nice big slush fund. Abolish Panuku altogether. Why do we need to pay another lot of bureaucrats.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
There should be no waiver for rates for religious groups

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Why is the council meddling with things such as perceived "inequality" this should not be the concern of local government as it is the responsibility of central government, please stay out of social engineering projects

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period
  (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Mental Health urbanisation and creating a happy city (see attachment- can be applied to lower density areas as well). Parks, recreation and community facilities should increase.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Good to minimise duplication and reduce powers at be to one entity so easier to get permissions etc. Have you looked at past masters of urban design 720 coursework (university of auckland) for the port area?
Mental Health & High Density Environments;

*Creating a “Happy City” in the heart of Auckland’s CBD*

School of Architecture and Planning, University of Auckland.
Abstract

This research paper looks at Mental Health & High Density Environments, and proposes Urban Design conditions to create a “Happy City” in Auckland’s Mayoral Drive.

Mental health is a concern in modern day life with growing demand for mental health care, and the way in which our cities have been fabricated often plays a role our mental health capabilities. This research looks at both the positive and negative ways that high density environments play on mental health, as well as the role of tertiary education. Before proposing simple and efficient ways of producing positive mental health effects from high density urban areas, these include the introduction surrounding greenness, and activating street frontages in our metropolitan areas.

Key Words

Mental Health, Happy City, High Density Environments, Surrounding Greenness, Active Transportation; Tertiary Education
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Introduction

This research paper looks at Mental Health & High Density Environments, and proposes Urban Design conditions to create a "Happy City" in Mayoral Drive.

Mental Health is one’s psychological well-being and satisfactory adjustment to society and to the ordinary demands of life (Random House, Inc., 2017). Mental illnesses are a contributor to poor mental health and include disorders such as stress, loneliness, depression, schizophrenia, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, grief, addiction, and suicidal thoughts among many more (Mental Health Foundation, 2017).

High Density Environments are when there is a high concentration of people in a space, either living there or visiting. These usually occur in City centres and metropolitan areas (Random House, Inc., 2017). There is much discrepancy about the number of people High Density includes, and so various points of research in this paper may be referring to a different concentration of people per hectare.

A Happy City is a term coined by Charles Montgomery, and has come to mean the manner in which we build our cities alters the way we feel, think, and behave as individuals and as a society, but is ultimately about empowering communities. Montgomery himself states that our city streets, hearts, and mobility systems are emotional infrastructure that can make or break the health or happiness of our citizens (Montgomery, 2013).
Figure One: 600 pairs of shoes each representing a New Zealander lost to suicide last year (Guardian, 2017).

Mental Health issues are the third-leading cause of health loss for New Zealanders, and impacts more than one in six New Zealand adults at some time in their lives (Mental Health Foundation, 2014). Many researchers believe that high density environments are propagators for mental health, however more extensive research needs to be undertaken. Unfortunately a stigma still exists around mental health, and so often it is not discussed and can go undiagnosed, further hindering the mentally ill (Mental Health Foundation, 2014). Our urban centres should aim to avoid, remedy and mitigate the negative effects high density environments have on mental health. This will help to better ourselves, our communities, and put less of a strain on health services in the long term.

The overarching research question is to find out what factors in high density environments contribute positively and negatively toward mental health?

To help answer this question research will also be undertaken to address the role green space and streets have on mental health, the role tertiary education has in contributing to mental health issues, before finally addressing the urban design conditions that help to face mental health problems in high density environments which can be implemented anywhere. To help facilitate this an urban design proposal highlighting how some of these urban design conditions can be implemented in Mayoral Drive.
Methodology

This research paper looks at Mental Health & High Density Environments, and proposes Urban Design conditions to create a “Happy City” in Mayoral Drive.

This research undertaken was primarily desk based, but also included site visits to the chosen case study of Mayoral Drive.

Mayoral Drive was chosen as a case study as although it is a low density living environment, it attracts a high number of visitors daily. It also has the potential and capability of providing a much higher density living environment, and so this can be moulded to urban design conditions that facilitate positive mental health.

Procurement of data was primarily web based, utilising Google and the University of Auckland library database. Additional information was also gained from a number of urban design books at my disposal. Searches undertaken included terms such as and combinations of: Mental Health, High Density Environments, Metropolitan, Urban Design, Mental Illness, Mental Well-being, Built Form, Density, Urban, Green Spaces, Streets, Happiness, Community, Safety, Positive, Negative, Depression, Anxiety, Stress, Urban Design Conditions, and Cities.

Impact of Built Form and High Density Environments on Mental Health

The World Bank and the World Health organisation estimate that mental health disorders currently constitute approximately 10% of the global burden of disease, their projections suggest that this will rise to 15% by 2020, and depression alone will be one of the largest health problems worldwide (Regional Public Health, 2010).

A contributing factor for mental health issues are high density environments,

Residents of denser places are more likely to report feeling lonely, sad, less likely to be happy and score higher on the CES-D depression index than residents of metropolitan places with lower population densities. Across all places within metropolitan areas, population density corresponds to greater emotional distress (Oliver, n.d.: 12)
Analysing the relationship between mental health and density is a difficult proposition with many contradictions, largely due to the taboo that has surrounded mental health in the past and still holds a grip on society today, and so there are some significant gaps in the knowledge. Such as researchers advocating that higher density increases poor mental health, whilst some others disagree with that sentiment.

This has proven to make the analysis of the relationship between density and mental health difficult, as the determinants of mental well-being are numerous and their linkages to environments are not always easily identifiable (Centre for Primary Health Care and Equity, 2011).

In other research, a useful starting point for examining the urban factors that contribute positively and negatively toward mental health is that environments can shape mental well-being in two general ways; physically and socially (Freedman, 1973).

The impact of the physical surrounding and interpersonal relations although filled with controversy as seen in the following paragraph have been linked to a variety of mental illnesses such as depression, anxiety, suicide, feelings of isolation, loneliness, and low self-efficacy (Freedman, 1973).

Many researchers disagree on the physical environment playing a role in mental health, stating that they should not be included as contributing factors but related (Howley, Scott et al. 2009). I believe that although these may be related factors, they still make up the urban fabric surrounding high density living and should therefore be a component in the research. Therefore as other pieces of literature suggest the architecture and urban design of developments can impact both positively and negatively on levels of social inclusion, isolation, and access to communities, social networks and services particularly for disabled persons, elderly as well as families with young children (Centre for Primary Health Care and Equity, 2011).
Urban Factors Contributing Positively and Negatively to Mental Health

In reviewing past research, I have compiled a list of Urban Factors that can contribute positively and/or negatively toward Mental Health; they are as follows in alphabetical order:

- Access to green space,
- Access to natural light,
- Active transport methods,
- Air quality,
- Crime,
- Housing Affordability and Household Income,
- Networks and support systems,
- Noise,
- Privacy,
- Safety,
- Sense of belonging,
- Sense of community, and
- Social interaction.

(Centre for Primary Health Care and Equity, 2011; Howley, Scott, & et al., 2009; Montgomery, 2013; Oliver, n.d.)

The bolded urban factors: Access to green space and active transport methods, are very important factors that aid in creating a happy city (Montgomery, 2013) and can be easily addressed within an urban design proposal. To help facilitate the urban design proposal I will briefly look at their impact on mental health in the following two subsections.
Role of Green Spaces on Mental Health

Urban Green Spaces have long been studied for physical health benefits, and although long hypothesized, few green space studies have incorporated mental health measures (Sturm & Cohen, 2014).

The psychological and emotional benefits from contact with nature are widely recognised as relieving stress, tension and diminishing anxiety. And as our cities become more urban, people begin to suffer from nature deficit disorder, worsening positive mental health and well-being. Exposure to open space, particularly green space is very important in the promotion of relaxation and restoration, restoring stress levels (Regional Public Health, 2010).

Figure Two: Benefits of Public Open Space (Heart Foundation, 2017).
Dr Ian Alcock of the University of Exeter Medical School conducted a five year study on the impact Green Spaces have on Mental Health. He found that green spaces provide lasting mental health benefits. Compared against things like marriage and winning the lottery which provide a short mental health improvement before returning to normal levels, studies found that relocating next to parks and other green spaces improved mental health and this improvement was sustained over the course of the study three years post move (Alcock, 2014).

Ulrich also found decades earlier that in contrast to nature scenery, urban spaces that lacked natural elements worked against mental well-being, and significantly increased sadness. He later found that the psychological benefits of parks ranked higher in importance than the social and recreational aspects (Ulrich & et al., 1991: Ulrich, 1979).

This is supported by findings made by the World Health Organisation in which an Australian study perceived neighbourhood greenness to be more strongly associated with mental health than physical health, while a Spanish study found that greater exposure to green space was linked to improved physical and mental health across all socioeconomic strata and genders. The positive well-being associations were stronger for surrounding greenness rather than distance to green space (World Health Organisation, 2010) adding to Gil Peñalosa’s quote “cities need Green in sizes small, medium, large, and extra-large. Otherwise the human ecosystem is incomplete” (Montgomery, 2013).

Montgomery states that green spaces are very important, and are the lifeblood of our cities, making or breaking a city’s happiness. Cities require medium sized parks, and community gardens within walking distance of every home. "If you don’t see it or touch it, then nature can’t do you much good. Every little bit helps" (Montgomery, 2013). He utilises Kuo in his discussion who insists that green space is also a crucial part of a healthy human habitat. Daily exposure to nature is essential and proximity to green spaces matters. This means we need to build nature into the urban system, and into our lives, at all scales (Montgomery, 2013).
Role of Streets on Mental Health

As stated earlier, active transportation methods play a role in contributing to positive mental health such as pedestrian and cycling activity.

By participating in active transportation methods, stress levels get reduced for example, cyclists are more likely to enjoy commuting to work than those who drive. As those who do drive are more likely to complain of poor sleep, higher stress levels, have lower frustration tolerance and have lower physical and mental health levels than those who actively commute to work (Region of Waterloo Public Health, 2016; Speck, 2012). Stress levels are so high that an unusually high percentage of people having heart attacks had spent time in traffic congestion on the day that they were stricken (Speck, 2012).

One study found that a 23 minute commute had the same effect on happiness as a 19 percent reduction in income, and in one poll 5 percent of participants said that they would be willing to divorce their spouse if it meant that they no longer had to commute and could work from home instead (Speck, 2012).

Putnam states that “each ten additional minutes in daily commuting time cuts involvement in community affairs by ten percent- fewer public meetings attended, fewer committees chaired, fewer petitions signed, fewer church services attended, and so on” which contributes negatively toward a person’s sense of belonging and therefore also their mental health (Speck, 2012).

Studies have also proven that ADHD, Hyperactivity and other disorders which affect children’s ability to learn are worsened by them not participating in active transportation methods (Speck, 2012). This has become more apparent in recent years as children are less likely to walk or cycle to school, rather being dropped off at the door by helicopter parents. 50 percent of children walked to school in 1989, whilst fewer than 15 percent do today. This trend has also been enforced by urbanism, such as the feeling of being unsafe on streets, and problematic road crossings (Speck, 2012).

Enrique Peñalosa, former mayor of Bogota, Columbia said “God made us walking animals--pedestrians. As a fish needs to swim, a bird to fly, a deer to run, we need to walk, not in order to survive, but to be happy” (Speck, 2012). And studies on residents have proven that walkability improved their happiness, largely due to residents exercising but also as social interaction was encouraged. As Jane Jacobs once put it “Lowly, unpurposeful, and random as they may appear, sidewalk contacts are the small change
from which a city’s wealth of public life may grow” (Speck, 2012). However, in low socioeconomic mixed-use neighbourhoods walkability increased their stress levels as they felt unsafe. However, this also found that mixed use with surrounding greenness mitigated this feeling of unsafe (Blue, 2017).

Montgomery also looked at East Houston Street in New York City, and how people reported feeling significantly happier along the messy but active street front in the top image below than they did along the blank but tidy façade seen in the bottom image.

*Figure Three:* Active Street Frontage (above), in contrast to a blank façade (below) (Montgomery, 2013).
The Case of Mayoral Drive

Although there are only 3 apartment buildings on Mayoral Drive itself with a fourth one under construction, Auckland’s CBD consists of a dense environment of approximately 67 people per hectare as of 2013. In the CBD there are 60,000 students enrolled in tertiary study, 25,000 residents, 90,000 workers and 12,000 tourists coming into the city every working day. The proposed growth of the inner CBD is 30,000 new residents by the year 2050, and so as the area continues to grow more considerations should be made toward mental health and well-being.

As seen in the following figure, there are a number of contributing factors toward mental health. These include access to three main parks: Albert Park, Myers Park and Aotea square; there are a number of busy roads such as: Queen Street, Wellesley Street, and Mayoral Drive itself resulting in 24/7 noise; and there are also two major tertiary providers: the University of Auckland and AUT.

*Figure Four:* Map showing key aspects of the Mayoral Drive area. White: Mayoral Drive Ring; Green: Green Spaces; Red: Key streets; Blue: Tertiary Education Providers. Base image (Google, 2017).
Tertiary Education

As there are two major tertiary providers on and in close proximity to Mayoral Drive, they are major contributors to density in and around the area both living and visiting. These two tertiary providers bring a raft of approximately 60,000 people to the Mayoral Drive area almost daily. Tertiary Education brings more mental health issues to the Mayoral Drive area.

Impact of Tertiary Education on Mental Health

It is more and more common nowadays to require a tertiary degree to enter the professional workforce, and so there are more students entering the world of tertiary education.

![Mental Illness in College Students](image)

*Figure Five:* Mental Illness in College Students (Henriques, 2014).
Unfortunately tertiary education institutes are rife with mental health issues as seen in the above figure, which can be exacerbated or brought on by: academic pressures, a high cost of failure, financial burden coupled with a high cost of living particularly in Auckland, first time living away from home, the competitive nature of degrees such as Engineering, Law and Medicine, an increasing dependence on technology and therefore less face to face social interaction, as well as a lifestyle imbalance due to higher stress such as a reduction in exercise, poor diet, plus an increased use of alcohol and drugs as coping mechanisms (Henriques, 2014).

This results in sleep deprived, highly stressed and anxious students in the Mayoral Drive area, as many of the accommodations are and will be student oriented. Tertiary Students are a large proportion of density within Mayoral Drive, and so their needs should also be taken into consideration in the Urban Design Proposal.

**Green Space**

As previously mentioned, there are three large parks in and around Mayoral Drive: Albert Park, Myers Park and Aotea Square.

*Figure Six:* Albert Park during the day, with the University of Auckland’s clock tower in the background (Elnicko, 2006).
These spaces also need to be safe, but unfortunately Albert Park has long had the reputation of being unsafe after dark, despite many students and people readily using it during the day. Auckland Transport have tried to address this issue earlier this year by installing long awaited $80,000 worth of CCTV cameras and better lighting following four separate attacks on Asian students in March (Pasley, 2017). New Zealand Chinese Student Association spokesperson Cindy Huang has said “a lot of international students live in town and usually walk across Albert Park, as a lot of students stay late studying” and that these upgrades are necessary to improve safety in the area (Pasley, 2017), this should also help to lessen anxiety and stress among those walking through the park at night.

Myers Park although created in the early 1900’s as part of “the city beautiful movement”, it has poor and unclear pedestrian access due to buildings surrounding the park particularly from Mayoral Drive.

![Figure Seven: Mayoral Drive over/underpass from Myers Park.](image)

The access from the Mayoral Drive overpass is hard to find, unpleasant and the smell of urine lingers in the air. The dark underpass which also smells of urine, can be seen in the above figure. It links to a carpark and moves up and down when trucks and buses go across the overpass.

However in 2015 the children’s playground seen below was built which brings families to the area (Auckland Council, 2015), and provides play space for the adjacent preschool.
Aotea Square is largely designed as open-air event space for fairs, protest rallies, music festivals, and the annual seeing in of the New Year. It is largely paved with a number of artworks in the vicinity (Eventfinda, 2017). However it is not utilised for events for a vast majority of the year, and so is not frequented by many as seen in the following figure, limiting the potential for social interaction in the area, which can worsen mental health. This space also discourages use by skateboarders etc. of which a large proportion are usually students disallowing them a sense of community close to where they spend a lot of their time, as they are pushed elsewhere, further limiting positive mental health.
Unfortunately there is not a wide variety or very much public or private green space other than these three parks in the area, and as discussed in the theoretical discussion on Green Spaces a wide variety of green space is necessary. As Gil Penalosa once put it "Cities need Green in sizes small, medium, large, and extra-large. Otherwise the human ecosystem is incomplete" (Montgomery, 2013). This is what I aim to address in the Urban Design Proposal.

**Streets**

![Image of Queen Street]

*Figure Ten:* Pedestrian Activity is encouraged on Queen Street (Reynolds, 2015).

Although the active transportation method of walking is encouraged along Queen Street, and parts of Wellesley Street largely due to street activation as seen above. Mayoral Drive itself does little to facilitate nor encourage active transportation methods as seen in the following images. Largely due to non-activated street frontages and blank façades. There is also very little street lighting, reducing active transportation activity even further. Mayoral Drive’s streetscape will also be addressed in the Urban Design Proposal.
Figure Eleven: Active Transportation is not encouraged on Mayoral Drive
Urban Design Proposal

Although one of the least residentially dense part of Auckland's CBD, Mayoral Drive has the potential of having a high living density environment. It is likely that due to the proximity of tertiary education facilities, the majority of these new residents will be students. It is important to try to avoid, remedy and mitigate mental health issues when adapting this environment. The following urban design proposal hopes to achieve this through the addition of surrounding greenness, and adaptation of streetscape.

Please note that residential participation in the planning and design process can also increase positive mental health and happiness, as residents feel a sense of ownership over the built environment. So prior to going ahead with any proposals for the area, residents should be consulted. (Regional Public Health, 2010).

Surrounding Greenness

Although Mayoral Drive has access to three large parks: Albert Park, Myers Park and Aotea Square (as seen in figure four); there is not enough variety provided nor surrounding greenness for the vast majority of Mayoral Drive.
Figure Twelve: Current extent of large scale greenness for Mayoral Drive.
To help to avoid, remedy and mitigate against mental health issues the following surrounding greenness plan is proposed for Mayoral Drive:

*Figure Thirteen: Proposed surrounding greenness for Mayoral Drive.*
• Adapt existing open air car parking to either new residential or green space.
• Provide additional smaller parks around Mayoral Drive.
• Adapt public realm spaces like streets, pedestrian walkways and Aotea Square with additional vegetation and seating.
• Provide stronger surrounding greenness around tertiary institutions.
• New Residential developments should provide green space with good solar aspect within their development.
• Integrate green walls and roofs onto current and future buildings.
• Create clearer and safer access to Myers Park from Mayoral drive.

By adapting existing open air car parking into either new residential or green spaces, there will be a reduction in commuters reducing pollution levels, a much more efficient use of space in the CBD, and providing places for people to live (potentially at a lower cost) as well as providing surrounding greenness increasing mental health benefits in the heart of Auckland City. Additional trees will help to reduce street noise for nearby apartments, and improve the character of the area. The surrounding greenness will also promote positive mental health benefits such as a reduction in stress levels, whilst promoting active transportation methods. Trees will also reduce sightlines, forcing vehicles to drive slower therefore creating safer roads and also creating less pollution. By providing resting spaces, opportunity is created for chance social interaction. By making mandatory the inclusion of green space in residential buildings as well as current and future buildings with the addition of green walls and roofs, the feeling of surrounding greenness is encouraged, and residents have private places for restoration and relaxation. By also ensuring that residential green spaces are provided with sunlight, residents can gain important Vitamin D which has been proven to increase happiness (Mayo Clinic, 2017). It is essential that access to public green spaces are clear and safe, and so grand staircases could be introduced off Mayoral Drive. Such as the one in Central Park seen in the following figure. These changes to the surrounding greenness of Mayoral Drive would help to address and solve some of the issues that the built environment has on mental health, helping to create a happy city.
Figure Fourteen: Steps leading to the fountain and lake in Central Park, New York (TripAdvisor, 2017).

Figure Fifteen: A simple rendering of the current street layout for Mayoral Drive.
The majority of Mayoral Drive is 26m in width. As seen above it has unactivated edges, six lanes of traffic and is largely unused by active transportation methods. It also has limited greenness and street lighting which promotes the feeling of being unsafe. All contributing negatively toward mental health.

To curb negative mental health impacts, the promotion of active transportation methods along Mayoral Drive is proposed as follows:

**Figure Sixteen**: A simple rendering of the proposed street layout for Mayoral Drive.

- Street activation on both sides where possible.
- Remove one driving lane and the parking lane to accommodate more trees and cycle ways, still allowing use by public transport systems.
- Reduce the number of open air carparks along Mayoral Drive.
- Line Mayoral Drive with additional street lighting.
- Provide spaces for seating.

Street activation frontage promotes happiness among residents. Additional trees will help to reduce street noise for nearby apartments, and improve the character of the area. The surrounding greenness will also promote positive mental health benefits such as a reduction in stress levels, whilst promoting active transportation methods. Trees will also reduce sightlines, forcing vehicles to drive slower therefore creating safer roads. By reducing driving lanes, active transportation methods are promoted over commuting. This reduces stress levels of those who would normally drive, and also creates less
pollution which also has negative connotations on mental health. By increasing street lighting, people feel safer walking at night. By providing resting spaces, opportunity is created for chance social interaction. These changes to the layout of Mayoral Drive would help to address and solve some of the issues that the built environment has on mental health, helping to create a Happy City.

Conclusions

This research paper looked at Mental Health & High Density Environments, and proposed Urban Design conditions to help create a ‘Happy City’ in Auckland’s Mayoral Drive.

To help achieve this research, an overarching research question was posed: what factors in high density environments contribute positively and negatively toward mental health? Factors included access to green space, active transportation methods, safety and pollution. To help avoid, remedy and mitigate against negative mental health in high density environments, urban design conditions were identified that could be enlisted anywhere in the world, but were more specifically proposed for the case study of Mayoral Drive. They were:

- Surrounding Greenness
- Active Transportation

If I were to redo this Urban Design Proposal I would be more specific to the case study of Mayoral Drive rather than trying to keep it broad enough so that the techniques could be implemented anywhere.

I would also like to further address the following questions: What conditions within green spaces negatively and positively impact upon mental health and well-being? And how can these be addressed?
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Religious organisations should not be exempt

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
 Anything that does away with governance duplication will save money
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of these properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I am happy for there to be a rates increase if it means a better service. These services make sense. It would be great for the food scraps area to be extended, there are many people who would benefit from that service too. I absolutely do not agree that religious organisation shouldn't be paying rates. There are some religious organisations that blatantly take advantage of vulnerable people, mainly in south Auckland. This should not be supported.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
The environment is important to me

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
I think all Local Boards need to advocate more for environmental outcomes

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
WE WANT YOUR FEEDBACK

This feedback form contains questions relating to the:
- Annual Budget 2019/2020
- Proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers
- Our Water Future

Feedback must be received by Sunday 17 March 2019.

Please read the consultation document available at akhaveyoursay.nz or at any library, service centre, local board office or by phoning 09 301 0101 before you give feedback. It has more information about the issues and choices that we want your feedback on.

All of the questions below are optional. We encourage you to give feedback online at akhaveyoursay.nz, or you can complete this form and return it to us using one of the options below.

Email
Scan your completed form and email it to akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

By post
Place your completed form in an envelope and send it to
AK Have Your Say
Auckland Council
Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92 300, Auckland 1142

Questions relating to the Annual Budget 2019/2020

To answer the following questions please read pages 16 and 17 of the consultation document.

To see how your rates may change go to our rates guide at akhaveyoursay.nz. All of these questions are optional.

Question 1: We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:
- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs.
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the North Shore former trial area to whom the service is available.
- Phasing out the West Auckland rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020-2020/2021).
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours).
- Not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes.

The waste management system should be more resource efficient e.g. Glass, cardboard, metal & make it more sustainable. Increase of fees based on current usage is not supported.

I don't understand why land owned by religious organisations should be exempted. The current amount for $200 is already too high. What are your proposals to reduce this amount? Should there be a cost or non cost?
Question 2: Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Please comment:

I think City Council is too big and bureaucratic. It should be made smaller to be efficient.

Question 3a:
Which local board does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Questions 3b:
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Partially

Please comment:

I would like to see how the pop-up business school (work)

Question relating to the proposed amendment to the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regarding property transfers

To answer the following question please read pages 34 to 45 of the consultation document.

Question 1:
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility.

The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

☐ Support  ☐ Not support  ☐ Partially support

Please comment:

Not sure
Outside of the Annual Budget we are also looking at the future of Auckland’s water.

Our water future - consultation questions
To answer the following questions about our water future please view the full discussion document or executive summary at akhaveyoursay.nz.

All of these questions are optional.

Question 1: Our values
People value water for different reasons. We have identified five broad categories that we will use to evaluate our progress on water issues.

Do these values match what you value about water?

a. Ecosystems: healthy water systems nourish the natural environment.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Strongly

b. Water use: we can meet our everyday needs safely, reliably and efficiently.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Strongly

c. Recreation and amenity: we enjoy being in, on and near the water at beaches, lakes and streams.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Strongly

d. Culture: water contributes to our identities and beliefs, as individuals and as part of communities.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Strongly

e. Resilience: our communities, catchments and coastlines are resilient to natural hazards and the impacts of climate change.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Strongly

Please tell us why, and if there is anything else you value about water?

Question 2: The big issues: what we need to work on
We have identified four issues that are at the heart of Auckland’s water future.

How concerned are you about these issues?

a. Cleaning up our waters, dealing with the pollution of our beaches and waterways, e.g. sediment, nutrients and contaminants from rural and urban activities and roads, litter and faecal contamination.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Very concerned

b. Growth in the right places, thinking about the water and wastewater impacts of where and how we grow.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Very concerned

c. Meeting future water needs, identifying how we will provide clean drinking water to a growing population, with a range of options to develop including more efficient water use, rainwater collection and storage, water re-use, or other water sources.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Very concerned

d. Adapting to a changing water future, planning for changing water conditions, e.g. higher probabilities of droughts, flash flooding and coastal inundation, and making sure our communities and our infrastructure are resilient to the changes.
   - Not at all
   - Somewhat
   - Very concerned

Please tell us why, and what you think we can do now to anticipate and adapt to the changes in our water future?

I think we still have heaps of waste water going directly into our waterways without being treated. It is a big project to look at the “old system” to bring it up.

Question 3: Meeting our future water needs
As we develop options for meeting our future drinking water needs, we want to understand which criteria you think are most important.

Which of the following criteria are most important to you? (Select your top two)

- Safety and quality of drinking water
- Reliable supply of drinking water
- Cost of infrastructure needed to provide drinking water
- Environmental impacts of the infrastructure for supplying drinking water
- Becoming less reliant on water sources outside the region by being more efficient and exploring other sources

Please tell us why these criteria matter to you, or if there are others you think are more important?
Question 4: Adapting to a changing water future
We expect that water-related hazards, like droughts, flash
flooding, erosion and coastal inundation will be more
frequent in future and will cost us more to recover from.
The effects will be felt unevenly across communities,
based on where they live and their socio-economic status.
Which of the following should we prioritise as we adapt to
this changing future? (Select your top two)

☑ Developing policy to define the extent of individual
and council responsibilities for adaptation

☑ Helping communities to be more resilient to hazards/
promoting community resilience

☐ Planning to withdraw from affected areas (moving off
land affected by flooding and inundation)

☐ Preventing new building in future hazard zones

☐ Providing information about the locations and risk of
future hazard

Please tell us why these criteria matter to you, or if there
are others you think are more important?

The framework contains:
• A vision for what we want our water future to be
• Values that describe why water is important to us
• Big issues that are at the core of our water challenge
• Principles that will guide our actions as we move forward
• Processes that we need to work on, to ensure we make
good decisions.

Do you have any feedback on the framework, or is there
anything else you think should be included?

The framework itself is fine
It is more important to make it work!

Question 6: Creating our water future together
Achieving a healthy, sustainable and affordable water
future for Tāmaki Makaurau will require energy and
commitment from all of us. From the decisions we make in
our own homes and communities, through to the regional
investment choices that we will need to make, we all have
the opportunity to make a better water future for our city.

What’s the most important thing you think we should do
for our water future?

Promote individuals & households
To be water wise, save water to reduce unnecessary/waste
as the first small steps.
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Your feedback will be included in public documents.
All other personal details will remain private.

All personal information that you provide in this submission will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. Our privacy policy explains how we may use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. We recommend you
familiarise yourself with this policy.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
land owned by religious organisations should be charged rates

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
footpaths are not well maintained in onehunga

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
There should be no more increases in any fees as we aucklanders are paying a lot. Inorganic waste service has been reduced and council not cutting grass on the burm. Fuel tax introduced recently. How can we survive in Auckland?

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Water rates are too expensive especially waste water. Similarly electricity is also very expensive and no incentive given to solar power. For new addition to the existing house council is charging heaps for their fees considered unreasonable

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

No

Comments

Lot of priorities are for housing and new building are coming up in the area. People are parking vehicles on both sides of the streets which is not safe

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

I never go to the city due to traffic. We as rate payers will not benefit at all from this project

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
unfair waste mgt increase

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
no

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
we need a more people friendly and attractive waterfront like wellington
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 20 Feb 2019 12:11
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
No

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
The changes are necessary.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Rid ambiguity.

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Comments
There is no plan against results can be measured, they are all generalities and scoping ideas

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Panuku should be abolished, as the whole of Panuku is a duplication of process and procedures that Auckland Council undertakes.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Traffic parking in my street all day long. No where for locals or visitors to arm.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
Traffic parking in streets all day preventing locals and visitors parking g there.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I feel that regulatory fees are high enough already. Rates charges should already be enough to cover waste management charges.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
no

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
the board seems to be supporting the area reasonably well.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
To save duplication of charges
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Maybe a incentive for people that will make a compost if they are able to. And maybe a incentive some other way if they can not.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Like growing own vegetables compost can be expensive will make me do it if the council say look if you do this we can show a cheaper rates bill that would be a laugh

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No

Comments
I could answer this question if I know what the priorities were? Email helengraham2012.hg@gmail.com

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

Don't care do what. You like you will any way

Auckland Council
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
23 April 2019

From: Auckland Council
To: APShure@Auckland.govt.nz
Subject: Annual Budget 2019-2020 feedback
Date: Wednesday, 20 February 2019 2:24:27 PM
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
How is the food scraps trial properties decided. I'd need more info to comment on this. I would support rates rebate for some land owned by religious organisations. There needs to be care that these organisations do have a quantifiable benefit to the community and city.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
I have a small garden and a compost bin. Therefore, no food scraps.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes

Comments
I get updates from the Local Board. Plus, I provide feedback to them as warranted.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
I don't have an issue with this. Neither do I have an issue with the addition of mooring buoys to allow super large cruise ships to dock at the wharf.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
No increase to waste charges - look to reduce costs Publish result of food scrap trial - if it is successful then extend otherwise not Waitakere targeted phase out - agreed Urban boundary - agreed Religious exemption - disagree Increased regulatory fees - review costs and decrease

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

General rate increases are unacceptable as services continue to decline - the council appears to be wasting a lot of rate payers money - concerned over AT and transport in general

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

No

Comments

Targeted to minorities rather than all people - some projects appear to be of questionable value

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

Of questionable benefit to ratepayers
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Increasing cost is probably valid but NOT if services are cut or restricted. This has happened in the past to the rate payers. Rather like telling an employer, you pay each employee more and reduce the the number of hours they have to work to earn that salary. Or tell an employee you must work more hours for less pay... where is the equity?

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Will this increase cost to rate payers and reduce potential income generation for the city?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
The regulatory fees should be reduced to bring down the cost of compliance and hence reduce cost of construction in and around Auckland. Instead religious organisations should contribute to rates as it should be for any property.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Waste management charges be levied per amount of waste generated by individual household or commercial organisation.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Puketapapa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puketapapa Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

Support

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="attachment.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I don't agree with the food scrap scheme. It would be better to educate and make it compulsory to compost themselves rather us all having to pay for their ignorance. The only people who should be part of this scheme are apartment dwellers. I can't believe resource consents are going up again! How are we supposed to be building more housing if fees keep going up. I thought things were supposed to be getting easier not harder.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Speaking of recycling, there needs to be more done to educate immigrants about home recycling. Many of our neighbours are oblivious as to what can be recycled and tip anything into either bin. Also, so many just put overflow bags on the curb and when they're not collected they just leave them there. The language barrier and lack of understanding as to why it's important to recycle properly are two reasons that I've witnessed.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Leave residential rates unchanged - we already have enough costs. Rather improve your internal efficiency to reduce your costs - don't just pass it on. Do something positive.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Get rid of cross lease in property ownership and remove the artificial council fees on correcting this aberration.

3. Local Board Information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
Happy with the growth and development but infrastructure - such as water, sewers and stormwater are falling badly behind. Also need more off street parking as roads get clogged

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Remove duplication and reduce costs. Set targets for this and use savings to pay for transition.
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Dealing with dumping and measures to reduce people doing that.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Providing the transfer reduces costs and not add other costs then sounds viable

Auckland Council
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Do not support differential rating for religious organisations. 1. There is no assessment of whether fees/koha are charged or received for the use of these facilities and any of the related services and no prohibition on the charging of fees by the religious organisations for access to these facilities and services. They can self-fund or fund on a user-pays basis as required. 2. Government in NZ is secular i.e. we should not be using tax or ratepayer money to support religion. 3. Even if you accept the provision or religious "services" and facilities is a "public good" (i.e. and therefore should be partly funded/supported by the public at large) this argument applies equally to a range of other services/facilities that operate both on a commercial and non-commercial basis i.e. Citizen’s Advice, Budgeting Services, Family Services, medical practices, sports and recreational clubs and services. There is no basis for singling religious sites/facilities or services out. Recognising the importance of religious organisations and the services they provide to our community we are proposing to not charge rates to the following land used by religious organisations for:  • presbytery/manse used to house clergy which is onsite or adjacent to the place of religious worship • halls and gymnasiums used for community not-for-profit purposes • not-for-profit childcare for the benefit of the community • libraries • offices that are onsite, and which exist for religious purposes • non-commercial op-shops operating from the same title • car parks serving multiple uses but primarily used for religious purposes

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Do not support Council’s funding of $5million to City Mission’s HomeGround. It is the role of central government not local government to address homelessness and social housing using taxpayer funding. Local government’s intervention in the social housing space blurs the roles between the responsibility (and accountability) for social housing/protecting those most vulnerable in our communities. Stepping into the significant gaps/deficiencies left by central government in relation to social housing, mental health, addiction services, adequate welfare provision and wrap around services simply lets central government “off the hook”. Auckland Council and Aucklanders need to take a strong and hard line with government and hold it accountable for not addressing these significant issues affecting all communities across NZ, not just in Auckland. Our intervention is not sufficient to address these issues - it simply “lets them off the hook” and allows successive governments to avoid making the significant welfare, health, housing reforms that are required to address social inequalities.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

No

Comments

1. Do not think pop up business service is a good value for money. There is a lot of information/service/s from central government already available on setting up businesses etc. These funds would be better spent on basic numeracy and literacy services tailored for MIT Local Board residents (i.e. available in range of different languages, times, media and locations). 2. Do not think heritage inventory is a good use of funds, particularly for residents in the Tamaki
Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 21 Feb 2019 10:02
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I think rates should be charged on land owned by religious organisations. Particularly Destiny church. They have a massive wealth and can afford it. Don't increase resource consents it will only have ongoing flow to increased prices for house buyers.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Our public transport really is a huge embarrassment and disgrace. We host international students and there are often problems. Trains are always breaking down. I don't like our money being wasted either. In Glen Innes there were some new bus stops placed that must have cost around $40k. Very soon like a matter of week's or even one week after that the zones all changed and the bus stops became redundant. Someone's head should roll over that stuff up. What an absolute waste of money that was evident for all to see.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
# Annual Budget feedback

## Submitter details

- **Date received:** 21 Feb 2019 10:35
- **Attachment:**

## Feedback

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

   We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
   These changes include:
   - a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs.
   - extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available.
   - phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021).
   - adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours).
   - not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
   - an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

   Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I'm very much in favour of better environmental protection through improved waste management. I also think that not charging rates on some parts of land owned by religious groups is a good move.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
I hope that developers impact on the environment will be scrutinised closely.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

There is much development happening and powerful companies such as Fletchers seem to have immunity in matters of resource consent.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

As long as people and not just money are the priorities.
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
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- **Date received:** 21 Feb 2019 11:50
- **Attachment:**

**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs. The proposed increase of 50 or so dollars to annual mooring fee to cover disposal of derelict boats. This fee increase directly penalises reliable (honest) fee payers like myself, to make up for those who shouldn’t have been allowed a boat on a mooring in the first place and have likely long since defaulted on licence fee payments. There must surely be a way to filter those non-payers out before they get in arrears? I would be happy in a fee increase that instead of paying for disposal, pays for extra policing of moorings by the harbourmaster to keep the areas ship-shape more like the Bay Of Islands and other more tightly controlled areas. Safe moorings in Auckland are very hard to find with increased ferry traffic rendering once-safe areas like Devonport unsafe. Yet with marinas prohibitively expensive to most (yes, there are a lot more boaters than there are boats on marinas!) there are still people like myself with a boat in perfect condition which is often used, but who aren’t on the type of salary to afford $800 per month berthage. So by all means, increase the fee but ONLY to improve quality of mooring areas (resulting in higher quality vessels on the moorings) as a result of better policing and management. I do not support a fee increase to pay for derelict boats.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

- Removing imported cars from the port ‘carpark’ downtown - Transfer of some shipping activity to Whangarei and Tauranga to decrease the need for permanent destruction of our irreplaceable harbour/water

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie–Tāmaki

Maungakiekie–Tāmaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
See Below

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Why do single person households pay the same waste management and refuse costs as families?
I regularly do not put out a bin as I don’t have enough rubbish

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No

Comments
The Tamaki re-development is an environmental disaster. All the old state houses were torn down with no attempt to recycle any of the non renewable resources such as native timber (rimu and matai) Thousands of tonnes of soil has been removed and replaced with concrete and every tree has gone. The waste water and other infrastructure should be replaced by the developers who were given the land for almost nothing. Pure profit for them and the real estate agents. As there are now no gardens either.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Supportive other than for the not charging rates on land owned by religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Submitter details
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Higher rates mean higher rents. The council needs to look at ways of lessening the burden on the taxpayer by cutting back on their own wasteful spending, inefficiencies, and staffing.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Regarding Fees and Charges and increases to some fees to maintain cost recovery, I object to the raising of these fees for the following reasons - [resource consents – bundled consent deposits, tree consents, boundary adjustments (unit title and cross lease), change of condition (s127) and others] [building control – lapsed/refused building consent, waiver/modification of building code, extensions of time to start building has a negative work, solid fuel heater/injected wall application and others] - 1) Fees for building improvement and land improvement in Auckland is already so high that it discourages building, house extensions and new houses builds. I was going to extend a rental property and add two bedrooms which would have helped the rental housing shortage, but decided against it due to council regulations, red tape & the unfair expense. For example, just to get an answer about a consent I needed to pay $500 for a meeting that didn’t even guarantee a firm answer.

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

No

Comments

As above

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.87 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
• adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently
urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
• not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring
fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
How much is the total increase?

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
No increase in payment

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments
What youth initiatives would you like to see take place in our local board area?
Peace and order
What support would you like to see to reduce local waste and increase recycling?
Pay the residents who will bring recycling waste depending in the kilos of the waste

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

Too many responsibilities for Auckland Council. They are already slow in making things happen or actioning things, no need to add more responsibility to them if they cannot act fast enough
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Absolute rubbish. This increase should be scrapped.

2. What is Important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Reduce rates and focus for once on what is important. Priorise your efforts and avoid all wasteful spending

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No
Comments
More work on beach cleanup. Widen Tamaki Drive. Stop e-scooters. No more cycle ways eating into the road space for other uses.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
How much $ will you be saving and making your council staff redundant as a result of this. You are pushing this to new structures and retaining existing staffing levels to do less.
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
They sound reasonable on the whole.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Areas where I can walk my dogs safely  Improving quality of water at the reserve and beaches  Not having a transfer fee or capital gains tax where properties change hands.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

---

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
They are being planned and implemented in a considered way.

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Sounds feasible and doable
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is Important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
The environment is however we need to ensure home owners do not absorb all cost

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

I dont actually understand it all. There is lack of communication and discussion about it

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
23 April 2019

- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
You need to tackle the underlying water and waste water infrastructure. Instead you are spending billions on your own agendas such as public transport that most don’t want, and then putting up fares every quarter so you can continue to subsidise public transport. Time for you to rethink who you are supposed to be serving...mayoral legacies, the small minority or the majority of ratepayers and what they want.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Stop throwing money at all the little “squeaky wheels”. Stop following poor agendas and focus on the important (which does not include public transport in its current form). Spend my hard earned money on fixing basic services like water, sewerage, rubbish collection, etc. Don’t throw any more money at buses that need to be subsidised when there are perfectly sound alternatives if you cared to look and think about them. What use is being world class if you can only drink bottled water, dirt and rubbish lays all over the streets, we can’t swim at our beaches because of foul discharges and overflows. Get your act in order before you discover people will no longer be able to afford your rates bills.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
They are not thinking logically for all but spend too much focused on being politically correct - doing what council wants rather than what the constituents want.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal
ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

I agree that all our waterfronts need solid management strategies but don't hide behind this. Be honest. You want the money and the control. And when you sell off parcels, the money should not go into central coffers to pay for your stupidity over public transport.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

It's important to me that Council exhibits an ability to live within budget and realize ratepayers are not ATM machines.

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

Keep all salable assets out of Council's direct hands.
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Fine with all changes apart from the no charge on some religious land. I disagree with religious sites being exempted from civic rates charges, and if they are to in effect be given money it should be in the form of grants for heritage building preservation paired with improved heritage scheduling (for historic church buildings) and/or community grants for community services operating from religious sites.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

I have nothing against unifying the management of civic assets, as long as it is being done sensibly. I 100% am against the building of a waterfront stadium however, and oppose the transfer if this is what it is meant to enable, and I oppose selling off Ports of Auckland or similarly important civic assets to private developers to build waterfront housing or the like.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I do not support the increase in regulatory fee. The current level of fee are considered high and levels of service low. So increasing it will just mean some developers will go under and pace of development will slow down over time.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki, Papakura and Whau

---

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No
Comments

---

Papakura Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No
Comments

---

Whau Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No
Comments
Roading network needs to be upgraded now with flyovers

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#933</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion about this proposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auckland Council
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Date received: 22 Feb 2019 18:00
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I agree with the majority of the proposed charges except I don’t agree with ‘...some parts of land owned by religious organisations’... will be exempt.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Fair and equitable rates, however while business should pay their ‘fair share’ we must allow them to prosper.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Efficiency
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Yes, that is ok as long as you actually fix the sewage system.

2. What is Important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Please ensure to get overseas experts in and make a 50 year plan to upgrade the sewage system, streets etc. Nothing will get cheaper as longer as AKL waits and waits. Get rid of most old villas/housing and start building proper houses such as certified passive houses like in Europe. AKL/NZ claims to be environment-friendly but actually it’s just a good marketing campaign, that’s all. It’s absolutely terrible that AKL failed on so many levels to foresee the upcoming issues. Stop having short-term thinking’s of 10 years. Be authentic and a true environment focused country. Don’t try to satisfy everyone and make decisions for the greater good.

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Get on with the East-West Link and train system to the Airport! It's overdue and it won't get cheaper! Get rid off all these little non successful tier 3 stores and businesses so that Onehunga can become the prime suburb in the middle between Airport and CBD.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- Not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Item 21

No increase to existing charges, the council has been increasing charges for last 10 years over the inflation rate EVERY year, it has to stop. There should be no exemptions to religious or iwi organisations - we are all one country and users, we should all pay the same.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
The council do not listen, they make they do however they already have made there minds up and just hold surveys to look as if they care and listen

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No
Comments
Too much emphasis on minority groups and spending on non core council activities

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support
Another entity that owns means another lot of unnecessary expense

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 23 Feb 2019 14:19
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
It work that was discussed in the 10 year plan.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
If it stops duplication of duty and keeps cost down is good planning

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs -should cut costs first before increasing rates extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available -does not apply to me -phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021) -does not apply to me adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours) -does not apply to me not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations -religious organisations should pay rates like any commercial property, they are a business an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs -does not apply to me

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

- Partially support
- I support the move if it decreases costs

---

Auckland Council

---
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 – 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I think that religious organisations should receive no discounts. I don’t agree with an increase to the annual waste management charge because the Council has to be aware that many ratepayers are paying huge amount already and many have no income increase to account for it. Some are struggling very much. Instead target the pollutants for this increase.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I love the waterfront and would hate to see it change except to make it more attractive by the removal of the port and thus the huge lorries.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Because it belongs to us and we elect representatives. Please do not increase personnel numbers - decrease them and lower the salaries. I am a hard-working professional and I find it hard to make ends meet and certainly don’t think the salaries are justified nor earned.
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 24 Feb 2019 17:17
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees
We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I object to these extra charges being proposed. Time and time again Auckland Council are requesting extra funding from its communities due to incompetence within the financial departments of Auckland Council. If the Council worked Smarter they would be able to reduce the costs for rate payers instead of increasing them. As an example, why do you not look at charging a Council tax which is based on the number of people living at the address. This is much fairer system as the more people living in a property the more rubbish and facilities they are likely to require.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Aucklanders are constantly being overcharged due to Council wasting money on unnecessary items. This also includes Auckland Transport which provided an extra 'levy' on the rates due to extra transport services. However time and time again I have witnessed buses not arriving, no updates and in some cases cancelled. These are not the services that I had expected due to the 'levy' imposed. Cost effective living in Auckland is important to me and I am sure others. I feel Council should get a hand on their finances.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

---

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

Do not support

This proposal is a huge cost, this would ultimately come from again us Auckland rate payers who would be expected to have their rates increased as a consequence. Also additional opex costs in order to maintain said waterfront properties and I do not believe Auckland Council have looked at the long term view. Apartments always have a high cost to maintain even more so on those apartments.
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is Important to you?
   Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
   Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
   Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Let's be honest here. We hardly see improvement in services to Aucklanders, quite the opposite. So to ask for more money is a smack in the face.

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

---

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Last few years it seems the council went to sleep, except in elections time. No good enough.

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

This looks (and feels) like a shot in the dark, instead of a robust review of a robust plan. I suspect more "amendments" would follow to adjust it.

---

Auckland Council
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Franklin

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Increase the basic standard rubbish charge

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
It is all concentrated on the Tamaki end

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Panuku is an unnecessary added expense

Auckland Council
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I fail to see why land owned by religious organisations are exempt from paying rates, especially if they currently use the services and facilities Auckland Rate Payers currently fund, either for on-going maintenance or new Capital Enhancement. If we like to think that we are living in an egalitarian society, where we want people to be equal, then it is only fair that everyone pays their way, regardless of religion, culture or ethnicity.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Build a railway track that connects the CBD to North Harbour. Other capital cities have achieved this. Why can’t we. Well done on providing more and more bus routes... but your super city is expanding at a phenomenal rate... faster than what our current infrastructure can handle. So plan big, think big, find the money (maybe from those religious organisations you mentioned earlier) and build it.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

We live on a street off Great South Road in Greenlane and our street is notorious for illegal parking and late noise offends. We’ve exhausted ourselves calling the council every time there’s a new parking infringement (car parked on our front lawn, across our driveway, front facing over a speed bump, on the yellow lines blocking our view from on coming traffic), or every time there’s excessive noise after 11pm. The council needs to enforce stricter parking around Wairakei St, Woodbine Ave and Mitchellson St as it’s incredibly bad. Additionally, the council needs to fund their noise control fleet with better equipment to monitor and measure sound, especially to those working during a public holiday. A couple years ago several complaints were raised because some idiot was concrete grinding and tree cutting at 7am on Boxing Day. The council turned up but then said that they couldn’t do anything as they were the relief staff over the holiday period and were not entitled to use the $20k noise measuring devices your usual fleet has.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your opinion about this proposal?</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I want to give my support to the proposal to not charge rates on some parts or land owned by religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- Not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I believe that land owned by religious organisations should be exempt from rating, as they provide services and space to the community that is not provided elsewhere. They are open organisations, and open their doors to all. A number of not for profit organisations use spaces within these religious organisations, and they would find it difficult to find spaces elsewhere, e.g. tai chi classes that take referrals for Green Prescriptions, English language classes, walking groups for elderly, ...

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

If regulatory fees are increasing, I believe that services need to be reflective of that price increase, in terms of timeliness of the provided service

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

---

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments:

With the growth in the Tamaki area, it is important that access and community facilities are maintained, improved and expanded. More large-scale public art should be encouraged, and not just in the town centres

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 27 Feb 2019 16:04
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I object to the proposal to increase mooring fees to cover the costs of disposing of abandoned boats. Council should have details of all current mooring owners so should have sufficient information to pursue the owner of the mooring, if that owner has not paid the mooring tax, then it would be incumbent on the owner to provide contact details. The current proposal goes against the principle of user pays, you propose to make all users pay for the default of a few.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would allow for the efficient management of waterfront properties and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Rates must be applied equally to all properties, including those owned by religious bodies.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
At a glance it looks OK

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Must always reduce duplication in governance.
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I am writing to express my support for the recent revision to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. These organisations make untold contributions to the betterment of society with very little demand on local infrastructure or support.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
No

3. Local Board Information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
I am writing to express my support for the recent revision to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. These organisations make untold contributions to the betterment of society with very little demand on local infrastructure or support.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
## Annual Budget feedback

### Submitter details

- **Date received:** 27 Feb 2019 21:11
- **Attachment:**

### Feedback

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I don’t see how it can cost more to pick up rubbish in one area but cheaper in another there should be a flat rate that is not calculated by how much your house is worth. Food scraps there should be an option to opt out and instead have a worm farm. 80-95% of my food scraps are put in a worm farm. It already cost enough for council consent how much more can you expect people to pay.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
If it reduce doubling up and most likely costs

Auckland Council
Submitter details
Date received: 1 Mar 2019 10:18
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
I do not agree to spend money on upgrades until the facility is fully utilised or it has become unsafe for use by public. Do not spend money for the sake of spending and to justify the boards existence. By reducing unnecessary expenditure the overall rates rises can be avoided or reduced. The people are really struggling to pay their rates.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
It is good to have the ownership with council. But every time you change the structure it cost money and it is passed on to the rate payers. The poor rate payers always suffers.

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 1 Mar 2019 20:52
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,900 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
   and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Churches and grounds that house a vicarage, parish office and community hall and or preschool
activities should not have to be burdened with paying rates. These organisations are struggling to
exist as it is because of their outreach into the community that they have done for many years.
They will not be able to remain financially viable if they had to pay rates - they are struggling now.
Do not put these organisations at risk of closing because they can’t function day to day due to
costs. The community that surrounds churches is far reaching, and constantly touches people that
are at their lowest where they can find help and guidance in dark times. They must remain solvent.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about
$790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership
of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The
resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with
other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

Certainly do not burden religious organisations that are already struggling financially to continue
their outreach with land rates. These are not for profit organisations that would be crippled by
further rates costs.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,900 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and

- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Strongly agree with not charging rates on some parts of land owned by religious organisations. If rates charged on full property the entire rates for full property likely to be passed on to the commercial operations rather than just what relates to their portion of the land. The religious organisations approach will be that relates only payable as direct result of that operation, and therefore they must foot the entire bill. This will have an affect on what these organisations charge and in particular pre schools that operate out of religious organisations land.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I do not think rates should be charged on religious organisations land at all.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,900 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
• an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Happy

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Dont like the proposed new dog bylaws

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

They seem very community driven

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about
$790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership
of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The
resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with
other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

reduce duplication.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
That's city missions grant for 5 million be approved as they are always helping the struggling people of Auckland

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
Cause the poverty of Auckland is going up

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available - $68.3

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

## Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

Support

Auckland Council

|   |   |
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Council rates are getting more expensive reasonably by making things harder for landlords, homeowners and property development. Building consents, building control also has to complete with a lot of costs.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board Information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I am happy with the changes

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Clean safe water and storm water, sediment and sewage that is treated or trapped in a way that is safe for humans, birds, animals, fish and aquatic life.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
I believe they have the right priorities.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
It would be good to remove duplication and to ensure there is consistency in the approach to development of the land with plans for the rest of the city.

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I support those with the exception of not charging rates on some parts of land owned by religious organisations. This is inequitable and should not apply to one segment of the community.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Strongly support investment in transport - particularly building new cycle infrastructure.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Reducing duplication and improving consistency are positive

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 6 Mar 2019 07:18
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
We cannot charge & tax ourselves into prosperity. Council needs to 1st proof it can curb inhouse cost, than I will be keen for rates to increase if deemed needed. I do agree with extending the urban rating boundary though.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Scrap the CRL as it will continue to blow out with cost. This latest increase in cost is sure not the end. Can the thing Auckland Council is literally chucking billions down a hole (no pun intended)

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

---

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes

Comments
I took part in the workshops being held & hope funding is coming through.

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

Partially support it. Plans are OK. Aki needs to be a city to adore, but there just ain’t no money to make it happen. The CRL is sucking up all the funds & we CANNOT keeping taxing our people.

---

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 4 Mar 2019 22:47
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Increase in waste charges should be done based on the number of times your wheely bins are put out to encourage people to start to recycle and compost and be more environmentally friendly. Reward those who aren’t creating as much waste each week. There should be some charges on land owned by religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Encouraging people to take care of their land and city rather than charging those who are already doing a great effort more to cover the cost of those who are careless.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Because this is a large region, and a diverse region; we need to be doing more to encourage people to care about the land.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

n/a
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
More education is required for inorganic pick ups. - Too much illegal dumping. - Food scraps bins need to be pack and stack assistant.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
More work needs to be done on the G.I. Station and bus terminal projects.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
The board abby to staff council policy on illegal dumping in the area.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Annual Budget feedback
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Date received: 7 Mar 2019 10:39
Attachment:
Language: Chinese

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

If annual waste management charge is to be implemented, it can be charged based on the size of rubbish bin and the frequency of waste collection. This will encourage people to reduce the amount of waste they produce, and use them for soil enrichment.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 23 Mar 2019 22:34
Attachment:
Language: Chinese

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees)
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

If waste management fees are charged to every household, the fees could vary according to the size of the rubbish bin and the frequency of rubbish dumping. This could encourage residents to reduce the amount of waste and also encourage residents to convert waste to fertilizers.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
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Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I fully support the decision by Council not to charge rates on land used for religious purposes. Most churches and sacred buildings exist as places of worship and service, and most contribute a great deal to the social cohesion of the communities in which they are placed. Where they are offering their premises to other groups for hire, they are usually doing this partly to offer hospitality to community organisations and build a sense of neighbourhood, and partly to help cover the costs of their buildings. There is no profit motive at play. In fact, for many churches the cost of their facilities far exceeds what they might bring in from community use through the week. Churches and religious organisations rely on donations from their members in order to continue, and many are struggling to meet the costs of supporting their ministers and the programmes they offer out of these donations. The kinds of rates demands placed on them without consultation last year would have seen a number of churches facing closure. With the closure of religious properties would come a significant loss of care, connection, and belonging for those people the churches and religious groups serve in their wider communities. Religious worship, and the places that support worship, are part of the common good of our society. They operate outside of the model that dictates that every building and every organisation must act like a business. Therefore they shouldn't be treated like businesses or rated like businesses.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I also fully support the decision to allocate $5 million funding to the Auckland City Mission Home Ground building project. This is one of the most significant efforts to address homelessness in our city in years and it’s good to see the Council getting behind it.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I am happy to pay extra in one area of rates/targeted rates if this is balanced by a reduction in another area of rates that is not as much of a priority. For example, if waste, water and infrastructure are the priorities, let’s direct funds from less important areas to these areas. Auckland’s are not able to sustain continual rates increases. Our wages do NOT go up with inflation!! We are a “middle class” family with a modest mortgage and yet we still find it difficult to make ends meet at times. Recently we have had to adjust our budget, cutting out non-essentials, in order to pay for bills etc that must be paid. The Council MUST act in the same way: cut down on waste, eliminate non-essential spending and make use of the revenue already available. The exemption from rates for land occupied by churches was not on the list of exempted properties. Are church properties exempt? They should be included on this list.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I am very much into composting, so in some ways I support the food scraps collection idea. However, if families have a worm farm or two and a compost system, and do not need this service, they should not be charged. This type of collection should be on a use by use basis. I strongly believe that the Council could do more to operate within its means instead of continually holding out its hands for “more”. The majority of Auckland families have to operate their household budgets in this way and we deserve no less from our Council.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments:

The improvements to the waterfront (new cycle paths linking up to Point England Reserve and down to the Penmur Wharf) are a valuable investment in our area and will make the area more attractive and liveable for the growing population of our area. The new/updated playgrounds are a long-awaited and much-needed improvement and we are very grateful for the facilities available so close by. In the past we always thought of travelling elsewhere for good playgrounds and nice places to walk/exercise, now we are fortunate enough to have playgrounds and beautiful walking paths close by. We also definitely need to continue to support the youth in our area so that they can find gainful employment and studies.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with...
other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

**Partially support**

If the proposed transfer of legal ownership of these waterfront properties goes ahead, I would want assurances from Council that there would be no further cost to the ratepayer beyond the legal costs resulting from the transfer, ie. I would want to know that there are no further $100K salaried staff needing to be hired to manage the properties in some way. I would also want to be assured that the development of the waterfront areas continues as it is going, as Panuku is doing a fabulous job of improving the waterfront areas for the public use. I would not want to see the progress stalled. Also, I would want to be assured that the development would not suddenly be pushed further in to the Waitemata (similar to the Ports of Auckland) after the transfer of ownership.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
Poor communication with police and residents about crime and applying simple measures already recommended to reduce crime.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Council really slow and selective in tackling erosion problem by sea water and rain. Recommendation are not put into practise.

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I would like to comment in favour of the proposal to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. While I consider that religious organisations already have these exemptions under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, nevertheless council officers have determined that their legal advice states otherwise. I dispute this advice. I represent the Greenlane Presbyterian Church (GPC) based in Greenlane. Christian churches in our communities provide for the spiritual, social, educational and physical needs of not only their own parishioners but all members of society willing to receive their assistance. This has been consistently recognised by central government, since 1876, by way of an exemption from rates for properties by churches for the furtherance of their religious worship. It needs to be stressed that the religious worship of a modern church involves far more than Sunday services and the observance of communion and baptism at ceremonies in the so called "sanctuary". A modern church is first and foremost founded upon the concept of community, a place where people can gather, to worship, fellowship, learn and support others. A modern church building will reflect these various aspects of modern living, often incorporating spaces for fellowship around a meal. A large community church will naturally require a sizeable auditorium, supported by public meeting spaces, for example GPC has a large hall for kids programmes and hosting other community events, classrooms for Sunday school, small offices for staff and parking spaces (as required by council). To suggest that these are not all integral to the activities of the church, making some of them rateable, is to lack understanding of how a modern church functions. Our facilities are also made available for community use, covering a wide range of activities from choir rehearsals to dance classes and even restorative justice meetings. These uses are often not charged for or if they are they are not charged at commercial rates and provide a valuable community service. The unintended consequence of rating any of these activities will be that either the charges will need to be increased significantly, or churches may need to stop making those facilities available to the wider community to avoid the resulting ratings outcomes. This will result in a decrease in the availability of community facilities in the very location that council is trying to re-populate. I strongly support the council's plan in relation to exemptions from rates for religious organisations, but reiterate my belief that religious organisations are exempt from rates on most of these activities under the law as it has been interpreted since 1876.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,900 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Agree with not charging rates on not-for-profit community land/organisation but religious organisations should be paying for their fair share - especially as I'm assuming this would also apply to Sanitarium and their $300m+ business. I understand that costs increase, but there has been no explanation of the source of these increases, or detail on what has been done to find other ways of driving efficiency to keep costs stable or even reduce. Commercial entities are always looking for ways to drive cost out, so what is Council doing?

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
What is Council doing to minimise financial waste and/or become more efficient to reduce or at least stabilise costs that aren't directly and specifically linked to population growth? Sharing that, widely, with the people of Auckland may make your rate hikes more palatable.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments
Investment is needed in and around the Te Papapa train station to make it a safer and more appealing rail option for the community. If indeed driving public transportation usage is one of the key strategies for Council over the next decade. The addition of feeder buses from the Onehunga/Oranga/Te Papapa areas to either Te Papapa or Onehunga stations would also reduce bus traffic and travel times into the CBD, and promote higher rail usage.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

Do not support

I can't support this without further information. Where does the accountability sit? What benefit does Council and the people of Auckland gain from owning these properties vs Panuku and what is the cost of transfer? What is the overhead of having separated ownership vs management?
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Churches and religious organisations are of great worth to the City. They fill any gaps that are left by a lack of service from either the Government or the Council. Any change to the current zero rating of these institutions will hurt them. Any money they make from using their land goes back into the community. Why change the rating at all? Please dont rate religious organisations property (like the law says!)

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Orakei

Orakei Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
They seem well led, and quite involved with the local community as expected. They are also quite approachable.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Panuku are a law unto themselves. The people own the properties - Panuku is a trustee holder only - on our behalf. There is no way there should be more encroachment of the harbour by wharves (or Dolphins!)
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Please do not charge rates on church property or land as they are community spaces, funded by donations and provide valuable places & resources for the community.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
My feedback is solely in relation to the proposed change to not charge rates on some parts of land owned by religious organisations. I support the proposed changes in their entirety. Increasingly these organisations are providing much needed welfare support for Auckland residents and are providing halls and other facilities for community use. These community use facilities supplement those provided by Council and means that Council does not need to apply its own funds to develop and maintain the network of facilities that would otherwise be required. The proposed rates relief will provide these organisations with greater ability to maintain these services and facilities in an environment of ever escalating costs.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
No

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

**Annual Budget feedback**

**Submitter details**

*Date received:* 12 Mar 2019 10:13  
*Attachment:*  
*Language:* English

**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Watakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas
Item 21

Attachment A

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Wataekere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised...
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
### Annual Budget feedback

#### Submitter details
- **Date received:** 12 Mar 2019 13:34
- **Attachment:**
- **Language:** English

#### Feedback

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

   We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

   These charges include:
   - a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
   - extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
   - phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
   - adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
   - not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
   - an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I agree with changes proposed

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
From: Auckland Council
To: All Have Your Say
Subject: Annual Budget 2019-2020 HARD COPY feedback
Date: Tuesday, 12 March 2019 3:37:08 PM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

---

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 12 Mar 2019 15:36

---

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- Not changing rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
All changes seem reasonable, and not charging rates on land owned religious organizations is particularly important.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 13 Mar 2019 12:51
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I support the amendment to NOT charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

I agree with the first liver bullet points especially point five relating to the rates on the religious organizations owned land. Given many of the organizations provide free or heavily subsidized services to their local communities this work could not be maintained if rates were charged. I totally object to the final bullet point given the exceptionally poor processes provided by the council.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Your planning department is a disaster of bureaucracy that needs a radical shake up to get the builders back in charge and facilitate development rather than hinder it with exorbitant costs.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
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submitter details

Date received: 13 Mar 2019 15:20
Attachment:

feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Church rates - the latest policy is better than what was proposed but the Local Govt Rata 2002 says that land used primarily for religious workshop is fully non-rateable. Therefore, no rates should be charged on land mainly used for worship. This would include all parts of the facility which are necessary to maintain functionality i.e. car parking.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
From: Auckland Council
To: All Home/Your Say
Subject: Annual Budget 2019-2020
Date: Wednesday, 13 March 2019 3:12:23 PM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 13 Mar 2019 15:21

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
### 2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

### 3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

---

**Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback**

*In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?*

Yes

**Comments**

---

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

---

Auckland Council
Submission to Auckland Council Annual Budget 2019/2020

I, Chris Sutton, work in a professional capacity as Town Centre Manager for the Panmure Business Association, which represents the Panmure Business Improvement District. This submission is on behalf of the Panmure Business Association (PBA); the membership consists of 350 building and business owners whose buildings and businesses are situated in a defined Business Improvement District (BID) area in and around the town centre. The role of the Business Association is to support and promote that businesses community.

TO THE MAUNGAKIEKIE-TĀMAKI LOCAL BOARD

Key priorities for 2019/2020

The Panmure Business Association supports the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s priorities:

1. We will prioritise the securing of funding for the development of a civic space in the heart of the town centre for our community to gather and hold events. Creating a new civic space will add new life to the town centre and become the heart and central meeting place for the community. Planning for this civic space will make Panmure town centre a place with a positive future, the civic space will bring more people, services, employment and job opportunities into the area.

2. We will work with Panuku to unlock development opportunities around the centre and the transport hub. The PBA has been grateful for the support and engagement from the Panmure Unlock Team. We are thankful to the Local Board for facilitating the monthly workshops and encouraging Panuku to engage with key community groups and residents of the area.

3. We will be working with Auckland Transport (AT) over the next few years to ensure that there are positive outcomes for Panmure as a result of AMETI. The PBA has always recognised the importance of the AMET Eastern Busway project to be the catalyst for the redevelopment of Auckland Council land within the Panmure Business Improvement District. We recognise that without the removal of the Panmure Roundabout, the town centre will continue to stagnate. We have already seen the positive changes of the reduced volume in traffic around the Panmure Roundabout once Te Horeta Rd was opened, and the steadily increasing patronage of people using the new Panmure Rail Station. However, we are naturally apprehensive about the potential negative impact of the Stage 2 work that is starting in April. This work directly affects the entry/exit into the town centre and is physically close by to many businesses within our BID. The PBA will seek support from the Local Board if the planned lines of communication with AT and Fulton Hogan fail.

4. We will leverage development opportunities to give the Panmure town centre its own point of difference and enhance its historic character as well as work with Panmure Historical Society to protect and maintain the Panmure Stone Cottage. The physical structure of the Stone Cottage is an important reminder of Panmure’s 170 years of European history. The physical maintenance of the Stone Cottage and garden seems to have been very much an after thought in the Auckland Council’s budget and the sorry state of the roof, windows and doors are a testament to the neglect of the Council over the years. This building is a highly visible statement that acknowledges the settler history of Panmure and its importance as one of the early major settlements for the fledging city of Auckland. We fully support the Panmure Historic Society’s desire to promote the history of Panmure, conserve the interior of the cottage and collections as well as their desire to enhance the poorly maintain garden that surrounds the cottage. We support the removal of tree branches that currently ‘hide’ the building from public view. The adjoining car park is earmarked for development and the community is naturally anxious about what ‘development’ could look like. In the
early 1990’s, the community recommended that the triangular piece of land, be held in reserve as a historic Precinct. We look to the Local Board to ensure that the local ‘voice’ does not get drowned out and that by working with Panuku Development Auckland, the historic element of this area is enhanced for future generations who value Auckland’s history.

The PBA appreciates that the Local Board is keen to ensure that the voice of iwi is heard, and the PBA would be very supportive of any art work that reflects the pre-European history of this vibrant, productive and populated area of Auckland.

5. **Change the use and service specifications for the Panmure Hall so that our community can use this as a community centre.** Any consideration to improve the functionality of the Panmure Hall would be of huge benefit to our town centre. The Dunkirk Road Activity Centre gives a frame work to what a well-run community centre can look like. The PBA recommends the Local Board allocate funding for the refurbishment of two Panmure Hall spaces:

   1) the current Annex e
   2) the vacant space that was once the Citizens Advice Bureau.

We heartily support the funding of an enhanced coordinator role to oversee a more functional public space.

6. **Provide a range of recreational opportunities catering for community needs on local parks, reserves and beaches:**

   The June 2015 document, Panmure Basin Master Plan, page 8 comments: Review the skate park in consultation with the Skate community and in association with the Panmure Business Association. The PBA appreciates the work that has been done on the Panmure Basin Master Plan and acknowledges that the Plan will take some years to complete.

   At the 2019 Panmure Basin Fun Day on Sunday 10 February, the recently widened footpath in front of the Waipuna Hotel & Conference Centre, received many positive comments about its functionality to cater for a family group with buggies and strollers. We encourage the Local Board to consider planning for renewal the Skate Park, situated alongside of Lagoon Drive.

   Since the skate park was installed in 2004 and has been modestly maintained over the years. Speaking to attendees at the Fun Day Skate Competition, simple changes could be made to the surface of the concrete to make it less abrasive to the skin for any falls. Further, small adjustments to the existing site could be made (as seen in the top left drawing of the attached 2013 plan). The skate park is popular with children on scooters and BMX bikes which broadens the recreational use of this facility.

7. **Work with the Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum to identify, advocate for, and implement initiatives, that will improve the F rating of the Tāmaki Estuary.** The PBA supports development within our town centre but look to the Local Board to ensure that development does not negatively impact on the water quality and health of the Panmure Basin.

8. **Work with community groups to identify and protect birdlife such as the shag colony at Panmure Basin.**

   A unique feature of this area is the Pied shag colony, situated to the southern side of the Panmure Basin inlet and river. Due to over fishing and incidents with fishing lines the colony has reduced in size. The PBA encourages the Local Board to mitigate any adverse effect from current and future developments taking place in our area, and to support community who wish to ensure the long-term survival of the colony.

Thank you for giving the Panmure Business Association the opportunity to contribute to the Auckland Council Annual Budget 2019/2020.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Land owned by religious organisations I agree that no rates should be charged on church land used for: 1) Vicarage used to house clergy which is onsite or adjacent to the place of religious worship 2) Church hall used for community not-for-profit purposes including Alcoholics Anonymous 3) Not-for-profit childcare for the benefit of the community eg after & before school care 4) Onsite Parish office which exists for religious purposes 5) Church car parking serving multiple uses but primarily used for religious purposes.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Don’t agree with increasing fees associated with building houses eg building and resource consent. The regulations and fees already make building homes too difficult - we are desperately short of houses so raising fees makes it even harder.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Orakei

Orakei Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Items relating to North Shore and Waitakere are not relevant to our area

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I support the proposal that you will not be charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. In my experience, religious organisations provide critical community services that help many Aucklanders feel a sense of value and belonging. Religious organisations are funded through the generosity of their members, therefore any additional costs would negatively impact these non-commercial organisations. In addition, a number of churches are located in areas which are now prime real estate - this simply due to the fact that they have been around for so long. Imposing rates base on the land value would make it extremely difficult to operate these churches. Also, many of the churches are heritage buildings which are maintained at the cost of the members. These buildings enhance our community. Imposing further costs on these churches would make maintenance of the buildings that much more difficult.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Albert-Eden

Albert-Eden Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments:
Love the focus on communities and shared enjoyment of facilities. The more we can bring people together the better for all. Love the focus on open spaces and parks. So easy to zone land for housing, we need to ensure we prioritize green spaces

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Like the idea of simplicity in structure and efficiency
#2240

**From:** Auckland Council
**To:** AttachmentTeam@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
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**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Item 21

Attachment A

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

It is appropriate to transfer to Panuku since it is Council's agency.
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Fine for increase in waste management cost but whatever happened to the three bin approach AC was proposing I still want my food waste collected as I don’t have a garden to compost in and it’s just going to landfill! when the hell are you rolling it out? Resource consents and building consents are prohibitive for all but developers. Do not agree these costs should increase particularly as we have recently had to tell your planners the rules they should have known which almost meant we wouldn’t have been able to trust our new garage. Also highly pricey building consent!

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Ongoing rate increases pricing people out of their homes its fine while I’m working but based on the pension I won’t be able to afford to stay in my home when I stop working. With an aging population this is going to affect more and more people, do you just want us to fuck off to the provinces so you don’t have to provide services for us as we age? O

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

Some separation between the two agencies provides some checks and balances so I prefer some duplication.
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Feedback

Manukau helicopter crash, the proposal was not for the local board's share in 2023.

Local Board Information

1. Local Board Information

For drainage of impounded car parking needs to aid in water development and sell the activity that may be permanent e.g. car park.

2. What is important to you?

What is your opinion about this proposal?

The council's waterfront properties are rezoned to permit commercial businesses that increase competition. The council needs to act on event development and sell the activity that may be permanent e.g. car park.

Do you have any feedback on any other business?

2. What is important to you?

What is your opinion about this proposal?

The council's waterfront properties are rezoned to permit commercial businesses that increase competition. The council needs to act on event development and sell the activity that may be permanent e.g. car park.

Do you have any feedback on any other business?

2. What is important to you?
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 15 Mar 2019 09:32
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
resource consent, building control charges are already too high and detailed. Delegate this to external consultants and trust their advice and recommendations.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
STOP Quay street road works NOW and keep 4 lanes until you have an alternate traffic route.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
From: Auckland Council
To: Auckland Council
Subject: Annual Budget feedback
Date: Friday, 15 March 2019 10:01:27 AM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 15 Mar 2019 10:00
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Would expect religious organisations to pay for any services.

2. What is Important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
for what I have read I have no objections

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
As Panuku is a council department can’t see why they should actually be able to have abilities ownership gives, council only should have this.

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Rather than charge an extra $20 to cover increased costs - reduce the costs. Why don't religious organisations pay rates? They use the facilities. Reduce costs of regulatory fees rather than increasing them and charging more.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Council needs to change its fundamental attitude of saying costs have increased or "we need to do" and then increasing rates to cover. There are obvious economies in council operations where savings could and should be made. An example of this is roadworks - I have seen three "safety trucks" parked one behind the other protecting a single work area. Three drivers sitting around - one would be adequate (if even that is needed). Once upon a time a simple wooden barrier with a red lamp sufficed.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, improve consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Agree, provided that it reduces costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2411</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Property owned by religious organisations and used in any form for religious work should not be charged rates because of the social work such organisations do for the citizens, much of it unseen by many. The support not only to the homeless and needy but for the day to day support of those among us suffering from stress, mental illness, family problems and so on. Many as yet not obvious to authorities. The support of someone to listen, advise, guide and support people before they reach a crisis point is invaluable. Also the support to those within and outside their own community, particularly the aged is widespread. To tax further these organisations means they will be asking for help rather than supplying it!

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 15 Mar 2019 11:13
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I DO NOT REQUIRE A FOOD SCRAP BIN AS I COMPOST. THE GRASS EDGES AROUND MANY PARTS OF THE CITY ARE SO BADLY NEGLECTED, PLUS PICTURES IN THE PAPER OF THE NEGLECT OUTSIDE TAKAPUNA LIBRARY. WHAT A DISGRACE THIS CITY IS. WHERE IS OUR CIVIC PRIDE, ABSOLUTELY NEGLECTED. PEACH PARADE IN GREENLAME LOOKS SO DREADFUL. THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL STREET WITH CHERRY TREES LINING IT AND NOW LONG GRASS UNDERNEATH. ALSO, WHY WOULD COUNCIL PLANT A POHUTUKAWA TREE OUTSIDE 68 TEMPLE ST, MEADOWBANK, WHEN THE STREET HAS MAINLY CHERRY TREES ?? LOGIC AND COMMON SENSE HAS DISAPPEARED

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

CUT GRASS, PRESENTATION, NOT NEGLECT IN OUR STREETS. SO MANY OF THE PROPERTIES ARE OWNED BY CHINESE WHO HAVE NO IDEA WHATSOEVER OF GARDEN/STREET MAINTENANCE AND SO, THIS SHOULD BE A REQUIREMENT ADDED TO THEIR RATES IN AN EXTRA PAYMENT, THAT LAWNS BE TRIMMED BY TRADESMEN

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments
AS ABOVE

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

The upgrades to Auckland’s public transport system over the last few years have been very good. The train station upgrades and the introduction of double Decker buses have had a positive impact. More needs to be done to the transport system to help with congestion. With costs increasing in all areas, more needs to be done to keep rates and utility costs low.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

---

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Council ownership would help ensure this strategic asset be developed to a nature that is beneficial to the public.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Sounds reasonable

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Fees are not excessive so ok

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Reduce duplication means better use of funds
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Don't agree with the increase in mooring fees as I don't see how costs for maintain these have increased this much (7%).

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Mainly positive changes, which should work.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
No

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support

Auckland Council
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
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**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
All parts of the land owned by religious organisations should be charged rates. There should be NO increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control and mooring fees) to cover increased costs. Fees are already high whilst services provided poor, increasing fees is not justified.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Rates are already expensive enough but value of services provided are poor. It doesn’t feel like that the people designing the services actually use the services, therefore, they do not know what is of value.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
If it actually would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility, then I would support. However, confidence in Auckland Council’s ability to make it work is low.
Attachment A

Item 21

#2583

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 16 Mar 2019 07:32
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Do not support

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 16 Mar 2019 10:40
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Religious organisations should still pay their fair share of rates. Recourse consents are already too high, to an already unsustainable level. I don’t agree with more regulatory fees.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

There is lots of emphasis on getting people out of cars and into public transport but more could be done to get people to purchase mopeds, scooters and motorcycles. Look at all the highly populated Asian cities and the mass movement of people there. This is the answer to getting people out of cars. The type of people who don’t want to rely on public transport.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Duplication is silly. Let the other council arms who already manage other assets take care of this too.
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 16 Mar 2019 11:58
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
About time

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Our environment

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Do not support
I feel it will be managed badly too much room to hide

Auckland Council
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 16 Mar 2019 15:00
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

I think it will be very difficult for many religious organisations many of which are providing social services such as food bank support, counselling services and educational facilities, to cope with any significant rate increases. A lot of these organisations are also facing high insurance and earthquake strengthening costs. I support the proposal to not charge rates on some parts of property owned by religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $700 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 16 Mar 2019 15:53
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Charge the Rates to the Religious organisations if they do not serve their community in any positive way. Each organisation should furnish detailed account of land/buildings used in that way, or members regularly serving e.g. weekly teaching in local schools or helping in Food Banks etc.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I cannot believe that the Lawn clippings from Council cut Lawns are not gathered (EVEN OCCASIONALLY) but intentionally blown from the cut surfaces into the gutters, where they gather with dead leaves and block gutters and drains! Where are the Supervisors? No doubt the same people who tell the mower men to mow where the council gardeners have just planted rows of spring bulbs which never saw light of day!

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Agree there needs to be a small affordable rate increase each year to keep up with inflation.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Transport and community amenities such as footpaths, cycleways, parks, libraries

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support

Auckland Council
Attachment A

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
23 April 2019
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Support increased fees both annual waste management and regulatory; support food scraps expansion; support adjusting boundary to include recently urbanised areas. Do not support excluding religious organisations from rates, especially this broadly. If we’re discounting for social nonprofit activity why does to also have to be religious? I’m thinking of scout halls for example? Nope, religious organisations can be lucrative money makers and already get discounts and it’s an easy “cover” for commercial activity ie child care centres. ** Parking lots also need to become more regulated to start taking care of environmental issues (see water policy) and therefore need to pay rates to cover water quality costs NOT pay less.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

It’s important to me that city services and resources are funded properly so that it is done right the first time and we don’t waste money and time having to re-do shoddy or cheap work. Projects need to think about ongoing maintenance and storage and consumables. Especially important is respecting and caring for the workforce - the situation with Chorus and the fibre installation, and particularly treatment of permanent employees and contractors is a model for what is NOT ACCEPTABLE for public (or private) organisations.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

**Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback**

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Yes

Comments

I read the plans and they are consistent with what the board has been saying and doing in recent years.

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Makes sense to reduce duplication of governance and because Council is more accountable, accessible and transparent to the public and ratepayers.
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.07 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Religious organisations should have to pay rates like everyone else. Why should the ratepayers subsidise them. I'm not willing to pay a food scraps rate when I don't have food scraps. That isn't fair that I should subsidise people who throw out food. I don't. I understand resource consent costs are already too high.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
I shouldn't have to pay rates for services I don't use.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Do not support
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
23 April 2019
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I would like to comment in favour of the proposal to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations. While I consider that religious organisations already have these exemptions under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, nevertheless council officers have determined that their legal advice states otherwise. I dispute this advice. I represent the Community of St Luke in the Auckland Council area. Christian churches in our communities provide for the spiritual, social, educational and physical needs of not only their own parishioners but all members of society willing to receive their assistance. This has been consistently recognised by central government, since 1876, by way of an exemption from rates for properties by churches for the furtherance of their religious worship. It needs to be stressed that the religious worship of a modern church involves far more than Sunday services and the observance of communion and baptism at ceremonies in the so called “sanctuary”. A modern church is first and foremost founded upon the concept of community, a place where people can gather, to worship, fellowship, learn and support others. A modern church building will reflect these various aspects of modern living, often incorporating spaces for fellowship around a meal. A large community church will naturally require a sizeable auditorium, supported by public meeting spaces, possibly a hall for kids programmes and Sunday school, offices for staff and substantial parking spaces (as required by council). To suggest that these are not all integral to the activities of the church, making some of them rateable, is to lack understanding of how a modern church functions. Our facilities are also made available for community use, covering a wide range of activities. These uses are often not charged for or if they are they are not charged at commercial rates and provide a valuable community service. The unintended consequence of rating any of these activities will be that either the charges will need to be increased significantly, or churches will need to move out of the central city to where they can occupy cheaper land. This will result in a decrease in churches in the very location that council is trying to re-populate. I strongly support the council’s plan in relation to exemptions from rates for religious organisations, but reiterate my belief that religious organisations are exempt from rates on most of these activities under the law as it has been interpreted since 1876. In terms of the so-called commercial activities of churches such as kindergartens, the fact that they are profitable should not be the measure for charging rates on these activities. The test should be how those profits are utilised. If they enrich the community and enable the church to extend its benevolent activities for benefit the whole community then they should not be rated.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
I believe decisions such as putting the dolphins in the harbour should be made by the public and our elected representatives in the open, the public domain. Transferring assets back to Auckland Council should go some way to achieving this.
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 17 Mar 2019 20:30
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
A good consultation would have an option to provide feedback after each statement. Food scrap collection is good. This should be rolled out everywhere. Agree with adjusting the urban rate boundary. Religious organization should not be exempt from rates (unless charity)

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Increased access to public transportation, walking and cycling facilities.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
I would focus on creating cycle and walking facilities, create safe access to public transport. Very much in favour of creating a bus/train interchange station

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
#2902
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Religious organizations should not be rated in relation to properties and related properties which provide a community service to people and families. These are a vital to their needs and support them with love and sustenance. These are non profit organizations and rely on donations and volunteers to keep them going. It would be mean-spirited of the council to impose fees on any activity that provides such a valuable service especially in light of the tragedy which is unfolding in Christchurch where such support is vital to those in need.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
No

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Franklin and Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Franklin Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
Sustainability initiatives like recycling and encouraging Aucklanders to get active e.g. through developing paths, are great things to have as priorities in my opinion.

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments
I like the focus on maintaining the community feel through good design. Also supporting waste minimisation initiatives is important, glad this is being included.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
I support, as I have just read the about the proposed changes in the consultation document and agree with this justification around transferring so that ongoing maintenance can be focused on by council. “After the waterfront development is complete, Panuku will shift its focus to other areas of Auckland which need development as determined by the council. Given this, legal ownership of the waterfront properties would likely transfer to Auckland Council to allow Panuku to focus on its...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>development activities, while leaving Auckland Council to focus on the maintenance of public assets, consistent with some other development agencies such as those in the UK and Australia. This ownership model for the waterfront properties contrasts with the way Panuku operates in other development locations, in which Auckland Council holds legal ownership of the relevant properties while Panuku are given broad delegations to manage and develop them on council's behalf. This facilitates the transition from development to ongoing maintenance activities without the need for a transfer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

St Thomas - Tamaki has maintained our grounds fro 175 years. It sits in dominant location and is used by a number of organizations within the community. Its grounds are used by the general public and is host Maori ancestor's graves. As well as past parishioners.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

When roadwork's have taken place on roads such as kohimarama and St Heliers Bay road the council have used its carpark land (sometimes other facilities when the church is open) the carpark usage has sometimes received a donation for this service but the usage has also caused damage from he heavy trucks! Our church also promotes zero waste and initiative to be sustainable within our environment.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

I FULLY SUPPORT NOT CHARGING RATES ON SOME PARTS OF LAND OWNED BY RELIGIOUS ORGANISATIONS BECAUSE IF FULL RATES WERE CHARGED, SOME CHURCHES WOULD CLOSE BECAUSE OF INCREASED COSTS. THIS WOULD ALSO MEAN THEIR HALLS WOULD DISAPPEAR AND A LOT OF CLUBS WOULD LOSE THEIR VENUES WHICH MEANS LOCALITIES LOSE MEETING PLACES.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Religious organisations have never paid rates, I believe, so I most definitely wish this situation to continue. Such organisations would struggle and close down if added financial burdens were to be demanded of them - and we as a people need these organisations.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I would like the $5 millions donation to the city mission who support city’s homeless to be brought to pass. As a city the situation of the homeless is terrible for everyone and any financial support - such as the proposed $5 millions for the homeless - is a very good step. I support any initiative of the city mission to empower the homeless and struggling people and would endorse any Council initiative towards this.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

---

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

**What is your opinion about this proposal?**

---

Auckland Council
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Reduce rates and fees

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support

Auckland Council
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Agree with all of these

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
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Date: Sunday, 17 March 2019 11:41:43 AM

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.

Attachment A

Submission details

Date received: 17 Mar 2019 11:41
Attachment:
Language:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
• a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs → Disagree

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

Rates should be charged on the land owned by religious organisations. As far as I know, they own a lot of land and some religious organisations trade the houses they own like property agencies. They should not only benefit their followers but also the society. I think rates should be charged.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

This issue I'm going to talk about does not necessarily relate to the theme in question, but I still want to put forward this to the government. The lawns on both sides of streets used to be regularly mown by people assigned by the government, but later residents became responsible for mowing the lawns, which has made things less organized. People mow their lawns at different times. The lawns in front of the houses without residents are full of unattended grass, which could reach people's calves. It is so ugly. I suggest the government take over the lawn mowing, which will increase job opportunities and make the city tidier and more beautiful.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Land rates increase every year. So do rubbish collection fees. How can us retired people enjoy our retirement? When the government is developing policies, have you thought about old people?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 17 Mar 2019 20:22
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

[the second point is marked 'disagree'; all the other points are marked 'agree']

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available. I think food scraps can only be used to make environment-friendly fertilizers. Ms. Li Yanling, the responsible person for our Chinese environmental protection education trust, held events to make an environment-friendly fertilizer called “Baoyeoshi”. This can solve the problem of food scraps. Why is there a need to extend the food scraps targeted rate? I took part in the event to learn how to make environment-friendly fertilizers organized by the Chinese environmental protection education trust in July 2012. I have used food scraps to make 200+ barrels of environment-friendly fertilizers, which are used to fertilize melons, vegetables, beans and fruit trees, and I've seen good results.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
Doubling Budget Feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 18 Mar 2019 09:54
Attachment:
Language:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees
We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area
  to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period
  (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised
  areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees

Having trouble viewing this email? Click here.
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

We would like to comment in favour of the proposal to not charge rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organizations. While we consider that religious organizations already have these exemptions under the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, nevertheless council officers have determined that their legal advice states otherwise. We represent the MATAGALUEGA METOTISI SAMOA PANMURE (Methodist Church of NZ Panmure Samoa Parish) in the Auckland Council area. Christian churches in our communities provide for the spiritual, social, educational and physical needs of not only their own parishioners but all members of society willing to receive their assistance. This has been consistently recognized by central government, since 1876, by way of an exemption from rates for properties by churches for the furtherance of their religious worship. It needs to be stressed that the religious worship of a modern church involves far more than Sunday services and the observance of communion and baptism at ceremonies in the so-called "sanctuary". A modern church is first and foremost founded upon the concept of community, a place where people can gather, to worship, fellowship, learn and support others. A modern church building will reflect these various aspects of modern living, often incorporating spaces for fellowship around a meal. A large community church will naturally require a sizeable auditorium, supported by public meeting spaces, possibly a hall for kids programmes and Sunday school, offices for staff and substantial parking spaces (as required by council). To suggest that these are not all integral to the activities of the church, making some of them rateable, is to lack understanding of how a modern church function. Our facilities are also made available for community use, covering a wide range of activities, such as funeral, birthday celebrations, health activities etc. These uses are often not charged for or if they are they are not charged at commercial rates and provide a valuable community service. The unintended consequence of rating any of these activities will be that either the charges will need to be increased significantly, or churches will need to move out of the central city where they can occupy cheaper land. This will result in a decrease in churches in the very location that council is trying to re-populate. We strongly support the council’s plan in relation to exemptions from rates for religious organizations.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 14 Mar 2019 21:08
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Attachment A

Item 21

Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 2 Apr 2019 13:33
Attachment: 
Language: 

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

---

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details
Date received: 14 Mar 2019 21:32
Attachment:

Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

I don’t drive much so I won’t be paying much fuel tax. But every cent collected from motorists must be spent on what motorists want which is free, unrestricted roads and free parking everywhere. Nothing else is acceptable. You must get on with reopening the roads up One Tree Hill and Mt Eden etc. We hear a lot about user pays but the corollary of that is payer says. Anyone who fails to understand the above is out of office.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

---

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $730 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Auckland Council
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Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 14 Mar 2019 21:45
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I think religious organisations should pay rates.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
No

Comments
More investment needs to be made on safer streets. Bike lanes, speed reduction. We have a considerable volume of commuter traffic in Onehunga that uses residential side streets to avoid the busy arterial roads. Importantly we also need investment to provide safe routes for children on bikes.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
The council should hold these properties with a long term view. Public control of key waterfront properties is vital to maintain access for future generations.
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 14 Mar 2019 22:11
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Am fine with those changes

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Off the lead dog area in One Tree Hill away from Farm Animals

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback
In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Yes
Comments

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I think that if there are to be rates increases for most ratepayers - some who don't have the money for it, as Aucklanders we shouldn't be allowing religious organisations not to pay their fair share.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Maintaining the neighbourhood - access to nature, safe streets with good lighting, increased noise control officers especially in summer and around holidays. Also, please resume cutting teh grass in the berms ad parks regularly. When neighbours can't do this, it increases the risk of rats in the area.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

I agree that we should upgrade and maintain current facilities. I would like to see more of this work in the area of Tamaki where I live - this area has had little to no development, unlike the Onehunga area and along the Tamaki River

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Partially support

Only if this change results in reduces cost to Aucklanders and we do not lose the asset
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
Action on climate change supporting aucklanders to have access to locally grown food, realistically priced and reliable public transport, open spaces supporting biodiversity recreation and food production

3. Local Board Information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?
Partially

Comments
Provide equal support across the local board area. Better playgrounds and facilities for young people in riverside oranges glen innes and panmure. Focus on safe cycling and walking routes Community food sources

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
Consider climate change and future proof water front
### Annual Budget feedback

**Submitter details**

**Date received:** 15 Mar 2019 07:41  
**Attachment:**

**Feedback**

1. **Changes to rates and fees**

   *We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.**

   These charges include:
   - a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
   - extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
   - phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
   - adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
   - not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
   - an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

**Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:**
Food scrap service should be optional and fees charged to those who opt in. We have a waste disposal unit and a compost bin, so no food scraps go in our bin. Why should we and others like us pay for a service we won’t use. Don’t increase regulatory fees as they are already too high. Cut your own cloth, become more efficient and leave fees as they are. Resource consent applications are unnecessarily too complicated (and therefore expensive) because of the complexities of the legislation. Lobby central government to change the Act so it’s more user friendly and cheaper to use.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

The Unitary plan is fundamentally flawed. Bringing thousands of more people (and by default, cars) into the isthmus region is madness. The reading cannot cope as it stands. Where are the new hospitals, schools, water and wastewater facilities. Any infill/multihousing development should be applied outside of the isthmus area.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki and Ōtara-Papatoetoe

---

**Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback**

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Investment should be in dedicated cycle parks, don’t limit access to roading for motor vehicles.

---

**Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board feedback**

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

Admission to swimming pools should not be free. Subsidized through rates yes, free no.

---

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of these properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are
Strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support

Auckland Council

#3194
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

How about extending the rates relief to properties which are part of SEAs, in return for owners agreeing to abide by certain principles of ecological stewardship?

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

I do not support charging rates on land owned by religious organisations. They are not businesses out to make profits but they support so many charities and social services often used by government social services to "fill in gaps" of community needs. The facilities are also used by many community organisations - which already reduces the pressure on rates needed for such services. It seems iniquitous to expect churches etc to pay thus be doubly rated.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
I don’t think church or religious organisations should be charge on rates due to non profit organisations

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?
Annual Budget feedback

Submitter details

Date received: 20 Mar 2019 14:54
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
#3756

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you? Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

**Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment**

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Submitter details

Date received: 20 Mar 2019 15:03
Attachment:

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
## Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
Please properly consider the low-income group’s affordability when making changes to fees.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Transferring the ownership to Auckland Council will help with comprehensive planning and development.
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020. These changes include:

- A $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- Extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- Phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- Adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- Not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- An increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees
and animal management) to cover increased costs.

Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

If waste fees are charged to residents, the fees could vary according to the size of rubbish bins and the frequency of rubbish dumping in order to encourage people to reduce the amount of waste and encourage people to convert waste to fertilizers.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of these properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Support
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:

1. Against the increase to the annual waste management charge. Increased costs cannot be solved by only resorting to fee increase, but should consider the following: a. how to improve the effectiveness of recycling; b. improve the current services; c. the new bin service system in Waitakere and North Shore necessary to implement? Will the costs of implementation be accurately reported? Government organisations should strictly make sure that there will be no waste of the public’s money and there will be no false report of the expenditure. There should be a way to monitor the budget.

2. What is important to you?

Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

Food scraps collection service should not charge fees. If this service is to be implemented across the board, it should be free to encourage the residents to cooperate so as to make better use of the waste and reduce waste, isn’t it? I agree on cancelling the Waitakere sewerage service fee. I agree on charging the rural residential properties that receive urban services, and there should be a comprehensive check on whether there are similar property rates that have not been charged. Religious use properties should be charged rates regardless of profit or not-for-profit purposes, so that the rate incomes can be fairly distributed to other religious properties in poorer suburbs. I agree on increasing/adjusting fees and charges with regards to resource consents, building control, mooring, etc.

3. Local Board information

Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board feedback

In your opinion, are the priorities right for this local board area in 2019/2020?

Partially

Comments

In addition to the current budget plan, the government should have budget for educational courses for the public in order to promote reducing the waste of water resources and rubbish. This will effectively help with the Council’s aim to reduce costs and the public will not need to pay unnecessary rates or suffer from fee increases.

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment

Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.
What is your opinion about this proposal?

Do not support

The supplementary document regarding Panuku development and ownership transfer has not made it clear why there is a need to transfer the ownership. For example, how much will be the increase to rate income due to the transfer after July 1, 2019? Are there any challenges in management at the moment? I can't see the purpose and rationale of this transfer? Why on earth is there a need to transfer the legal ownership of Panuku? Any inner secrets?
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Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These changes include:

- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
should not increase some regulatory fees and the annual waste management charge

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support
Annual Budget feedback
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Feedback
1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.
These changes include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
- While I think it's a good idea to have a separate bin for food scraps, it's unfair to charge targeted rate on this service. Current rates are already too expensive. - It's unfair to not charge the property rates on the the land owned by religious organisations.

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?

3. Local Board Information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?
Maungakiekie-Tamaki

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council's urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Partially support
I hope the development costs do not fall back on the ratepayers.
Attachment A

Feedback

1. Changes to rates and fees

We are proposing a small number of rating and fee changes for 2019/2020.

These charges include:
- a $20.67 increase to the annual waste management charge to cover increased costs
- extending the food scraps targeted rate to 2,000 properties in the former North Shore trial area to whom the service is available
- phasing out the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate over a two-year period (2019/2020 - 2020/2021)
- adjusting the urban rating boundary to apply urban rates to 400 properties in recently urbanised areas (that receive the same services as their adjacent urban neighbours)
- not charging rates on some parts of the land owned by religious organisations, and
- an increase to some regulatory fees (such as resource consent, building control, mooring fees and animal management) to cover increased costs.
Please tell us what you think about some or all of these changes:
1. support this charge 2. this could be trialed 3. this benefits the public 4. this benefits people living near suburbs 5. this could be trialed

2. What is important to you?
Do you have any feedback on any other issues?
[answer to Q3] 3a: East Auckland 3b: Yes To have a green city, it's important to manage waste and waste water and should attach importance to this.

3. Local Board information
Which local board(s) do you want to provide feedback to?

Proposed 10 Year Budget Amendment
Panuku is Auckland Council’s urban development agency and currently owns and manages about $790 million of city centre waterfront properties. We are proposing to transfer the legal ownership of those properties to Auckland Council. Panuku would continue to manage the properties. The resulting ownership structure would reduce governance duplication, increase consistency with other development areas and maximise future flexibility. The city centre waterfront properties are strategic assets so we want to know what you think of the proposal.

What is your opinion about this proposal?
Support