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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities

This committee is an ad-hoc committee of the whole of the Governing Body which is established in times of emergency. It will assume the functions and power of all governing body committees (and sub-committees), except for the Audit and Risk Committee, and its responsibilities include all the responsibilities of the Governing Body which can legally be delegated as well as the responsibilities of all the committees it assume the functions and power for.

Powers
(i) All the powers of the Governing Body which can legally be delegated, except those of the Audit and Risk Committee.
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting

- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff

- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members

- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Emergency Committee:

confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 14 May 2020, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

5 Public Input

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than one (1) clear working day prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of thirty (30) minutes is allocated to the period for public input with five (5) minutes speaking time for each speaker.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public input had been received.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to five (5) minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give one (1) day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.
7 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion.”
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To enable the committee to be briefed on the COVID-19 pandemic, Auckland Emergency Management status and council’s response.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Ian Maxwell, Director Executive Programmes, Phil Wilson, Group Recovery Manager, as well as Kate Crawford or Mace Ward, Group Controllers, Auckland Emergency Management will provide a verbal briefing.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Emergency Committee:

a) receive the report and thank Ian Maxwell, Director Executive Programmes, Phil Wilson, Group Recovery Manager, Kate Crawford and Mace Ward, Group Controllers, Auckland Emergency Management for the briefing on the COVID-19 pandemic and the Auckland Emergency Management status update.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sarandra O'Toole - Kaiarataki Kapa Tohutohu Mana Whakahaere / Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation part 1 - local board feedback

File No.: CP2020/05832

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide an overview of local board feedback on the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 first round of consultation (at that time the Emergency Budget was referred to as the Annual Budget).

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
The report would normally go before the Finance and Performance Committee, however, in light of COVID-19, it must now be considered by the Emergency Committee

2. As part of Auckland Council’s shared governance model, local boards have a legislative role to provide input on regional plans, such as the annual plan. For this year’s Emergency Budget, local boards achieve this in two key ways:
   - Preparing local board agreements to be included in the Emergency Budget (Volume 2) – this includes local board projects, budgets, performance measures and local fees and charges for 2020/2021
   - Providing feedback on regional proposals

3. From 21 February to 22 March 2020, the council consulted with the public on the Annual Budget. Each local board has now considered community feedback received for their local area and resolved feedback on the Annual Budget for the consideration of the Governing Body.

4. Local boards will adopt their local board agreements between 20 to 24 July 2020 and the Governing Body will then adopt the Emergency Budget on 30 July 2020.

5. This report summarises feedback from local boards and focuses on common themes. As such, it does not include all of the matters raised in local board resolutions. A complete set of the local board resolutions are provided in Attachment A.

6. Key themes arising from those local boards that resolved on regional issues include:
   - The majority of local boards support all three key proposed changes to targeted rates for:
     o waste management (14 support / 1 do not support)
     o refuse collection in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas (15 support)
     o Waitākere rural sewerage service (12 support).
   - A few local boards provided feedback on the other proposed changes. Those that did support the:
     o changes to charges for pool fencing inspections (5 support)
     o changes to some building and resource consent fees (2 support)
     o new and increased regulatory fees and charges to recover costs (2 support)
     o draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021 (2 support)
Item 9

- introduction of a targeted rate scheme to assist ratepayers in Clevedon with connection to Watercare’s reticulated wastewater and water system (1 support).
- The only proposal that was not supported by local boards was the introduction of HomeFit assessments to the Retrofit Your Home Scheme (2 do not support)

7. The council is now considering what the impacts of COVID-19 are likely to be, and plan to ask Aucklanders for their views on a proposed Emergency Budget.

8. The local boards would normally resolve on their advocacy initiatives for inclusion in their local board agreements. However, due to the pressure on timeframes, staff capacity and budget, this year’s Emergency Budget document will only include the parts that are statutory requirements to the local board agreements. As advocacy initiatives are not a statutory requirement for the council’s Emergency Budget and local board agreements, they will not be included in this year’s Emergency Budget document.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Emergency Committee:

a) consider feedback from local boards when making decisions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation part 1.

Horopaki

Context

9. An annual plan sets out Auckland Council’s priorities for a financial year and how the council plans to pay for them. The Governing Body is responsible for the regional elements of the annual plan and local boards develop annual local board agreements which are agreed between the local boards and Governing Body, and are included in the annual plan.

10. From 21 February to 22 March 2020, the council consulted with the public on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021. Overall, the council received feedback through written feedback (including online and hardcopy) and in-person feedback (e.g. Have Your Say events). In total there were more than 4750 pieces of feedback, which included:

- 3820 written responses, with two thirds of these received digitally
- over 900 people attending one of 44 Have Your Say or community events, providing over 930 feedback points.

11. Local boards considered consultation feedback related to their local board area and then passed resolutions detailing their feedback.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

12. After considering feedback from their communities, local boards resolved on their regional feedback at their business meetings between 4 – 15 May 2020. This report summarises feedback from local boards and focuses on common themes. As such, it does not include all the matters raised in local board resolutions. The full set of local board resolutions are provided in Attachment A (local board resolutions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021).

13. As part of consultation, Aucklanders were asked their opinion on several proposed rating and fee changes, the three key proposals related to the:

- waste management targeted rate
- refuse collection in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas
- Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.
14. The other proposals were:
   • changes to charges for pool fencing inspections
   • changes to some building and resource consent fees
   • new and increased regulatory fees and charges to recover costs
   • the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021
   • the introduction of HomeFit assessments to the Retrofit Your Home Scheme
   • the introduction of a targeted rate scheme to assist ratepayers in Clevedon with connection to Watercare’s reticulated wastewater and water system
   • the expansion or establishment of five Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and targeted rates.

Waste management targeted rate

15. Aucklanders were asked if they support a $19.97 increase to the waste management targeted rate to cover increased costs. The cost of responsibly dealing with Auckland’s kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions. The council proposed to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate. If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.

16. The majority of local boards that provided feedback on this change supported an increase to the waste management targeted rate to cover increased costs. These local boards are: Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Papakura, Puketapapa, Rodney, Upper Harbour, and Waitematā local boards (14 local boards).

17. Ōrākei Local Board (1 local board) did not support an increase to the waste management targeted rate, and requests further consultation be undertaken on this proposal considering the COVID-19 pandemic.

Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

18. Aucklanders were asked if they support a $14.23 increase to the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City targeted rate to cover increased costs. In other parts of the city, residents pay for their collection via Pay As You Throw. The targeted rate for the former Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas no longer meets the cost of collection. If we do not do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those living outside these two areas who would subsidise residents within them.

19. All local boards that provided feedback on this change supported an increase to the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City targeted rate to cover increased costs. These local boards are: Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketapapa, Rodney, Upper Harbour, and Waitematā local boards (15 local boards).

Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

20. Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pumpout service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal of this service in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour Local Board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area said they wanted to keep the service. The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43.

21. This year, Aucklanders were asked if they support removing the septic tank pumpout service funded by a targeted rate in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour Local Board areas, and continuing it for those in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area and recovering the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $260 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.
22. If we do not do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

23. The majority of local boards that provided feedback on this change supported an increase to the Waitākere rural sewerage service targeted raterate to cover increased costs. These local boards are: Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Puketāpapa, Rodney, Upper Harbour, and Waitmatā local boards (12 local boards).

24. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board, whose area includes the ratepayers who will be most affected by this change, supports the Waitākere rural sewerage pump out service continuing without increasing the targeted rate, recognising that rural sewerage systems are part of the regional infrastructure and recognising the public good outcomes it supports.

25. Waitākere Ranges Local Board has provided detailed feedback on this proposal which can be found on pages 34-35 of Attachment A (local board resolutions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021).

26. Henderson-Massey noted the minimal impact for Henderson-Massey residents, and support bringing on-site wastewater systems under a regional compliance scheme, noting that improving water quality is a major issue for Auckland.

Changes to charges for pool fencing inspections

27. The council proposed to replace the $130 first inspection fee for pool fencing inspections with an annual targeted rate of $44 for all private pool owners.

28. All of the local boards that provided feedback on this change supported it. These local boards are: Manurewa, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa, and Waitmatā local boards (5 local boards).

Changes to some building and resource consent fees, and new and increased regulatory fees and charges to recover costs

29. The council proposed changes to some building and resource consent fees and deposits to better align with actual costs and improve customer experience, such as changes to the structure and level of some resource consent and building control fees.

30. The council proposed to introduce some new regulatory fees (or deposits) and raise some fees including:
   - scooter licensing – new deposit to be introduced for commercial operators
   - the high impact commercial event permit - increase fee from $1,100 to $1,500 (including GST)
   - Auckland Botanic Gardens – introduce an entry charge of $20 for international visitors.

31. Only Manurewa and Papakura local boards (2 local boards) provided feedback on these changes. They both supported the changes to some building and resource consent fees to improve transparency. They also both supported the proposed new and increased regulatory fees to recover costs. Both specifically stated their support for the introduction of an international visitor fee for the Auckland Botanic Gardens to fund the upgrading of facilities and promotion to overseas markets.

The draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

32. The Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 (the Act) requires that the Tūpuna Maunga Authority prepare an Annual Operational Plan to provide a framework in which the council will carry out the routine management of the 14 Tupuna Maunga, under the direction of the Maunga Authority. This must be prepared and adopted concurrently with the council’s annual plan and included in summary form. A summary of the draft Operational Plan 2020/2021 was included in the Supporting Information for the Annual Budget Consultation Document.
33. Hibiscus and Bays, and Rodney local boards (2 local boards) supported the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021.

34. The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board have provided detailed feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021 in a memo to the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority members. This can be found on pages 6-9 of Attachment A (local board resolutions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021). No other local boards provided feedback on this.

Introduction of HomeFit assessments to the Retrofit Your Home Scheme

35. The council proposed to change the Retrofit Your Home scheme to require a New Zealand Green Building Council HomeFit Assessment for all new applications of more than $2,000. The HomeFit assessment will help homeowners make the best decisions about upgrading their home. The HomeFit assessment costs $260 (excluding GST) and this will be added to the amount of financial assistance provided.

36. Manurewa and Papakura local boards (2 local boards) did not support the Introduction of HomeFit assessments to the Retrofit Your Home Scheme, stating the additional cost and bureaucracy may discourage some homeowners from taking part in the scheme.

37. The Puketāpapa local board did not state if they support or do not support this proposal but noted that it aligns well with the local board’s Low Carbon Action Plan particularly the action area “Low Carbon Homes and Buildings”.

Introduction of a targeted rate scheme to assist ratepayers in Clevedon with connection to Watercare’s reticulated wastewater and water system

38. Water and wastewater networks have recently been extended to the Clevedon area. Residents now have the opportunity to switch from their on-site systems to the reticulated network. To help Clevedon ratepayers with their connection costs, the council proposed introducing a voluntary financial assistance scheme. Ratepayers within the service area will be able to apply to us to pay their upfront connection costs. They will pay this back through a targeted rate over 15 years.

39. The only local board to provide feedback on this proposal was Franklin Local Board, whose local board area includes Clevedon. The board supported the provision of an ‘opt-in’ targeted rate to facilitate connection to the reticulated and wastewater supply in Clevedon repay through rates, noting that connection is not available to all Clevedon residents at this time.

The expansion of or establishment of five Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and targeted rates

40. The council proposed five changes to BID targeted rates to support the following business associations:
   • establishment of Central Park Henderson and One Warkworth BIDs and new targeted rates
   • extension of the Glen Innes, Manukau Central and Manurewa BIDs and increasing the targeted rates.

41. The proposed new BIDs and BID expansions are in six local board areas. These are: Henderson-Massey, Rodney, Ōrākei, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, and Manurewa local boards.

42. Local boards are required to endorse any new local targeted rate proposals or BID targeted rate proposals in their local board area (noting that any new local targeted rates and/or BIDs must have been consulted on before they can be implemented).
43. Most of the local boards supported the BIDs proposals in their local board area. These local boards are: Henderson-Massey (subject to receiving further information, intended at the 19 May 2020 business meeting), Rodney, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, and Manurewa local boards (4 local boards). Ōrākei and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local boards noted the Glen Innes BID expansion has been postponed.

44. In addition, Whau Local Board note that the majority of submitters from the local board area generally supported the proposals set out in the consultation document.

45. Three local boards; Hibiscus and Bays, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu and Rodney Local Boards, deferred providing feedback until after Emergency Budget consultation part 2 has been completed and feedback reported to local boards.

Local board advocacy
46. The council is now considering what the impacts of COVID-19 are likely to be, and plans to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed Emergency Budget (Consultation part 2).

47. This will put considerable pressure on the timeframes and staff capacity. For this reason, this year’s Emergency Budget document will only include the parts that are statutory requirements. Normally local boards are requested to approve any advocacy initiatives for consideration by the Governing Body and inclusion (as an appendix) to the local board agreements. As it is not a statutory requirement to include this, these will not be included this year.

48. This triennium a longer-term approach has been taken to progress initiatives that are unable to be funded by local board budgets. This approach used the annual plan, long-term plan (10-Year Budget) and local board plan processes to progress and advise on a narrower range of local board initiatives, in a more comprehensive way.

49. As part of the 10-Year Budget 2018-2028, additional funding was provided to progress the priority advocacy initiative of each local board (the One Local Initiative (OLI)). All OLIs are progressing with funding either allocated or earmarked in the 10-Year Budget.

50. Some of the local boards have recommended that the Governing Body continue the commitment to their OLIs. These local boards are: Franklin, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Rodney, Waitākere Ranges, and Waitematā local boards. Some local boards also noted that the projects may generate local employment opportunities, which is significant for the economic recovery from COVID-19.

51. Other advocacy initiatives have been included in the local board’s resolutions; these can be found in Attachment A (local board resolutions on the Annual Budget 2020/2021).

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
52. There is a neutral climate impact from the matters outlined in this report. The report summarises feedback on proposals that relate to the allocation of charges, rather than decisions on activities to be undertaken.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

53. The changes proposed in the consultation had been communicated to and agreed on by the following departments or business units of the Auckland Council group prior to this consultation:
   - Waste Solution
   - Healthy Waters
   - Regulatory Services
   - Parks Sports and Recreation
   - Arts Community and Events
   - CCO/External Partnerships
   - Legal and Risk.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

54. Local boards have been involved throughout the development of the Annual Budget, including:
   - local board chairs attending Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Annual Budget
   - engaging with communities on the Annual Budget.

55. Local board views and feedback on the regional aspects of the Annual Budget are provided in this report.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

56. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. The annual plan, including local board agreements, are important tools that enable and can demonstrate the council’s responsiveness to Māori.

57. The total number of submissions relating to the first round of consultation from individuals who identified as Māori was 262 (compared to 115 in the 2019/2020 Annual Budget consultation), this represents 9 per cent of all submitters.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

58. The annual plan is a statutory process which must be completed every year. The Council budget provides for the resourcing to deliver this project.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

59. The Governing Body needs to consider feedback from local boards as this is a legislative requirement and part of Auckland Council’s shared governance model.

60. The council plans to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (consultation part 2).
61. Local boards will receive the feedback from Aucklanders from consultation part 2, and will provide their feedback to the Governing Body following this.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

62. Decisions made from the Annual Budget consultation part 1 will be incorporated into the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

63. The council will ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed Emergency Budget. This consultation will take place from 29 May 2020 to 19 June 2020.

64. Local boards will adopt their local board agreements between 20 to 24 July 2020 and the Governing Body will then adopt the Emergency Budget on 30 July 2020.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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Albert-Eden

15 Albert-Eden Local Board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

A copy of the Albert-Eden Local Board written feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 is available on the Auckland Council website via the link below:

https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say/topics-you-can-have-your-say-on/annual-budget-2020-2021/Pages/submissions-received-.aspx

Resolution number AE/2020/1

MOVED by Chairperson M Watson, seconded by Member J Maskill:

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the Albert-Eden Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) note that 79 per cent of submitters either partially-support or support the Albert-Eden Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, which are:

i. Priority 1: We will focus on projects which connect communities, especially those experiencing change, and work with other organisations in development areas to assist new residents to feel welcome and part of our community.

ii. Priority 2: We will plan for when and where we provide facilities in our parks such as toilets, shade, shelter, water or play.

iii. Priority 3: We will prioritise upgrading our community centres, libraries and halls.

iv. Priority 4: We will investigate building developments at Windmill and Nixon Parks, and implement upgrades at School Reserve and the former bowling greens at Nicholson Park.

v. Priority 5: We are working on a revised approach for Chamberlain Park including development of a local park and walking and cycling connections, restoration of Waititiko (Meola Creek) and wetland area, while retaining an 18-hole golf course.

vi. Note that there is significant comment from submitters on the need to increase funding for environmental initiatives.

vii. Note that there are a diversity of views from submitters regarding Chamberlain Park.

c) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

d) provide the following feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021:

i. support the proposed changes to the waste management targeted rate

ii. support the proposed changes to the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

iii. support the proposed changes to the Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

e) appreciate the feedback provided by Albert-Eden Local Board residents on the Local Board Priorities.
CARRIED
Aotea / Great Barrier

13 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: changes to original recommendation under clause c) and the addition of new clauses d) and e) were incorporated with the agreement of the meeting.

Resolution number GBI/2020/2

MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Member P O'Shea:

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Aotea / Great Barrier local board area.

c) have no further feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Consultation part 1) at this time.

d) delegate the chairperson, in consultation with the board, to provide feedback to help the Governing Body determine its draft Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Consultation part 2), referred to as the “Emergency Budget”, by Monday 18 May 2020.

e) note that there will be additional feedback on the annual budget proposals following the second tranche of public consultation on the Emergency Budget (Consultation part 2).

CARRIED
Devonport-Takapuna

15 Local board input and feedback into the 2020/2021 Annual Budget

A copy of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board written feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 will be available on the Auckland Council website.

Resolution number DT/2020/3

MOVED by Member R Jackson, seconded by Member T Deans:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) as part of phase one of the 2020/2021 Annual Budget:

i) receives the consultation feedback on the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board priorities for the 2020/2021 financial year.

ii) receives the consultation feedback on the 2020/2021 Annual Budget regional topics.

vii) provides feedback on the following Annual Budget 2020/2021 regional proposals:

- supports in principle a user pays approach to the three waste management, refuse collection in the former Auckland and Manukau city areas and Waitakere rural sewerage service targeted rates, because:
  - the burden of cost should be placed on the people who use the services and directly benefit from them; and
  - it is unfair to spread the cost to all ratepayers and expect them to pay for these services twice, especially when there is no benefit to them.

b) acknowledges the comments received as part of other planning processes from the community regarding the importance of both the water quality issues in Wairau Creek and the future of the Takapuna Markets, and notes that these comments will be considered as part of the development of the 2020/2023 Local Board Plan.

CARRIED

Resolution number DT/2020/4

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson G Wood, seconded by Chairperson A Bennett:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

c) adjourn this item until Monday 11 May at 10 am via Skype for Business, as the board is awaiting further information to enable the formation of views and preferences as part of phase two of the Emergency Budget.

CARRIED

Note: Resolution d) below was taken at the reconvened meeting of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board on Monday 11 May 2020 at 10am via Skype for Business.

14 Local board feedback on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority 2020/2021 Draft Operational Plan
Resolution number DT/2020/5

MOVED by Chairperson A Bennett, seconded by Member T Deans:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) Adopt the local board’s feedback on the 2020/2021 Tūpuna Maunga Authority Draft Operational Plan as outlined in Attachment A.

b) Request Local Board Services staff organise a hui with the Tupuna Maunga Authority and the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board to continue the governance and discuss matters such as:
   i. any future plans to pedestrianise Maungaulika;
   ii. the future use of existing assets on both maunga;
   iii. appropriate commercial activities on both maunga;
   iv. the removal of exotic trees from either maunga;
   v. the removal of infrastructure from either maunga;
   vi. potential transfer of administration of land contiguous to other Tupuna Maunga;
   vii. potential transfer of some maunga land from the Department of Conservation;
   viii. removal of encroachments from either maunga; and
   ix. Potential acquisition/transfer of land to enable the Tupuna Maunga Authority to manage adjoining land that comprise the true extent of the Tupuna Maunga Authority to enable integrated management and development.

CARRIED

Memo

29 April 2020

To: Paul Majurey – Chair, Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority
    All Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority members

cc: Dominic Wilson – Head of Co-Governance, Auckland Council

From: Aidan Bennett – Chair, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
    George Wood – Deputy Chair, Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Subject: Devonport-Takapuna Local Board feedback on the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority Draft Operational Plan 2020/2021

1. This memo details the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board’s (the local board) feedback on the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority (the Tūpuna Maunga Authority) Draft Operational Plan 2020/2021.

2. The local board is appreciative and welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft operational plan.

Feedback by section

Tūpuna Maunga work programme 2018-2028

3. Wairuatanga / Spiritual value, the local board:
- support the protection and restoration of tihi by completing the implementation of pedestrianisation at Takarunga / Mt Victoria.

- support complete installation of generic signs at each Tūpuna Maunga and develop comprehensive and specific interpretation for each Tūpuna Maunga using signs, notice boards, visual aids, interactive displays, art etc that recognises and shares with visitors the significance of the Tūpuna Maunga and mana whenua’s relation to them.

- support off-site interpretation/storing telling develop technology and digital content to complement on-site interpretation.

- suggests that the proposed education programmes be brought forward to years one – three (2018-2020) and prioritised to continue the awareness of the role and values of the Tūpuna Maunga Authority.

- advocate that a future event to celebrate the Tūpuna Maunga be held at either Takarunga / Mt Victoria or Maungauika / North Head. The local board also welcome the opportunity to collaborate and provide support to deliver the event.

- support settings that inspire reverence, aroha, respect and awareness of the Tūpuna Maunga as treasures through new and distinct entrance signs. The local board encourage the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to work with both groups located on the maunga and the wider community.

- support all opportunities to provide input and collaborate with the Tūpuna Maunga Authority on the identified plans and strategies.

- appreciate and value the governance relationship with the Tūpuna Maunga Authority and look forward to future engagement opportunities.

- request that the Tūpuna Maunga Authority work with local boards and other relevant entities (i.e. business improvement districts) to consider wayfinding to and from the maunga.

4. Mana Aotūroa / Cultural and Heritage value, the local board:

- support greater on the ground Tūpuna Maunga Authority presence from year 3 onwards, and welcome opportunities to work alongside the local board to utilise their networks and relationships in the local community.

- support sharing European and other histories and geological significance: develop interpretation that honours the multiple narratives, cultural meaning and connections felt and expressed among all people of Tāmaki Makaurau over the Tūpuna Maunga and the geological significance of the Tūpuna Maunga.

- support neighbours and local communities: communicate and collaborate with neighbours and local communities to enhance the values of the Tūpuna Maunga, and welcome opportunities to work alongside the local board to utilise their networks and relationships in the local community.

5. Takotoranga / Landscape value, the local board:

- the local board encourages the Tūpuna Maunga Authority to consider community-led approaches, or work with existing volunteer networks when undertaking pest and weed control initiatives.

- support proposed volunteering programme to create opportunities for people to contribute to the wellbeing of the Tūpuna Maunga.

- support chemical-free approaches to pest and weed management on the Tūpuna Maunga.
• advocate for the development of individual management plans for both Takarunga and Maungauika.

6. Mauri Pūnaha Hauropi / Ecology and Biodiversity
• support the programme to control the presence and spread of pest plants and animals and environmental weeds in accordance with the Biosecurity Plan.
• support the Biodiversity Plan to reintroduce indigenous species such as microorganisms, invertebrates, lizards and birds.

7. Whai Rawa Whakauka / Economic and Commercial
• support approaches to facilitate and promote commercial activities that promote the values of the Tūpuna Maunga.

8. Mana Whai a Rehia / Recreational value, the local board:
• support the track network development, and request that where possible, they align to and enhance local board greenway plans that have been developed.
• support the development of the way finding programme.
• request that when the Tūpuna Maunga Authority consider ancillary infrastructure, passive recreation and play infrastructure, they engage the relevant local board and/or their staff as often local boards have completed service assessments to determine service provision and need across their areas. These documents are useful tools to inform future planning, avoiding duplication, and meeting gaps in service provision.

Funding and Revenue

9. The local board support the proposed level of operational and capital funding to ensure the appropriate conservation and protection of the Tūpuna Maunga.

Maungauika / North Head

10. The following table provides the local board response to the proposed projects scheduled for Maungauika / North Head:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital or operational expenditure programme years one to three</th>
<th>Local board response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation / storytelling</strong></td>
<td>The local board welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Tūpuna Maunga Authority and the three business improvement districts, through their 'Shore Coast Tourism' initiative to provide cultural and economic development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete installation of generic signs and then prepare and implement network wide programme to develop comprehensive site-specific interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track network</strong></td>
<td>The local board support the $400,000 allocated to this proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop track network to improve access and protect values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way-finding</strong></td>
<td>The local board advocate that funding be allocated to this project so that locals and visitors can easily access Maungauika. This will be particularly important for visitors as part of the America's Cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete installation of main entrance and secondary destination signs and progressively implement additional way-finding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takarunga / Mt. Victoria

11. The following table provides the local board response to the proposed projects scheduled for Takarunga / Mt. Victoria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital or operational expenditure programme years one to three</th>
<th>Local board response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation / storytelling</strong></td>
<td>The local board welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with the Tāpuna Maunga Authority and the three business improvement districts, through their ‘Shore Coast Tourism’ initiative to provide cultural and economic development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete installation of generic signs and then prepare and implement network wide programme to develop comprehensive site-specific interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancillary visitor infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>The local board note that this was a funded project in the 2019/2020 operational plan, but now has a $0 budget. The local board request an update on whether this project is proceeding, or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track network</strong></td>
<td>The local board support this project and request it align to and enhance the local board greenway plans that has been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop track network to improve access and protect values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Way-finding</strong></td>
<td>The local board support this project and requests how this can be expanded to other areas of Devonport to provide a start-to-end journey for visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete installation of main entrance and secondary destination signs and progressively implement additional way-finding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage</strong></td>
<td>The local board support the repairs and replacements of signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and/or the replacement of signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin

12 Franklin Local Board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Lucy Stallworthy, Engagement Advisor, was available to speak to this item.

Note: A copy of the Franklin Local Board written feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 will be available on the Auckland Council website via this link.

Resolution number FR/2020/6

MOVED by Chairperson A Baker, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Fulljames:

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback as tabled on the Franklin Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Franklin Local Board area.

c) recommend to the Governing Body the new or amended local targeted rate proposals based on feedback from submissions from Franklin Local Board area submitters including:

i. provision of an ‘opt-in’ targeted rate to facilitate connection to the reticulated and waste water supply in Clevedon repay through rates (noting that connection is not available to all Clevedon residents at this time).

ii. proposed changes to the waste management targeted rate

iii. proposed changes to refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

iv. proposed changes to the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

d) recommend that the Governing Body approves investment in development of a multi-sport hub at Karaka Sports Park (the Franklin Local Board One Local Initiative) noting that planning for this project is well advanced and construction may generate local employment opportunities.

e) request that the Governing body consider expanding the scope of the Kauri Dieback track enhancements at Ada Platts Mills Reserve, Maraeatai noting that the Friends of Ada Platts Mills Reserve have expressed an interest in partnering with Auckland Council to expand the track network in the reserve, offering greater protection for Kauri and improved access to the reserve as an educational and recreational amenity for the growing population into the future.

f) note that public feedback was received prior to public understand of the likely impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the Annual budget 2020/2021, and that a second phase of consultation is now planned to further inform Annual Budget 2020/2021, and reserve the right to provide further feedback on the proposed Annual Budget following this second stage of public feedback.
g) agree that Item 12 is adjourned until May 12 at 11.30 am via Skype so that feedback on the local board input on council savings for the annual budget can be resolved.

CARRIED
Henderson-Massey

11 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Resolution number HM/2020/7

MOVED by Member B Brady, seconded by Member B Loader:

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the Henderson-Massey Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Henderson-Massey local board area.

c) subject to receiving further information, intended at the 19 May 2020 business meeting, endorse and approve the establishment of a new Business Improvement District (BID) programme and BID boundary map area and recommend to the Governing Body the setting of a BID targeted rate of $400,000 for the 2020/2021 financial year

d) provide the following feedback on the regional proposals in the draft Annual Budget 2020/2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the waste management targeted rate base charges.</td>
<td>Support the increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the targeted rate for refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City</td>
<td>Support the increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing the Waitākere Ranges rural sewerage service and increasing the targeted rate.</td>
<td>Note the minimal impact for Henderson-Massey residents. Support bringing on-site wastewater systems under a regional compliance scheme, noting that improving water quality is a major issue for Auckland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED
Hibiscus & Bays

1 Local Board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Hibiscus and Bays Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) note that 82 per cent of submitters either partially support or support the local board priorities for 2020/2021, which are:

i) Priority 1: Extend our environmental work through plant pest control carried out by specialist community groups who provide their knowledge, experience and support to residents

ii) Priority 2: Promoting a sustainable waste programme with businesses in the East Coast Bays

iii) Priority 3: Continuing the contestable and facilities grant programmes to enable community events, activities and projects

iv) Priority 4: Supporting our arts centres to deliver their vibrant classes and shows

c) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Part 1) from people or organisations based in the Hibiscus and Bays local board area

d) provide the following feedback to the Governing Body:

i) supports the proposed changes to the waste management targeted rate due to the 71% support for this proposal from respondents in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area.

ii) supports the proposed changes to refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City due to the 73% support for this proposal from respondents in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area

iii) supports the proposed changes to the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate due to the 60% support for continuing this service from respondents in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area

iv) supports the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

e) support the submission of the Hibiscus Coast Youth Centre and their request for continued regional operational funding of $100,000 and advocates to the Governing Body to confirm that funding for the 2020/2021 year noting that other youth centres receive regional funding and the proposed assessment of youth services across Auckland has still not been completed

f) request an urgent update on the Governance Framework Review – Service Levels and Funding project which is assessing equitable regional funding for community facilities such as art centres, youth centres and performing arts centres (Centrestage)

g) that the Governing Body supports the ongoing regional funding for the Orewa Beach Esplanade Enhancement Programme North (OBEEP) (the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board One Local Initiative) noting that resource consent for this project is still subject to a decision from the Environment Court and if the decision is to approve then construction may generate local employment opportunities.
h) defer providing feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Part 2 – Emergency Budget) until further consultation is completed and feedback from Part 2 is reported back to the local board for their consideration

i) delegate authority to the local board chairperson to provide formal local board feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Part 2) in response to the COVID-19 pandemic response

j) note that this local board feedback to the Emergency Committee on the proposed annual budget 2020/2021 part 2 will be distributed to members before it is submitted

Moved - GB
Seconded - LW
CARRIED
Howick

11 Howick Local Board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Resolution number HW/2020/8

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson J Spiller, seconded by Member M Turinsky:

That the Howick Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Howick Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Howick Local Board area.

c) recommend that the Governing Body approves any proposed capital projects, which are outside local boards’ allocated decision-making responsibility, including investment in the Flat Bush Library and Community Centre and Flat Bush Aquatic and Leisure Centre (the Howick Local Board One Local Initiative).

d) provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 as follows:

i) support the changes as proposed to the waste management targeted rate

ii) support the changes as proposed to refuse collection in the former Auckland City Council and Manukau City Council areas.

iii) support the changes as proposed to the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

CARRIED
Kaipātiki

14 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

A document titled ‘Annual Budget 2020/2021 - Kaipātiki Local Board WRITTEN FEEDBACK Vol. 1 (10–4674)’ was tabled. A copy of the tabled document has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

The item was taken in parts

Resolution number KT/2020/9

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Kaipātiki Local Board priorities for 2020/2021 including the request for funding from the Little Shool Bay Renewal Working Group.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Kaipātiki local board area.

c) provide the following feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (part 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Kaipātiki Local Board Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste management targeted rate</td>
<td>In line with the feedback received from our local community, the Kaipātiki Local Board support the proposal to meet the increased cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling through an increase to the waste management targeted rate instead of an increase to general rates for all ratepayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City</td>
<td>In line with the feedback received from our local community, the Kaipātiki Local Board support the proposal to meet the cost of collection through an increase to the targeted rate in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas instead of an increase to general rates for all ratepayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate</td>
<td>In line with the feedback received from our local community, the Kaipātiki Local Board support the proposal to meet the cost of this service through an increase to the Waitākere rural sewerage service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) confirm it has no feedback on the draft Tupuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

CARRIED

Chairperson John Gillon adjourned item 14 e) to Monday 18 May 2020 at 2.00pm.

Resolution number KT/2020/10

MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Grant:

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

a) agree to adjourn item 14 e) to Monday 18 May 2020 at 2.00pm.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 3.20pm on Monday 11 May 2020 and reconvened at Monday 18 May 2020 was/were not present.

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

e) provide views and preferences as part of the phase two Emergency Budget, which will be considered by the Emergency Committee at its 21 May 2020 business meeting

Attachments

A 11 May 2020 - Kaipātiki Local Board Business Meeting - Annual Budget 2020/2021 - Kaipatiki Local Board
WRITTEN FEEDBACK Vol. 1
(10–4674)
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

21 Local board decisions and input into Annual Budget 2020/2021

The submissions can be found on the Auckland Council Website.

Resolution number MO/2020/11

MOVED by Chairperson L Sosene, seconded by Member A Neru Leavasa:

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board area.

c) recommend to the Governing Body the continuation of the local targeted rate set as a uniform charge per separately used or inhabited part of a property, on residential properties in the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board area, to fully subsidise entry to Mangere-Ōtahuhu swimming pools for persons 17 years and over, noting that the rate for 2019/2020 is estimated at approximately $33.04.

d) provides the following feedback on local priorities from consultation phase one to inform the proposed Annual Budget and draft local board agreement 2020/2021:

i. Local environmental management – focus on waste reduction and clean streets

ii. Local parks, sport and recreation – continue to develop and maintain local facilities

iii. Local planning – support better designed built-up areas and accessible transport links

iv. Local community services – support local health and wellbeing objectives for all locals

v. Local engagement – advocate for engagement methods to include bilingual translations as standard practice.

e) resolves to defer its feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 regional proposals until the public consultation phase two results are presented in full to the local board,

a. Note: this will also allow the local board to set its local fees and charges schedule, and local performance measures.

f) delegate to the Chair and Deputy Chair to provide the Governing Body, the local board’s feedback to the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 also known as the Emergency Budget before the 21 May 2020.

CARRIED
11 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

A copy of the Manurewa Written Feedback Vol. 1 into the Annual Budget 2020/2021 was tabled at the meeting. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minute attachment.

Resolution number MR/2020/12

MOVED by Chairperson J Allan, seconded by Deputy Chairperson M Atama:

That the Manurewa Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Manurewa Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Manurewa local board area.

c) provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the waste management targeted rate base charges</td>
<td>The board supports this increase as preferable to the alternative of a general rates increase to pay for increased costs of this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in charges for refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City</td>
<td>The board supports this increase as preferable to the alternative of a general rates increase to pay for increased costs of this service. We believe that the current weekly frequency of this service must be maintained to avoid an increase in illegal dumping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate</td>
<td>The board has no position on this as it does not relate to its local board area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to charges for swimming pool fencing inspections</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed changed to charges for swimming pool fencing inspections as these will assist pool owners to spread the cost of inspections over three years and reduce administration costs to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to building and resource consent fees to improve transparency</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed changes to calculating building and resource consent fees to reduce the likelihood of overpayments and reduce administration costs to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and increased regulatory fees and charges to recover costs</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed new and increased regulatory fees to recover costs. We support the introduction of an international visitor fee for the Auckland Botanic Gardens to fund the upgrading of facilities and promotion to overseas markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require a New Zealand Green Building Council HomeFit Assessment for all new Retrofit Your Home scheme applications of more than $2,000</td>
<td>The board does not support this as the additional cost and bureaucracy may discourage some homeowners from taking part in the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing a voluntary financial assistance scheme to help Clevedon ratepayers with their water and wastewater connection costs</td>
<td>The board has no position on this as it does not relate to its local board area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*d) delegate authority to Chairperson Joseph Allan to provide the feedback on the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 on behalf of the Manurewa Local Board to the Emergency Committee by 18 May 2020.*

**CARRIED**

**Attachments**

A  Manurewa Written Feedback Vol.1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

10 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Resolution number MT/2020/13

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson D Burrows, seconded by Member D Allan:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board priorities for 2020/2021;

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area;

c) note that the proposed expansion of the Glen Innes Business Improvement District was consulted on but has been postponed and will be considered as part of the Annual Budget 2021/2022, subject to successful ballot;

d) provide the following feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021:

i) note that there was overall support for the regional proposals from those that submitted and reside in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board area

ii) support the regional proposals to:

• increase the waste management targeted rate;
• increase the refuse collection target rate in former Auckland City and Manukau City;
• increase the Waitākere rural sewerage service targeted rate, in response to supporting the wellbeing of the Manukau Harbour.

e) note that the local board have until 12 May 2020 to provide its formal view on priorities for consideration in the ‘emergency budget’ and staff are currently preparing advice to support the local board to provide feedback.

CARRIED
10 Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

The Annual Budget 2020/2021 Ōrākei Local Board written feedback was tabled in support of this item. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number OR/2020/14

MOVED by Member C Davis, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Pownie:

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) note that 53 per cent of submitters support most of the proposed Ōrākei Local Board priorities for 2020/2021 and 33 per cent of submitters support all the proposed Ōrākei Local Board priorities which are:

i) Priority 1: Prioritising our natural environment working with the community, including Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei to improve water quality in Ōkahu Bay and to develop an integrated plan for Pourewa Valley.

ii) Priority 2: Continue advocating for transport initiatives, including the Gowing Drive linkage to the Glen Innes to Tāmaki Drive Shared Path, and wider safety improvements.

iii) Priority 3: Community and park facility upgrades will continue, along with our commitment to ensuring our heritage assets are protected.

iv) Priority 4: We will support regional events, and seek funding for projects to support these locally, such as America’s Cup 2021.

v) Priority 5: The Glen Innes Business Association was proposing to expand the boundary of the Business Improvement District (BID) into the Ōrākei Local Board area but has now deferred this request.

c) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

d) provide the following feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021:

i) does not support the proposed changes to the waste management targeted rate, and requests further consultation be undertaken considering the Covid-19 pandemic.

ii) supports the proposed changes to the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City and requests further consultation be undertaken considering the Covid-19 pandemic.

iii) supports the proposed changes to the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.

iv) supports the proposed changes to the pool fencing inspections targeted rate.

e) agree that the meeting and further discussion of item 10: Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021 be adjourned to 3.00pm on Monday, 18 May 2020 via Skype for Business once details of the proposed Auckland Council emergency budget to help manage the financial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has been made available to the local board for its consideration.
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Member Robertson declared a conflict of interest in this item as he is patron of the Papatoetoe Soccer Club and took no part in the discussion or voting.

Resolution number OP/2020/15
MOVED by Chairperson L. Ful, seconded by Member O Dewes:

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe local board area.

c) recommend an increase to the Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rate grant from $490,000 to $550,000 as of 1 July 2020 for the Manukau Business Association, following the successful expansion of the Manukau (BID) programme and boundary map, which results in BID membership increase. Further noting that the Manukau BID targeted rate will be set as at a percentage against capital value of approx. 0.00034086 (rate in the dollar) as at 1 July 2020.

d) recommend the continuation of our local targeted rate (to enable free adult entry to swimming pools) to the Governing Body and note that the rate is currently estimated at $31.20 plus GST, based on current estimates, for the number of separately used or inhabited parts of a residential property in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board area, and under Emergency Budget assumptions.

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

f) provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 on local priorities based on the first tranche of consultation noting strong support that confirms the local board’s priorities to:

   i) invest into our local community facilities and sports fields.

   ii) seeking opportunities for youth and senior programmes,

   iii) strengthen our partnership with Manu Whenua and Maatawaka,

   iv) support community-led initiatives.

   g) delegate to the Chair and Deputy Chair to provide feedback to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process on three key issues, to help the Governing Body determine its draft Annual Budget 2020/2021 (referred to as the "Emergency Budget"); also noting that this input must be provided in time for the Governing Body meeting on 14 May 2020.

h) note that there will be additional feedback on the annual budget proposals following the second tranche of public consultation on the Emergency Budget (Consultation part 2).
CARRIED

Link for the webpage for the Annual Budget 2020/2021 submission volumes:
https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say/topics-you-can-have-your-say-on/annual-budget-2020-2021/Pages/submissions-received-.aspx
Papakura
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A copy of submissions from the Papakura Local Board area on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 will soon be available on the Auckland Council website here.

The members considered the feedback received from public consultation relating to phase one of the 2020/2021 annual budget. Bearing in mind the feedback received, local board members agreed the feedback below:

Resolution number PPK/2020/16

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Deputy Chairperson J Robinson:

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Papakura Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Papakura local board area.

c) provide the following feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the waste management targeted rate base charges</td>
<td>The board supports this increase as preferable to the alternative of a general rates increase to pay for increased costs of this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in charges for refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City</td>
<td>The board supports this increase as preferable to the alternative of a general rates increase to pay for increased costs of this service. The board supports a consistent “pay as you throw” system across the Auckland region and believe solutions need to be found to prevent illegal dumping which could include maintaining the weekly frequency of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase to the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate</td>
<td>The board has no position on this as it does not relate to its local board area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to charges for swimming pool fencing inspections</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed change to charges for swimming pool fencing inspections as these will assist pool owners to spread the cost of inspections over three years and reduce administration costs to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to building and resource consent fees to improve transparency</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed changes to calculating building and resource consent fees to reduce the likelihood of overpayments and reduce administration costs to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and increased regulatory fees and charges to recover costs</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed new and increased regulatory fees to recover costs. We support the introduction of an international visitor fee for the Auckland Botanic Gardens to fund the upgrading of facilities and promotion to overseas markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require a New Zealand Green Building Council HomeFit Assessment for all new Retrofit Your Home scheme applications of more than $2,000</td>
<td>The board does not support this as the additional cost and bureaucracy may discourage some homeowners from taking part in the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing a voluntary financial assistance scheme to help Clevedon ratepayers with their water and wastewater connection costs</td>
<td>The board has no position on this as it does not relate to its local board area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d)** delegate authority to Chairperson Brent Catchpole to provide the feedback on the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 on behalf of the Papakura Local Board to the Emergency Committee by 18 May 2020.

**CARRIED**
**Puketāpapa**

**11 Local Board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021**

Samantha Tan Rodrigo, Local Board Advisor and David Rose, Lead Financial Advisor were in attendance to speak to the report.

The motion was put in parts: clauses a-d,f, clause e to be considered at the adjourned meeting.

**Resolution number PKTPP/2020/17**

**MOVED by Deputy Chairperson J Fairey, seconded by Member E Kumar:**

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

- **a)** receive consultation feedback on the proposed Puketāpapa Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.
- **b)** receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Puketāpapa Local Board area.
- **c)** provide the following feedback to the Governing Body on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 regional proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Body Proposal</th>
<th>Puketāpapa Local Board Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste management targeted rate increase</td>
<td>Support the proposed increase as waste reduction is one of the goals of the local board plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: that 70 per cent of community feedback supported the proposed increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City targeted rate increase</td>
<td>Support the proposed increase as waste reduction is one of the goals of the local board plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: that community feedback was split with interest in a standardised model across the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wātakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate</td>
<td>This proposal is outside the board area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support, In principle, the proposed service and targeted rate in support of decisions made by the Waitākere Local Board.

**Pool fencing inspection fee changes**  
Support the proposed changes, with a request for further investigation into phasing an equitable transition to the proposed charging method.

**Tūpuna Maunga Authority Operational Plan**  
This proposed plan is outside the local board’s responsibility.

Note: that there were six detailed submissions from Puketāpapa Local Board area

**HomeFit assessments for Retrofit Your Home Scheme**  
Note: that this proposal aligns well with the local board’s Low Carbon Action Plan particularly the action area "Low Carbon Homes and Buildings".

d) note that the local board have until Monday, 18 May 2020 to provide its further additional formal view on priorities for consideration in the 'emergency budget' and staff are currently preparing advice to support the local board to provide feedback.

f) thank Samantha Tan Rodrigo and David Rose for their attendance.

**CARRIED**
13 Rodney Local Board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Resolution number RD/2020/18

MOVED by Chairperson P Pirrie, seconded by Deputy Chairperson B Houlbrooke:

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed local board priorities for the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Part 1) from people and organisations in the Rodney Local Board area and confirms that 68% of submitters either support or partially support its local board priorities 2020/2021:

i) Priority 1: Access to new bus services will be improved further by park and ride facilities at Warkworth and Kumeū-Huapai. Design work is near completion. New footpaths are being funded directly from the transport targeted rate

ii) Priority 2: The One Warkworth Business Association Inc (OWBA) is proposing a new business improvement district (BID) in our local board area, the Warkworth BID programme. If the council approves the Warkworth BID programme, it will represent 593 business ratepayers and owners, with a proposed BID targeted rate of $135,000 as of 1 July 2020

iii) Priority 3: New parks and reserves in Milldale and Riverhead will be planned as a result of new development. Growth is also making the future library needs of Warkworth a priority

iv) Priority 4: A masterplan for Green Road (Rangitopuni) Park in Dairy Flat

v) Priority 5: Continuing key initiatives to fund and improve drainage areas in the north and greater emphasis on environmental projects to improve water quality, waterways and harbours

b) receive consultation feedback on the regional proposals for the Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Part 1) from people and organisations in the Rodney Local Board area and provides the following feedback:

i) supports the waste management targeted rate

ii) supports the refuse collection in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas

iii) supports the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

iv) supports the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

c) request that the Governing Body establish the Warkworth Business Improvement District programme according to the amended boundary map (V2), as shown in Attachment A to the agenda report

d) request the Governing Body set the Warkworth Business Improvement District targeted rate at a flat rate of $500 + GST per rateable property, equating to a business improvement district grant sum of approximately $135,000 for the One Warkworth Business Association Incorporated and as shown in the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021

e) confirm commitment to the local board’s One Local Initiative in the 2020/2021 budget and the allocation of $1m LDI capex to support its delivery
f) receive the Annual Budget 2020/2021 Part 1 submissions in Volumes 1 and 2 shown in Attachment B and C to the agenda report

g) defer providing feedback on the proposed Annual Budget (Part 2 – Emergency Budget) until consultation is completed and the consultation feedback (Part 2) is reported back to the local board for its consideration

h) delegate authority to the local board chairperson to provide formal local board feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Part 2) in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

CARRIED
Upper Harbour

17 Local board decision making and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

The Relationship Manager was in attendance via Skype for Business to support the item.

Resolution number UH/2020/40

MOVED by Chairperson M Miles, seconded by Member B Neeson:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Upper Harbour Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

c) provide the following feedback to the Governing Body on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021:

   i) based on feedback received from residents in the Upper Harbour Local Board area during Consultation Part 1 (21 February to 22 March 2020), the board supports in principle the three regional proposals which apply a user-pays approach for changes to rates and fees (waste management targeted rate; refuse collection in the former Auckland and Manukau city; and Waitākere rural sewerage service targeted rate), as it is fair and reasonable to expect the cost of services to be charged directly to users who benefit from the service.

CARRIED

Resolution number UH/2020/41

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson L Whyte, seconded by Member A Atkinson:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

d) adjourn this item until Monday 18 May 2020 at 10am via Skype for Business, as the board is awaiting further information to enable the formation of views and preferences as part of phase two of the Emergency Budget.

CARRIED

Note: The meeting was adjourned at 10.44am
Waiheke
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Resolution number WHK/2020/19

MOVED by Member P Walden, seconded by Chairperson C Handley:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Waiheke Local Board priorities for 2020/2021.

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Waiheke Local Board area.

c) recommend that the Governing Body acknowledge the approval of $1 million (debt funded at the rate of $100,000 per annum from LDI operating expenditure budget) towards development of a community swimming pool, noting this was approved by the Governing Body in FY16, and this will be required in the next 12–18 months.

d) provide feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 as follows:

• that budgets and priorities should be renegotiated with a focus on supporting covid-19 impacts and climate change, and the purposes of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act.

• that commercial rating of the non-commercial properties including the Accommodation Providers Targeted Rate (APTR) needs to be revoked and Waiheke Island should be moved from zone B to zone C.

• that board request the Governing Body address the inequity of legacy funding for art galleries, and develop a policy framework for determining the funding of asset based services which include community art galleries as a priority.

• note feedback on other local matters was mixed.

e) delegate the chairperson, in consultation with the board, to provide feedback to help the Governing Body determine its draft Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Consultation part 2), referred to as the “Emergency Budget”, by Monday 18 May 2020.

f) note that there will be additional feedback on the annual budget proposals following the second tranche of public consultation on the Emergency Budget (Consultation part 2).

CARRIED
Waitākere Ranges
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Resolution number WTK/2020/20

MOVED by Chairperson G Presland, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Toms:

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area

c) recommend the Glen Eden Business Improvement District targeted rate to the Governing Body with no change

Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

d) support the Waitākere rural sewerage pump out service continuing, and note:

i) this is the view taken by 73 per cent of submitters in the local board area, and 78 per cent of submitters across the region

ii) the need to improve water quality of harbours, streams and lagoons is strongly supported by submissions

e) support the status quo option “continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers”, recognising that rural sewerage systems are part of the regional infrastructure and recognising the public good outcomes it supports, and note:

i) it aligns to the “Our Waters Future” discussion document principles:

A) recognise that water is a treasured taonga

B) work together to plan and deliver better water outcomes

C) deliver catchment scale thinking and action

D) focus on achieving right-sized solutions with multiple benefits

E) rural communities must be part of council’s thinking about Auckland’s water future

ii) in our area, the west coast and northern Manukau Harbour beaches are popular visitor destinations for all Aucklanders so there is a significant regional benefit in improving the water quality to protect recreational value, public health and the environment in these areas

iii) we have concerns that improving poor water quality in the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area and the Manukau Harbour is being reduced to individual responsibility; with council intervention limited to a regulatory approach only

iv) the Waitākere rural sewerage pump out service started as part of a response to poor water quality. It included the establishment of local Water Liaison Groups, recognition that council and community needed to work together, and that regulation alone was not enough
v) there is a need to take a catchment-wide and behaviour change approach in order to maintain and improve water quality and clarity in streams, lagoons, estuaries and coastal environments

vi) the pump-out service ensures all septic tanks in a catchment are pumped out at regular intervals with council coordination and oversight

vii) it provides fair and equitable access to pump out services for remote communities, that may otherwise be disadvantaged. The travel distance may make a commercial service to an individual household unattractive to the industry in some areas. This has proven to be the case with private providers of waste recycling

viii) investigations are yet to fully determine the sources of contamination in the Manukau Harbour, and beaches in areas with reticulated sewerage are just as contaminated. For example, at Te Henga it is known that livestock and bird life contribute to the poor water quality of the lagoon. Maintenance and management of council’s own on-site wastewater systems are also under scrutiny from the community in coastal areas such as Piha, Te Henga, and it is critical these are kept to a high standard

ix) there has been a lack of evaluation of the pump out service and other interventions over the years, which needs to be addressed going forward. There is no clear evidence that either the regulatory or non-regulatory approach has worked to improve water quality to date. We strongly support a two-pronged approach in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area

x) there is concern from rural communities that they are not getting a fair share of services as the emphasis is on urban infrastructure. This is reflected in submissions on the rural sewerage topic from Waitākere residents. Some 80 per cent of the Water Quality Targeted Rate is funding the Western Isthmus water quality improvement project

xi) there is concern about the increasing cost of the pump out service which needs to be addressed in negotiating a new contract for service. It is expected that costs will be at or near the current cost.

f) recommend the Water Quality Targeted Rate be used to:
   i) accelerate the investigation and amelioration of sources of contamination of the Manukau Harbour and west coast lagoons
   ii) increase locally targeted educational programmes on how to effectively operate and maintain on-site wastewater systems, including how to conserve water, the use of environmentally friendly household products

g) recommend council’s Infrastructure and Environmental Services department continues to work at a community catchment level in the coastal settlements of Piha, Karekare, Te Henga, Fosters Bay and Hula in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, which have high risks for on-site wastewater systems across a range of factors

h) note changes in the intensity of land use and household types in areas with high risks for on-site wastewater systems need to be closely monitored and managed through council’s regulatory system

Annual budget

i) provide the following feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021:
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i) One Local initiative programme: investing in the regeneration of Glen Eden Town Centre is an important economic stimulus. We recommend work on preparing the business case resumes speedily or that the Governing Body approves the release of the earmarked capital funds directly to the local board to accelerate to the project delivery stage.

ii) Active transport: delivering a completed Auckland-wide walking and cycling network needs to be accelerated. The increased use of walking and cycling paths over the lockdown period shows the latent potential. In our area there needs to be an emphasis on links to Western Line train services from the surrounding communities to improve access to public transport.

iii) Regional environmental programmes: weed and pest control programmes for the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area need at least the same level of base funding from general rates, supported by the Natural Environment Targeted Rate to implement the new Regional Pest Management Plan. The targeted rate is meant to enhance existing base-line service levels for the environment, not replace them.

iv) Te Henga quarry: we are advocating for regional funding and the reinstatement of the Quarry Aftercare Fund, to develop this area as a park to provide additional recreation to the regional park, to address unmet demand, filming opportunities, failed restoration and Health & Safety concerns of current usage.

CARRIED
Waitematā
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Trina Thompson, Relationship Manager, was in attendance to speak to this report.

Resolution number WTM/2020/21

MOVED by Chairperson R Northe, seconded by Member A Bonham:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) note from the consultation feedback on the Waitematā Local Board priorities for 2020/2021 that there was strong support for environmental, climate change and Access for Everyone proposals, for the restoration of the Leys Institute Buildings and for St Georges Bay Road and Faraday Street enhancements.

b) provide feedback on the proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation part 1 as follows:

i) support increasing the annual waste management targeted rate by $19.97 to recover the additional costs of recycling paper, cardboard and plastics

ii) support increasing the refuse collection targeted rate in former Auckland City and Manukau City to cover the cost of collection

iii) support continuing the Waitākere rural sewerage service and increasing the targeted rate to cover the cost of the septic tank pumpout service

iv) support replacing the swimming pool onsite inspection cost with an annual targeted rate.

c) confirm its One Local Initiative and its advocacy to secure funding, resource and support to deliver the community’s agreed vision and chosen design for Ponsonby Park, 254 Ponsonby Road as soon as practicable.

d) approve its top five advocacy initiatives as follows:

i) advocate to the Governing Body and Auckland Transport to take appropriate actions to halve our carbon emissions by 2030, and to be at net zero emissions by 2050

ii) advocate to the Governing Body, Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) and Panuku to provide business continuity response and recovery plans through pandemics, extreme weather events, major disasters and emergencies, and all major transformation projects to include a business continuity plan and development response programme

iii) advocate to the Governing Body and Panuku Development Auckland to ensure Auckland Council actively builds or enables others to provide affordable housing through appropriate mechanisms and tools

iv) advocate to the Governing Body to prioritise Leys Institute for funding to retain, strengthen and reopen for library and community use

v) advocate to the Governing Body and Auckland Transport to include the revitalisation of St Georges Bay Road and Faraday Street in the list of Regional Land Transport Projects (RLTP) prioritised projects and seek the Governing Body to fund the streetscapes improvement as set out in the Parnell Plan vision document.

e) approve its other advocacy positions as tabled at the meeting.
f) note that since the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council's financial situation, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year.

g) support the decision of the Emergency Committee to grant relief to those ratepayers facing hardship by not requiring its May 2020 quarterly payment of the Accommodation Providers Targeted Rate and enabling residential and business ratepayers to postpone their May payment until the end of August 2020.

h) support council advocacy to Central Government to enhance its Rates Rebate scheme to assist low income ratepayers

i) note that the Emergency Committee has directed that a part 2 consultation will be undertaken to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council's proposed 'emergency budget' and that the proposed council savings options are not yet available.

j) note that the Governing Body will now be making final decisions on the reprioritisation for the 'emergency budget' on 21 May 2020 and that the updated positions and savings options will be made available to local boards on the 14 May 2020 for formal input by 19 May 2020.

k) agree to adopt the following high priority in-principle views and forward them to the Finance and Performance Committee and the Emergency Committee to inform their consideration on budget options:

i) maintain Council spending and resources and avoid services cuts principally through the avenue of additional short-term borrowing, and exploring increased revenue streams and alternate funding vehicles

ii) maintain council staffing levels at the current appropriate level and ensure that there is budget provision for a 'living wage', look to reduce the use of consultants and outsourcing, and focus on enabling local jobs and employment to help boost economy.

iii) ensure a long-term view of potential savings is taken, including reviewing current commitments to identify which projects may deliver savings in the long term or where stopping would create longer term costs

iv) climate action analysis to be central to the process in considering savings so that climate emergency response is prioritised and such implications, benefits and trade-offs are understood

v) continue to care for the environment (water quality, biodiversiy, pest control)

vi) protect service levels for libraries, pools, marae, community centres, community houses, recreation centres, playgrounds, parks, sports fields, green initiatives, climate change projects, cleaning streams, environmental partnerships, renewals and general activities that provide local jobs and help towards the recovery and mental and physical health

vii) refocus ATEED funding primarily towards the recovery as an economic development agency (including support for BIDs and town centres) while retaining a longer-term role for revenue generating economic activities such as films, and domestic eco-tourism

viii) prefer providing relief in the form of access to appropriate rates postponement policies and systems being made available for residents
and businesses facing hardship rather than making significant cuts to many Council services and projects.

i) agree to circulate the following in-principle views to the Finance and Performance Committee and the Emergency Committee to inform their consideration on savings options:

i) acknowledge that local board funding is a small percentage of the overall council group budget but is a vital and highly responsive support avenue for a variety of community initiatives that help support resilient communities

ii) that the delivery of the four well beings – social, economic, environmental and cultural should continue to be “core” services for Auckland Council

iii) continue to focus funding towards building community capacity to support the recovery and ensure the inequity divide across the region does not worsen

iv) support for vulnerable communities such as the elderly, deprived/low income communities, youth and Maori/Pasifika communities should be maintained or enhanced through the Emergency Budget as they are disproportionately affected by health and economic emergencies

v) continue the existing value for money review to ensure cost effectiveness and efficiency gains of our services

vi) ensure all major transformation projects include business continuity plans and a development response programme to mitigate further financial pressure on local businesses

vii) limit the reduction of services or deferment of capital projects only to those whose priority is affected by controls on entry to New Zealand and restrictions on large-scale events

viii) investigate the use of local procurement and supporting local services/businesses and community organisations for the delivery of council projects and services.

m) note that at the 19 May 2020 Waitemata Local Board business meeting, we intend to agree formal feedback on the emergency budget proposed savings and ratings and revenue options for tabling at the 21 May 2020 Governing Body meeting.

CARRIED
Whau

12 Whau Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

Resolution number WH/2020/22

MOVED by Chairperson K Thomas, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Zhu:

That the Whau Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on the proposed Whau Local Board priorities for 2020/202

b) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Whau Local Board area

c) thank the people and organisations from the Whau Local Board area who gave feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021

d) note that the majority of submitters from the Whau generally supported the proposals set out in the consultation document, including the Whau Local Board priorities

e) confirm its key advocacy priorities for 2020/2021 as follows:

i. site identification for the Whau aquatic and recreation facility

ii. funding for full design and implementation of the Te Whau Pathway

iii. development of a multi-story park and ride in New Lynn.

CARRIED

Secretarial Note: A copy of the Whau Local Board written feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021 will be available on the Auckland Council website:

https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/have-your-say/topics-you-can-have-your-say-on/annual-budget-2020-2021/Pages/whau-local-board.aspx
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek agreement on minor changes to rating policy and some fees for inclusion in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 and consequential amendments to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. In February and March 2020, the council consulted on a number of minor changes to rating policy and some fees for inclusion in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021. These changes were proposed to ensure cost recovery and improve the efficiency and transparency of charging methods. Feedback received on these proposals was presented at the Finance and Performance Committee workshop on 13 May 2020.

3. Consideration of feedback is one part of the decision-making process alongside assessment of options to address their advantages and disadvantages. Consultation provides an opportunity for those who may be affected by decisions to have their say and for any new issues to be raised. Officers have considered the feedback in developing their advice to the council.

4. As consultation took place over February and March 2020, feedback on the proposed changes was provided before respondents were able to fully understand the impact of COVID-19. However, staff have reviewed the proposed changes in light of COVID-19, and assessed that the reasonably practicable options for each of these matters have not changed. The changes proposed ensure users are paying for services or improve the customer experience through more transparent and efficient pricing of services. To continue to provide these core services the costs will need to be funded by either users, general ratepayers or from savings made in other service areas. None of the proposed increases are anticipated to be material in terms of household budgets.

Increases to the waste management targeted rates

5. The council proposed to increase the region-wide base service waste management targeted rate by $19.97 (38 cents per week) and the standard refuse rate in the former Auckland City Council and Manukau City Council areas by $14.23 (27 cents per week) to recover increased costs. Sixty-five per cent of all feedback received was in support of the proposal. Increasing the waste management targeted rate to cover the cost increases ensures that costs are paid for by the recipients of the service.

6. The cost increases are market and contractually driven. Some savings have been made allowing further increases due to market disruption in fibre and plastic recycling costs to be absorbed. Also, some potential cost savings mean officers now recommend a reduction in the increase to the standard refuse rate to $11.67 (23 cents per week).

7. These are cost increases for a core council service that if not funded by service users would add $9.5 million and $3.0 million respectively to the costs the council would need to fund from general rates. This would add 0.8 per cent to the general rates increase or require the council to reduce other expenditure by $12.5 million.

8. Officers recommend adopting an increase to the base service waste management targeted rate of $19.97, and an increase to the standard refuse rate in the former Auckland City Council and Manukau City Council areas of $11.67.
Changes to Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

9. The council proposed to stop providing the septic tank pump-out service to ratepayers in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas and continue to provide the service to ratepayers in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area with an increased targeted rate to fully recover costs.

10. Sixty-seven per cent of feedback received on the proposal supported it, commenting that it was fair that households receiving the services should pay. Ten per cent of those who did not support the proposal wanted the subsidy to continue and 23 per cent commented that the service should end.

11. Officers recommend that the proposal be adopted as consulted on.

Charging for pool fencing inspections

12. The council proposed to replace the $130 first inspection fee for pool fencing inspections with an annual targeted rate of $44 for all private pool owners. 36 per cent of feedback from consultation supported this proposal while 40 per cent did not. The main argument against the proposal was from pool owners who didn’t want to pay in advance for the service. People in favour agreed that the proposed change would spread the cost over three years for pool owners and improve efficiency.

13. Officers recommend that the proposal be adopted as consulted on.

Other proposals

14. Feedback on the other proposals was mixed. No significant issues were raised that weren’t considered when the proposals were adopted for consultation. Officers recommend the adoption of the following proposals for 2020/2021 as consulted on (with adjustment to fees to reflect the council’s revised rate of inflation of 1.25 per cent):

- Changes to some consent fees and deposits to better align with actual costs and improve customer experience such as changes to the structure and level of some resource consent and building control fees
- Increase the permit fee for high impact commercial events to $1,500 (incl. GST)
- Introduction of a targeted rate scheme to assist ratepayers in Clevedon with connection to Watercare’s reticulated wastewater and water system
- Inclusion of HomeFit assessment cost of $260 plus GST in the Retrofit-your-home targeted rate for all new applications of more than $2,000.
- Establishment of the One Warkworth BID with a new targeted rate introduced
- Expansion of the Manukau Central BID.

15. Officers are recommending changes to the following consultation proposals:

- deferring the introduction of a $20 entry fee for international visitors to the Auckland Botanic Gardens for further consideration until our borders are reopened
- consulting again as part of the Emergency Budget on the establishment of the Central Park Henderson BID and associated targeted rates as the required ballot returns could not be achieved before the country moved to Alert Level 4.

16. Officers also recommend lowering the annual resource consent charges for larger marine farms to better reflect actual costs.

17. Decisions made at this meeting will be incorporated into the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 that will be presented to the Governing Body for adoption on 30 July 2020.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Emergency Committee:

a) recommend to the Governing Body as part of the final Annual Budget 2020/2021 to:
   i) adopt the changes to pool fencing compliance charges as set out in Table 1 of the report
   ii) amend the Rating mechanism in the Funding Impact Statement to:
       A) increase the waste management base service targeted rate to $141.03 (including GST)
       B) increase the waste management standard refuse rate in the former Auckland City and Manukau City council areas to $141.60 (including GST) and increase the large refuse rate for those areas to $66.55 (including GST)
       C) include a pool fencing compliance targeted rate as per a) above
       D) include a Clevedon wastewater and water connection targeted rate
       E) include the cost of HomeFit assessment ($260 plus GST) in the Retrofit-your-home targeted rate for all new applications of more than $2,000
       F) include a new targeted rate for the One Warkworth BID
       G) provide for the expansion of the Manukau Central BID

b) agree to consult further on the establishment of the Central Park Henderson BID and associated targeted rate

c) recommend to the Governing Body to adopt
   i) the changes to fees as specified in Attachment A of the report
   ii) the increase in the permit fee for high impact commercial events to $1,500 (including GST) for 2020/2021
   iii) the annual resource consent functions, powers and duties charges for marine farms as specified in Table 2 of this report

d) recommend to the Governing Body that it agree to amend the Revenue and Financing Policy to identify targeted rates as a funding source for the regulation activity.

e) recommend to the Governing Body that it agrees to:
   i) discontinue the rural sewerage pump-out service and targeted rate for ratepayers in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas effective from 1 July 2021
   ii) retain the rural sewerage pump-out service for ratepayers in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area and increase the targeted rate from 1 July 2021 to recover the full cost of providing the service.
Horopaki

Context

Decision making

18. When making decisions the Local Government Act 2002 requires the council to:
   • identify all reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective of the decision
   • assess these options in terms of their advantages and disadvantages
   • give due consideration, with an open mind, to the views and preferences of people
     who will or may be affected by, or to have an interest in the decision.

19. The consultation process ensures those interested in or affected by decisions have an
    opportunity to have their voices heard by their elected representatives prior to decisions
    being made. Feedback received during public consultation is one key part of many
    components that need to be considered when making final decisions. Comments provided
    as part of the feedback should be considered in order to understand the context and the
    meanings behind the numbers and percentages presented.

20. The council must weigh up the information provided on the advantages and disadvantages
    of each option, consider the feedback received, and then arrive at what it determines to be
    the best decision.

Consultation and feedback

21. The council consulted on the proposed changes to rating policy and some fees as part of the
    Implementation of the council’s proposal for the pool fencing inspection charges also
    requires amendments to the Revenue and Financing Policy. These proposed amendments
    were consulted on separately from the consultation on the Annual Budget.

22. Analysis of feedback received during the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation was
    contained in the Summary of Feedback report to the Emergency Committee meeting on 21
    May 2020. Analysis of feedback received during the Revenue and Financing Policy
    consultation is included in this report under the section on pool fencing inspection charges.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

23. The following sections set out for each of the proposed changes to council’s financial
    policies and fees:
   • the proposal that was consulted on
   • a summary of feedback received
   • consideration of feedback including the advantages and disadvantages of the options
   • local board feedback
   • recommendations.

24. The analysis below records brief summaries of local board feedback on the proposals.
    Local board feedback is set out in full in a separate report also on this agenda. A number of
    local boards did not comment on many of the proposals given they did not directly impact on
    their areas.
Waste management targeted rate base service charge

Proposal
25. The council consulted on an increase in the waste management base service targeted rate by $19.97 (incl. GST) from $121.06 (incl. GST) to $141.03 (incl. GST) to cover cost increases of $9.5 million (excl. GST). The cost increases (excl. GST) are made up of:
   - recycling – declining demand for recyclables: $7.7 million
   - Hauraki Gulf Islands service $0.3 million
   - higher take-up rate for the inorganic service $1.2 million
   - other - $0.3 million.

Feedback
26. Of the 2,965 pieces of written or in-person feedback received on this topic, 67 per cent supported the proposal and 24 per cent did not. Those in support commented that the cost increase should be borne by those who receive the service, and that the proposed increase was fair and reasonable and needed to be done. Respondents opposing the change argued that the increase would be unaffordable, and that the financial burden should be shared among all ratepayers as one community. Some submitters also commented that the current system needed improving and the council needed to look at the option of local recycling.

Consideration
27. The proposal maintains a standard level of regional charges for base waste management services and keeps the costs transparent. Raising the base rate means the users and beneficiaries of the services are meeting the costs. If the waste management targeted rate is not increased it will add $9.5 million to the costs required to be funded from general rates. The additional costs are equivalent to a general rates increase of 0.6 per cent above the level set in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028. This would create issues with fairness and transparency when the 37,000 ratepayers who don’t receive the service would have to bear some of the costs.

28. It is not reasonably practical for council to reduce the current costs or service levels for recycling or the inorganic service as these are subject to contract terms and would be inconsistent with the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. During Alert Level 4 we were unable to provide for recycling of our fibre waste and this was sent to landfill. The costs associated with this were managed with use of the waste levy. There has also been a further contraction of the fibre and plastic recyclables market leading to a $2 million cost increase which will be managed by savings.

29. We have also rejected the option of permanently sending all recyclables to landfill as it would end up costing ratepayers more than continuing the recycling service and would be an environmentally unsound decision.

Local board feedback
30. Fourteen local boards supported the proposal and one were opposed.

Recommendation
31. Officers recommend the waste management base service targeted rate be increased by $19.97 (incl. GST) to $141.03 (incl. GST) as proposed.
Waste management targeted rate refuse charge

Proposal
32. The council consulted on an increase in the waste management refuse targeted rate for the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas as follows to cover cost increases of $3.5 million.

- Standard refuse rate to increase by $14.23 (incl. GST) from $129.93 (incl. GST) to $144.16 (incl. GST)
- Large refuse rate to increase by 20.91 (incl. GST) from $191.00 (incl. GST) to $211.91 (incl. GST).

Feedback
33. Of the 2,837 pieces of written or in-person feedback received on this topic, 65 per cent supported the proposal and 23 per cent did not. Those in support commented that the cost increase should be borne by those who receive the service. Respondents opposing the change argued that the service was too expensive.

Consideration
34. We may be able to make some costs savings as a result of delays to the introduction of the new collection contracts arising from restrictions on activity during Alert Level 4. This will reduce the required increase to $11.67 with the total rate $141.60. Officers will update the rate at adoption if the proposed level of savings can’t be achieved.

35. Raising the refuse rate means the users and beneficiaries of the services are meeting the costs. If the refuse targeted rate is not increased the council will need to fund an additional $3.0 million from general rates or the base waste management targeted rate. General rates would have to increase by a further 0.2 per cent or the waste management base service rate by a further $7 per annum, to cover the shortfall. These options will see either general rate payers or all those who receive a waste service across the region meeting the increased costs of refuse services provided in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas.

36. The average refuse charge in the waste management targeted rate for former Auckland City and Manukau City ratepayers was $141.75 in 2012/2013 (the first year when the rating policies of the former councils were integrated). The amended rate proposal of $141.60 for 2020/2021 would mean a cumulative decrease of 0.1 per cent over eight years.

37. It is not practical for the council to reduce the current costs or service levels for refuse collection as it is an essential service for Aucklanders and council has an obligation to effectively manage potential health and sanitary implications.

Local board feedback
38. All of the fifteen local boards that provided feedback on the proposal supported it.

Recommendation
39. Officers recommend the waste management standard refuse rate in the former Auckland City and Manukau City council areas be increased to $141.60 (including GST) and the large refuse rate in those areas be increased to $66.55 (including GST).

Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Proposal
40. The council proposed to, effective from 1 July 2021,

- stop providing the septic tank pump-out service to 656 ratepayers in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas
• continue to provide the septic tank pump-out service to the 3,210 ratepayers in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, funded from an increased targeted rate (likely to be between $260 and $320 per year) to fully recover costs.

Feedback
41. Overall, 1,611 responses were in favour of the proposal while 796 were against. Of the 796 responses that did not support the proposal, 549 said the service should be ended.

42. The most common theme for those who were in support was that user pays was the most equitable way to fund the service. Those against the proposal argued that the pump-out service should be subsidised by the council to acknowledge the lack of access to council services in remote areas, or that the targeted rate might be unaffordable for low income households. Feedback received through have your say events was of much lower volume but generated similar themes.

Consideration
43. The sewerage pump-out is a service that benefits individual tank owners. A targeted rate that recovers the full cost from properties that receive the service is therefore an appropriate mechanism to fund the service. Rural properties in other areas of Auckland already manage and pay for their own pump-outs without council involvement. The current rate is $198.43 per year. The proposed targeted rate is estimated at an amount between $260 and $320 per year, or $5 to $6.15 per week (subject to the tendering process). Auckland households on average pay $690 per annum, or $13.30 per week to Watercare for the disposal of their wastewater.

44. The council consulted on removal of the service and the targeted rate as part of its 2019/2020 Annual Budget consultation. Feedback received from residents in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area was strongly against the proposal, citing convenience of the service. However, the potential to increase the targeted rate for full cost recovery was not incorporated in the consultation. During this year’s consultation (Annual Budget 2020/2021), the proposal to continue the service in the Waitakere Ranges Local Board area with full cost recovery was put forward, alongside the option to stop the service. Among those respondents who identified themselves as tank owners (84), a higher number (36) supported the proposal than those who favoured a service removal (25). This indicated the service is still likely to be popular even with the general rate subsidy removed.

Local board feedback
45. Eleven local boards supported the proposal and one was opposed. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board supported continuing the service in the board area with costs subsidised by general ratepayers. They argued that the setting of the targeted rate should recognise the public good outcome delivered by the rural sewerage systems noting that the west coast and northern Manukau Harbour beaches are popular visitor destinations for all Aucklanders.

Recommendation
46. Officers recommend that the proposal be adopted as consulted on. From 1 July 2021, the council will:
• stop providing the septic tank pump-out service to ratepayers in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas
• continue to provide the service to ratepayers in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, funded from an increased targeted rate (likely to be between $260 and $320 per year subject to the final tendering process) to fully recover costs.
Pool fencing compliance charges

Proposal

47. The council proposed to replace the $130 first swimming pool fencing inspection fee with an annual targeted rate of $44 for all private pool owners. If the pool owner arranges an inspection from an independently qualified pool inspector (IQPI), then the targeted rate will be reduced to $22 (incl. GST) which will cover the council’s costs of administering and maintaining the swimming pool inspection register. Any follow-up inspections will continue to be charged separately.

48. Including the first inspection charge on the rates invoice (as a targeted rate) makes it easier for pool owners to pay for their inspection by:

- bundling the cost in with their rates
- spreading the cost over three years
- giving them access to a range of rates’ payment options.

49. If we don’t make these changes then the three-yearly fee for inspection will remain and increase to $135 for 2020/2021. This is higher than $132 ($44 times three) because the proposed targeted rate has incorporated efficiency gains in administration costs which would not be realised if the current charging mechanism remains. The current inspection fee of $130 does not fully recover costs.

50. To implement the proposed changes required separate consultation to amend the Revenue and Financing Policy to identify targeted rate as a funding source for the Regulation activity.

Feedback

51. Of the 451 respondents to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation who specifically commented on this proposal, 153 supported the proposal and 209 did not. Another 62 respondents thought the proposal was to increase the frequency of pool inspection to once every year. Submissions that supported the proposal agreed that the annual targeted rate would spread the financial burden for pool owners (8 feedback points) and improve efficiency (6 feedback points). Of the feedback points that opposed the proposal, common themes were:

- Don’t want to pay council in advance (before an inspection is carried out) (36 feedback points)
- Pool inspections are not necessary (21 feedback points)

52. Of the 128 respondents to the proposed changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy, 61 supported the proposal and 67 did not. Comments received for and against the proposal were in line with those received to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation.

53. Over both consultations, a total of 579 feedback points on the proposed swimming pool fencing inspection targeted rate were received. Of these, 38 per cent were in support and 43 per cent did not support the proposed changes.

Consideration

54. The proposal was to spread the charge for the first inspection over a period of three years. The frequency of the inspection remains unchanged (once every three years), with a small price increase to cover cost inflation.

55. The Building Act 2004 requires that councils ensure all residential pools within their jurisdictions be inspected at least once every three years to determine whether the pool complies with safety standards set out in the Act. It is important to note that some of the feedback points against the proposal argued that pool inspections were not necessary which is inconsistent with the legislative requirements. The remaining feedback was evenly balanced and no significant issues were raised that weren’t considered when the proposal was adopted for consultation.
56. Under the proposal, some targeted rate amounts will be paid before the inspection takes place, and some will be after. Given the size of the proposed targeted rate, the cost to ratepayers of paying early in terms of foregone interest, or the cost to council of receiving payment after the service is provided, is negligible.

Local board feedback
57. All of the five local boards that provided feedback on the proposal supported it.

Recommendation
58. Officers recommend adoption of the proposal as consulted on. This is set out in the table below.

Table 1: Proposed changes to pool fencing compliance charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charge 2019/2020 (incl. GST)</td>
<td>Charging method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First inspection[1]</td>
<td>Single household $130 per inspection</td>
<td>Fee invoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared[2]</td>
<td>$130 per inspection</td>
<td>Fee invoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent inspection[3]</td>
<td>Site visit required $130 per inspection</td>
<td>Fee invoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit not required</td>
<td>$65 per inspection</td>
<td>Fee invoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQPI inspection[4]</td>
<td>Single household No charge n/a</td>
<td>$22 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>No charge n/a</td>
<td>$66 per record update Fee invoice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to the table:
1. This also includes inspections carried out by the council to confirm that a pool has been removed.
2. Pools shared by multiple rating units (such as one owned by a body corporate and used by all units of an apartment building) will continue to be charged an inspection fee instead where there is no separate rates account for the shared area.
3. Pools failing the first inspection require subsequent inspections until all defects have been remedied. Approximately 50 per cent of the pools require more than one inspection. This also includes pools that fail their first inspection by an independently qualified pool inspector (IQPI) (see note 4 below) and are passed back to the council for subsequent inspections.
4. Pool owners can choose to have their pools inspected by an IQPI. Over 99 per cent of the pools in Auckland are currently inspected by the council. Pool owners who use an IQPI will be charged a reduced amount to recover costs required to maintain swimming pool data to ensure council compliance with the Building Act.

Changes to some fees and deposit levels

Proposal
59. The council consulted on changes to some fees and deposits. These were to ensure that:

- fees continue to meet the cost recovery levels set by the council
- service costs are transparent to customers
- fees are set appropriately for new legislative requirements
- user charges are introduced where appropriate to replace ratepayer funding.

60. The proposed changes were in the following categories:

- changes to some consent fees and deposits (attached as Attachment A)
- increase the permit fee for high impact commercial events from $1,100 to $1,500
- introduce a $20 entry fee to Auckland Botanic Gardens for international visitors
Feedback

Consent fees and deposits

61. Consultation sought feedback on the introduction of a deposit for an application for a licence for micro-mobility devices including e-scooters. No feedback was received on the deposits. However, 24 feedback points were received on e-scooter fees (although e-scooter licensing costs are recovered from hourly rates which were being adjusted for inflation only and were not consulted on as part of this annual budget). Another four submitters expressed concern over the current resource consent annual charge for marine farms (also not an issue consulted on as part of this annual budget) and commented that the method to calculate the fee was not transparent.

Commercial event permit fee

62. 18 feedback points were received on the proposal with eight in support and 10 against. Those who were not in support commented that the commercial event fee is unreasonable and may discourage event holders.

Botanic Gardens entry fee

63. 55 feedback points were received on the proposal with eight in support and 34 against. Seven of those opposing the proposal commented that the proposed fee was too high (six said they would support the fee if it were lower). A further four observed that an entry fee would be unmanageable due to the multiple entry points and the cost of administration.

Consideration

Consent fees and deposits

64. No issues were raised on the proposed changes consulted on. The proposed changes would improve transparency and cost certainty for consent applicants and simplify the fee structure for some customers. There were also changes in response to legislative change (works on earthquake prone buildings). The proposed increases have been adjusted downward to reflect the council’s revised rate of inflation of 1.25 per cent. The estimated increase in revenue as a result of these changes is now less than $10,000.

Marine farms – functions, powers and duties charge

65. Officers consider that the current resource consent functions, powers and duties (FPD) charges on marine farms could be lowered for larger farms to better reflect costs.

66. The FPD charge covers the resource consent holder’s contributions to the council’s monitoring programmes, environmental research and investigations, education and advisory programmes. It is charged on a per hectare basis for marine farms. The majority of marine farms in the Auckland region are relatively small, in the order of 5 to 15 hectares, which attract a charge that is largely commensurate to the cost of the council performing the related functions.

67. The council has recently approved a number of large farms. Some of these are in the order of 130 to 460 hectares in size. The FPD charge based on a flat fee per hectare for these larger farms would no longer reflect the actual cost associated with the relevant programmes undertaken by the council. Officers recommend introducing lower FPD charges for larger marine farms to better reflect actual costs:
Table 2 Recommended changes to annual FPD charges for marine farms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of farm</th>
<th>Annual FPD Charge per hectare (incl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 hectares</td>
<td>$209.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas between 10-20 hectares</td>
<td>$209.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$104.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas greater than 20 hectares</td>
<td>$209.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. These changes are in line with feedback received during this consultation from consent holders of the large marine farms.

69. Proposed changes to regulatory fees and deposits including marine farm fees are included in Attachment A.

   Commercial event permit fee

70. Significant staff effort is required to facilitate and process a high impact (5,000 participants or more) commercial event application e.g. St Jerome’s Laneway Festival. The council needs to ensure that the event meets all safety and other legislative and bylaw requirements. The permit fee has not been changed since its introduction in 2015/2016. An increase in the fee of $400 would reduce the ratepayer subsidy and is not considered unaffordable for high impact event organisers. Fees for community and other commercial events will either remain unchanged or be adjusted for cost inflation.

71. While major events cannot proceed at time of writing, they may be able to take place at COVID-19 Level 1. At this time the council may incur additional regulatory costs to ensure compliance with social distancing or other measures.

72. While the COVID-19 situation may reduce the additional revenue from the proposed change, the underlying principle of the proposal remains sound.

   Botanic Gardens entry fee

73. The proposed fee is comparable with that of similar facilities in Auckland such as Auckland Art Gallery ($20), Auckland Museum ($25) and New Zealand Maritime Museum ($20). In the first year a “soft” introduction was proposed to keep administration costs to a minimum:
   - The fee will be primarily collected through arrangements with commercial guided tour operators so no entry gates or barriers will be required for implementation
   - Entry signage will direct international visitors to a welcome desk to purchase tickets on arrival, but this will not be enforced.

74. Officers recommend that the proposed entry fee be reconsidered when our borders are reopened. As a result of COVID-19 it is unlikely that there will be many international visitors this year with the prospect of our border remaining closed for the foreseeable future (for example, until a vaccine is available, which has been suggested could be up to 18 months away). While there is discussion of an open border with Australia, visitors from across the Tasman are a small proportion of entrants to the gardens.

Local board feedback

75. Two local boards provided feedback on the proposed changes to regulatory fees and deposits and the proposed introduction of entry fee to Auckland Botanic Gardens for international visitors. Both supported the proposals. No local board feedback was received on the proposed change to the high impact commercial event permit fee.
Recommendation

76. Officers recommend the adoption of the changes to fees and charges as included in Attachment A. Officers also recommend the adoption of annual FPD charges for marine farms as set out in Table 2 above. Officers recommend that the proposed Botanic Gardens entry fee be reconsidered when our borders are reopened.

Other changes

Proposal

77. The council also consulted on the following proposals as part of the draft Annual Budget 2020/2021.

- introduction of a voluntary scheme where ratepayers in Clevedon who are able to connect to Watercare’s reticulated network can apply for financial assistance from the council and pay it back through a targeted rate over 15 years
- inclusion of a HomeFit assessment at the cost of $260 plus GST in the Retrofit-your-home targeted rate for all new applications of more than $2,000
- potential changes to Business Improvement Districts (BID) and related targeted rates
  - establishment of Central Park Henderson and One Warkworth BIDs
  - extension of the Glen Innes, Manukau Central and Manurewa BIDs

Feedback

78. Sixteen feedback points were received on these proposals.

- All seven feedback points that commented on the Clevedon voluntary scheme supported the proposal.
- Of the five feedback points that commented on the inclusion of HomeFit assessment cost in the Retrofit-your-home targeted rate, four supported the proposal and one did not.
- Four feedback points were received on the BID proposals with two supporting the establishment of the One Warkworth BID and one opposing the expansion of the Glen Innes BID.

Consideration

79. Council encourages connection with the reticulated network as it reduces the risk of environmental pollution. Connection to the water supply network also ensures safe and reliable drinking water supply for households.

80. The HomeFit assessment will give homeowners a better understanding of how well their home meets ventilation, insulation, heating and energy efficiency standards, and therefore help them make the best decisions about upgrading their home. The cost of $260 plus GST is proposed for new applications of $2,000 or more only. This ensures that existing scheme holders and low value loans won’t be affected.

81. We currently have six financial assistance schemes to help ratepayers with the costs of installing home heating and insulation, connection to water/wastewater networks, replacement of failing on-site wastewater systems, or construction of a local road. Ratepayers who enter these schemes repay the financial assistance through a targeted rate over a number of years. Around 14,000 ratepayers are currently enrolled in these schemes.
82. Our previous consultation noted that some changes had been made to the Credit Contracts and Consumer Finance Act 2003 and that we were working through the implications of these for our various voluntary financial assistance schemes. We are now aware that we will be unable to make the changes to our systems and processes that we know are required in time to set rates for the 2020/2021 year. Without implementing these changes, we cannot recover interest on the financial support these schemes provide. This requires amendments to the Funding Impact Statement in relation to the rates set to recover the cost of these schemes. We will therefore include reference to these changes in the draft materials for the Emergency Budget consultation.

83. The Glen Innes BID Association has decided to withdraw the proposed expansion of the Glen Innes BID for 2020/2021. The ballot for Manurewa BID expansion was unsuccessful.

84. The ballots for the One Warkworth BID establishment and the Manukau Central BID expansion were successful.

85. The ballot for the establishment of Central Park Henderson BID was affected by the Covid-19 lockdown. The total number of votes returned (23.4%) fell just short of the minimum of 25% the BID policy usually requires for a successful ballot. However, of the votes returned a clear majority of the votes were in support of the BID programme (of those returned, 64.42% voted Yes, 35.34% voted no).

86. The BID Policy generally requires a threshold of 25% of total voting forms to be returned. However, the policy anticipates that there may be occasions where exceptional or unexpected circumstances, such as an earthquake or a major extended business interruption, have impacted the voting and ballot process.

87. Council and the independent election services agent, who conducted the ballot, are satisfied that the COVID-19 virus is an exceptional or unexpected circumstance that has had an impact on the ballot. As the 25% threshold was very close to being met with a clear majority in favour, the council proposes to proceed with the BID programme but with a slightly lower targeted rate of $400,000 for the 2020/2021 year. The original targeted rate proposed was $500,000. This means, each BID rateable property, on average, will pay approximately $392 plus GST per year. Given that the requirements of the BID Policy regarding a successful ballot were not quite met, officers recommend including this matter in the further consultation on the Emergency Budget.

88. In response to COVID-19, the following BIDs, along with the proposed Central Park Henderson BID, have voted to decrease their grant budget for 2020/2021. The setting of the BID targeted rates for 2020/2021 will incorporate these changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID</th>
<th>Decrease in budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellerslie</td>
<td>6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karangahape Road</td>
<td>5 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere Town Centre</td>
<td>5 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau Central</td>
<td>7 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lynn</td>
<td>4 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harbour</td>
<td>3 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In order for a BID proposal to proceed these ballots require a 25 per cent return rate and of those over 51 per cent must be in support of the proposal.
## Local board feedback

89. Franklin Local Board supported the proposed introduction of the voluntary Clevedon water and wastewater connection scheme. One local board supported the proposed inclusion of HomeFit assessment cost in the Retro-fit Your Home targeted rate and two were opposed.

90. The proposed establishments of the One Warkworth BID and the Central Park Henderson BID, and the propose expansion to the Manukau Central BID were all supported by the relevant local boards.

## Recommendation

91. Officers recommend that

- the voluntary financial assistance scheme be set up as consulted on assist properties in Clevedon with connection to reticulated water and wastewater systems, including a targeted rate scheme to be applied from 2021/2022.
- a HomeFit assessment at the cost of $260 plus GST be included in the Retrofit-your-home targeted rate for all new applications of more than $2,000
- the One Warkworth BIDs be established with a new targeted rate introduced as consulted on
- the Manukau Central BID be expanded as consulted on
- the establishment of the Central Park Henderson BID and the associated targeted rate be consulted on again as part of the Emergency Budget.

## Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

### Climate impact statement

92. Recommendations in this report have a neutral climate impact as they relate to the allocation of charges rather than decisions on activities to be undertaken.

93. The recommended Clevedon Water and Wastewater Connection Targeted Rate will have minimal impact on greenhouse gas emissions within the Auckland region. Greenhouse gas emissions from onsite wastewater systems are not recognised as a significant contributor to emissions, although they do contribute towards the cumulative emissions from the Auckland region. Decommissioning these onsite systems and directing the effluent to the Mangere Wastewater Treatment Plant will allow for these wastewater volumes to be managed through a more efficient and technical treatment process. Connecting the residents to a more secure potable water supply will also provide for additional resilience to adapt to the effects of climate change by ensuring they are not fully reliant on tank water supply.

94. Climate change related issues and impacts were considered as part of the criteria for identifying and assessing waste services provided under the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The recommended changes to waste management targeted rates are consistent with this plan.
95. Climate impacts for the recommended changes to the Retrofit Your Home Targeted Rate were considered by the Environment and Community Committee when it made its recommendations on the proposed changes. The recommended changes to the Waitakere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate have a neutral climate impact as the onsite wastewater system servicing will continue whether it is provided privately or by council.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

96. The changes proposed in this report have been communicated to and agreed on by the following departments or business units of the Auckland Council group:

- Waste Solution
- Healthy Waters
- Regulatory Services
- Parks Sports and Recreation
- Arts Community and Events
- CCO/External Partnerships
- Legal and Risk.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe Local impacts and local board views

97. Local boards views on the impacts of regional decisions on their local community are included in a separate report on this agenda.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

98. The council does not hold information on the ethnicity of ratepayers, building and resource consent applicants so is not able to identify the exact impact on the proposed changes on Māori. The impact of the proposed changes on Māori will be similar to that on other residents in Auckland.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea Financial implications

99. The financial implications of the recommended charges are noted in the relevant sections above.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga Risks and mitigations

100. There are no risks associated with recommendations in this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri Next steps

101. Decisions made at this meeting will be incorporated into the Emergency Budget 2020/2021. On 30 July 2020, the Governing Body will be asked to adopt the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 and set rates for the 2020/2021 financial year. Changes to fees arising from decisions made in response to this report will be implemented from 1 July 2020.
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Attachment A: Changes to fees and deposits 2020/2021

New fees and charges

The council proposes to introduce new fees for a range of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee type</th>
<th>Fixed fee 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building consents fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Plumbing</td>
<td>Minor plumbing with a producer statement where works are for single</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shower, single vanity or single toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Alteration for structural</td>
<td>Minor structural engineering design with a producer statement where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering design</td>
<td>value of work &lt; $5k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Warrant of Fitness (BWOF)</td>
<td>BWOF Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independently Qualified Pool Inspectors (IQPI) record administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of IQPI records</td>
<td></td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Cooling Towers</td>
<td>Industrial Cooling Towers- per inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Prone Buildings</td>
<td>Extension of time to complete seismic work on certain heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buildings or part of the building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemption from the requirement to carry out seismic work on the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>building or part of the building</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consents and licensing fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>s357 Objection hearing deposit</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-mobility device including e-scooters</td>
<td>Application for licence</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring deposit charged on approval of application</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of requirement</td>
<td>Inspection monitoring for dairy farms - per inspection</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple new notice or alteration</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor alteration to existing notice of requirement</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upfitt an existing notice of requirement</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex new notice or alteration</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deposit level changes

The proposed deposit levels have been adjusted to reflect the likely final charge more accurately increasing transparency for customers. Consolidating fee bandings are proposed for lower valued projects and additional bandings for upper level bandings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current Deposit $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Processing deposit 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Inspection Deposit 2020/21 $ (incl. GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building consents fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other building applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value up to $1,999</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value $2,000-$4,999</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value up to $4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value $5,000-$19,999</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value $20,000-$499,999</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value $100,000-$499,999</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value $500,000 - $999,999</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project value $1,000,000 and over</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All fixed fees and base fees are non-refundable. Base fees may have additional hourly rate charges applied. The fixed fee plus the deposit is payable at lodgement of application.
### Rates and Fees Issues for the Emergency Budget 2020/2021

#### Other Changes

Changes from fixed fees to base fees will reduce administrative costs and provide the ability to recover hourly fees for additional processing or inspection work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee type or change</th>
<th>Current fee $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Fee 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Approval</td>
<td>Project value up to $19,999</td>
<td>Change from fixed fee to base</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,200 plus inspection deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Prosecution and Infringements may also apply for work undertaken without consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Approval</td>
<td>Project value $20,000 and over</td>
<td>Change from fixed fee to base</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2,000 plus inspection deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Prosecution and Infringements may also apply for work undertaken without consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing compliance schedule</td>
<td>Base charge</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional charge per specified system</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All fixed fees and base fees are non-refundable. Base fees may have additional hourly rate charges applied. The fixed fee plus the deposit is payable at lodgement of application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee type or change</th>
<th>Current fee $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Fee 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-application meeting</td>
<td>Building Consent Pre-application: complex</td>
<td>Change from deposit to base fee</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire engineering briefs</td>
<td>Fire engineering brief meeting, limited to one hour (hourly rates apply thereafter)</td>
<td>Change from deposit to base fee</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing</td>
<td>Refusing of building consent</td>
<td>Change from deposit to base fee</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title search</td>
<td>Certificate of Title</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building inspections late cancellation</td>
<td>Fee for building inspections cancelled after 12 pm the day before the inspection booking</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary structures</td>
<td>Application for a temporary structure</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Information Memorandum (PIM)</td>
<td>Issuing Project Information Memorandum</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver</td>
<td>Building consent subject to waiver or modification of building code</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Warrant of Fitness (BWOF)</td>
<td>Annual renewal</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate for Public Use (CPU)</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of time for CPU</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol licensing</td>
<td>Certificate that proposed use of premises meets requirements of building code and Resource Management Act</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building and planning certificate</td>
<td>Construction of vehicle crossings</td>
<td>Change from fixed to base fee</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee registration for Independent Qualified Persons have been simplified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee change</th>
<th>Current fixed fee for processing $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Fixed fee for processing 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQP Register</td>
<td>Registration costs for Independent Qualified Person (IQP) base charge</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration for each specified system: IQP</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration renewal for Independent Qualified Person base charge</td>
<td>Changed to 3 yearly</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid fuel heating appliances (fee per appliance)</td>
<td>If installed by an approved installer** providing a producer statement</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wettback Installation</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All fixed fees and base fees are non-refundable. Base fees may have additional hourly rate charges applied. The fixed fee plus the deposit is payable at lodgement of application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee change</th>
<th>Current fixed fee for processing $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Fixed fee $ for processing 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid fuel heating appliances (fee per appliance)</td>
<td>If installed by a person who is not an approved installer (plus inspection deposit payable at the time of application)</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar water or heat pump water heating devices (fee per device)</td>
<td>If installed by an approved installer providing a producer statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If installed by a person who is not an approved installer (plus inspection deposit payable at the time of application)</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injected wall applications</td>
<td>Application for injected wall insulation. If installed by an approved installer providing a producer statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If installed by a person who is not an approved installer (plus inspection deposit payable at the time of application)</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes from deposits to base or fixed fees will reduce administrative costs and provide the ability to recover hourly fees for additional processing or inspection work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee type change</th>
<th>Current deposit (incl GST)</th>
<th>Fee 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building consent fees</td>
<td>Code Compliance Certificate (CCC)</td>
<td>Project value up to $19,998</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project value $20,000-$99,999</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project value $500,000 and over</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project value $20,000 and over</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of building consents (lodged as one on lodgement)</td>
<td>Application to separate a historic building consent that relates to two or more buildings on the same site (per application)</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource consents and licensing fees</td>
<td>Resource Consents – Land Use</td>
<td>Exemptions and approvals under the Auckland Council Signage Bylaw</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to hourly rates are proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current hourly rates $ (incl GST)</th>
<th>Hourly rates 2020/21 $ (incl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical level 3</td>
<td>Manager, project/account lead, legal services (all areas)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>206.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical level 2</td>
<td>Building – Residential 2, 3 and all Commercial, Planning, Engineering, Monitoring, other – Senior, Intermediate, Principal, Team leader (all areas)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical level 1</td>
<td>Planning, Subdivision, Urban design, Compliance, Monitoring, Investigation, Environmental health, Licensing, Building – Residential 1, other</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>170.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Administration (all areas)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All fixed fees and base fees are non-refundable. Base fees may have additional hourly rate charges applied. The fixed fee plus the deposit is payable at lodgement of application.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To recommend a COVID-19 rates postponement scheme to be adopted for consultation alongside the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The economic fallout of COVID-19 is confronting many residents and businesses with both immediate cash challenges and medium to longer term uncertainty. The council is providing short term assistance using existing policies to allow ratepayers to defer the fourth quarter rates instalment until 31 August 2020.

3. Economic recovery is forecast to take two to three years and many ratepayers may still be in the early stages of adjusting their financial position as we enter the 2020/2021 rating year. The council is also facing a fall in revenue and must operate within its borrowing limits.

4. Officers recommend a targeted postponement scheme to support struggling ratepayers with their 2020/2021 rates. This balances support for ratepayers with the council’s need to maintain services and support economic recovery. Under the proposed scheme postponement will be available to all ratepayers (residential and business) financially stressed as a result of COVID-19 (excluding government entities, utilities and overseas based owners); specifically:
   - residential and lifestyle ratepayers with a mortgage (property owners without a mortgage are very unlikely to be financially stressed)
   - financially stressed business and farm ratepayers

5. To focus support on small and medium business all postponement will be capped at $20,000 (GST incl) per property. This will make full support available to 85 per cent of business properties. Larger businesses tend to be better capitalised and have greater access to finance. Properties with higher rates will be able to postpone the first $20,000 (GST incl) of rates. A cap reduces the council’s exposure to uptake of postponement in excess of forecasts. Postponement of rates over $20,000 could be assessed on a case by case basis against more stringent criteria but this could present administrative challenges and greater uptake risk.

6. Not for profit ratepayers will be eligible for postponement under either the residential or business criteria depending on the rating classification of the property they are applying for. Not for profit applications for residential property will not be required to have a mortgage.

7. The proposed scheme provides for applications to be made up until 31 December 2020 by which time we expect ratepayers to have a clearer view of their financial position. It will be available to properties owned prior to 26 March to ensure that the council is not taking on the risk of decisions made by ratepayers after the full impact of COVID-19 was becoming clear.

8. The proposed scheme is primarily targeted at postponement of rates for the 2020/2021 rating year but has provision for extension to subsequent years by committee resolution.

9. The scheme will provide for the council to set a postponement fee to cover the costs of interest and administration.

10. A draft scheme to be added to our Rates remission and postponement policy is set out in Attachment A: Draft COVID-19 Rates postponement scheme.
11. We forecast that up to 11,000 ratepayers will postpone up to $85 million of rates for the 2020/2021 year under this proposed scheme. The council can manage the reductions in cashflow arising from the forecast increase in ratepayers taking up the option to postpone their rates. The proposal is cost neutral as recipients will meet our interest and administration costs.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Emergency Committee:

a) agree to consult alongside the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 on the addition to the Rates remission and postponement policy of a COVID-19 Rates postponement scheme in Attachment A to this report

b) note that the consultation materials for the COVID-19 Rates postponement scheme will be included in the Consultation Document and Supporting Information for the Emergency Budget 2020/2021

c) delegate to the chair of the Finance and Performance Committee and Group Chief Financial Officer to authorise any minor amendments and corrections to the proposed scheme and consultation materials.

Horopaki

Context

Economic impact

12. Many of our ratepayers are facing immediate financial stress and an uncertain future. Nationally around 1.6 million workers have received the wage subsidy through nearly 500,000 businesses. Across New Zealand 100,000 homeowners have reduced or deferred their mortgage payments. Economic forecasts include major falls in output, rising unemployment and a recovery that could take two to three years.

13. To assist with the short term impacts the council is allowing financially stressed ratepayers to defer their fourth quarter rates instalment, due on 28 May, to 31 August 2020. As of 13 May, $17 million of the fourth quarter instalment have been deferred for 4,139 residential and 1,449 business properties. This temporary respite will allow some ratepayers to reorganize their finances as restrictions on economic activity are lifted. As we move into the new rating year some of these ratepayers will remain short of cash having consumed capital reserves and savings. They will be facing a longer period with greatly reduced incomes and the prospect of unemployment or business failure.

14. Auckland Council will also be severely impacted. However, council has an important role to play continuing to provide essential services and supporting the government’s efforts to maintain stability and stimulate recovery. In order to fulfil that role with reduced income and constrained borrowing the council needs to ensure cashflow remains robust.

Cost of rates to property owners

15. Rates are a fixed cost for property owners. For those who have become unemployed, or are facing major falls in business or personal income, rates may present a demand on cash they cannot easily meet now or over the next few months. However, rates are a small proportion of business and household costs.
16. The Productivity Commission’s notes that residential rates are only 5 per cent of income for the lowest 20 per cent of household income earners. The average residential rates in Auckland are $2600 per year, $650 per quarter or around $50 per week. In comparison the average residential mortgage is around $387,000 which costs $525 per week over 20 years at current interest rates.

17. For businesses rates are also a small proportion of outgoings and much lower than rents. The return sought on commercial property is generally more than 5 per cent which is ten times business rates.

18. Any rates relief is also small relative to the support being offered by government through wage subsidies, tax deferrals and loan guarantees.

Current council support for ratepayers

19. The deferral of the fourth quarter instalment at no cost is available to all ratepayers who are financially stressed. Prior to COVID-19 only 490 ratepayers were on payment plans including 20 businesses.

20. In addition to the deferral the council:
   - offers rates postponement to residential ratepayers who have owned their property for two years and have sufficient equity while they live at the property
   - administers the government’s rates rebates scheme which provides rates relief of up to $640 for those on incomes below a specified level
   - supports ratepayer’s applications for the government’s Accommodation Supplement. This is the primary assistance for accommodation costs and can include help with rates payments. People do not need to receive a main benefit to be eligible.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

21. Within the context set out above officers consider that a rates postponement scheme addressed to the challenges presented by COVID-19 should balance:
   - targeting support to those ratepayers who are financially stressed
   - aligning the length of postponement to predicted recovery timeframes
   - maintaining the council’s cashflows
   - providing security for future payment of postponed rates.

22. Officer’s propose that a COVID-19 Rates postponement scheme be added to the Rates remissions and postponement policy. The scheme will allow ratepayers to defer payment of their 2020/2021 rates for one year until 30 June 2021.

23. The support being proposed extends beyond the timeframe of Alert Levels 3 and 4. Many ratepayers will have consumed their capital reserves or savings while activity was restricted. We recognise that reorganizing their financial position may take longer than one year for some ratepayers. The council will be able to review the scheme over the coming year and extend the postponement scheme if it is considered that further assistance for some ratepayers is required.

24. Officers recommendations and alternative options for targeting financially stressed ratepayers along with the terms and conditions for postponement are discussed in the sections below.
25. The analysis of eligibility criteria groups ratepayers into two classifications, business and residential. The current differential groupings (residential, business and farm/lifestyle) are based on the council's decisions on the distribution of the rates burden. Officers do not consider these classifications represent the basis on which financial stress from COVID-19 will manifest or can be managed. We have therefore split the farm/lifestyle differential group placing farms alongside businesses and lifestyle in the residential category.

**Targeting the impacts of COVID-19**

26. Applications for the proposed postponement will be open until 31 December 2020. While the economic impacts may extend well beyond this period unemployment is forecast to peak by the end of 2020. Officers therefore consider most ratepayers will have more clarity about their future financial position by this time.

27. Officers also recommend that postponement be limited to applications from ratepayers who owned their property, or entered into agreement to buy their property, before 26 March 2020. The purpose of this criteria is to limit council's financial exposure to situations that are out of ratepayer's control due to COVID-19.

28. Some ratepayers may have purchased or transferred properties after 26 March 2020 while being in a financially secure situation only to find their situation changes. While this change in circumstances may not be the ratepayer's fault, they would have been aware of the economic uncertainty and associated risk. The council will consider applications from residential ratepayers in these circumstances on a case by case basis. Business ratepayers have a greater responsibility to undertake due diligence.

**Targeting options: excluded properties**

29. To balance provision of support to financially stressed ratepayers within the council's financial constraints officers consider that the offer of postponement should not be available to:
   - government entities
   - utilities
   - overseas owners of residential properties or businesses without a physical presence in New Zealand.

30. Officers have rejected the option of making this postponement open to all ratepayers. Limiting support to financially stressed ratepayers reduces the risk of excessive uptake. It also ensures other ratepayers aren't bearing the cost of supporting those who don't need assistance.

31. Officers consider that it isn't necessary to provide assistance to government entities including the Ministries and Departments of the public service, State enterprises and Crown entities. Government entities can draw on the resources of the Crown to ensure they can meet their commitments. We also consider that utilities while facing reduced demand will continue to have strong cashflows.

32. The intention of the scheme is to support ratepayers who may be facing financial stress. Officers consider that it will not be practical to establish the financial position of overseas based ratepayers unless this can be verified by use of New Zealand government sources.

33. To qualify, owners of residential properties should be citizens or New Zealand residents living here. For business properties, the property owner must be the recipient of the wage subsidy which requires proof of New Zealand operation or where receiving other forms of government support the property owner will be required to provide similar evidence to the council.
Supporting residential and lifestyle
34. Officers recommend that all residential and lifestyle ratepayers financially stressed due to COVID-19 be eligible to apply for postponement of the first $20,000 (GST incl) of their 2020/2021 rates per property. Only 285 residential and lifestyle properties that aren’t businesses owning residential land pay more than $20,000 rates. These ratepayers aren’t operating in the sectors most effected by COVID-19 economic fall-out and will still be able to postpone the first $20,000 of their rates if they are in financial hardship.

35. Officers consider that residential and lifestyle rates postponement should be available to property owners with a mortgage. Residential ratepayers with a mortgage free property are unlikely to be under significant financial stress given that rates are a small proportion of household costs and may be able to access the rates rebate scheme. Residential ratepayers with mortgage-free properties who have owned their property for two years may, however, qualify for postponement under the existing residential postponement policy.

36. The postponement will be available to landlords who can display that they are under financial stress. While landlords may hold more wealth than owner occupiers, they too may face financial stress. Some landlords support mortgage payments through paid employment which may have been affected by COVID-19.

37. Officers will assess financial stress for residential and lifestyle ratepayers based on evidence provided by applicants which may include amongst other factors whether they have:
   - suffered a 30 per cent drop in income
   - become unemployed.

Supporting businesses and farms
38. Officers recommend that all business and farm ratepayers financially stressed due to COVID-19 be eligible to apply for postponement of the first $20,000 (GST incl) of their 2020/2021 rates per property.

39. The cap is proposed per property rather than per ratepayer because of the difficulty of establishing ownership by related parties. Around 5,900 business properties (15 per cent of the total) pay more than $20,000 (GST incl). For the most impacted sectors, 94 percent of accommodation properties will be under the cap along with 86 per cent of retail/restaurant properties. This may favour some large businesses who own multiple properties over those with one large value property. However, it isn’t administratively practical to determine ownership reliably for complex corporate structures so capping per ratepayer was rejected.

40. A cap of $20,000 (GST incl) will focus the support on small and medium businesses. Compared to smaller businesses, large businesses are more likely to have greater:
   - asset bases
   - diversity of income streams
   - potential to cut costs
   - access to finance and alternative funding e.g. share issues
   - access to financial and legal advice.

41. This does not mean that all large businesses will be able to weather the effects of the current crisis without assistance. Larger businesses particularly in the hospitality, accommodation and travel industries will likely face severe disruption in the short to medium term, regardless of size.

42. To support these businesses the council could allow for postponement in the case of severe financial hardship. However, this option was rejected because of the cost to council of the higher potential value of postponement and the administrative challenges in determining severe financial hardship for large businesses. The owners of these properties would still be able to postpone the first $20,000 of their rates.
Financial stress test

43. Officers consider that all business and farm properties should be able to postpone their rates if they are financially stressed. Possible tests of financial stress include:
   - have or are a recipient of the government’s wage subsidy
   - deferral of tax payments
   - receipt of a government guaranteed business loan
   - reduction in income of 30 per cent year on year.

Commercial landlords

44. Many small and medium businesses are tenants and are required to pay the rates under their lease. However, the council’s relationship is with the landlord as ratepayer. The landlord is ultimately liable for payment of the rates. Commercial landlords in financial stress are eligible under the conditions for business properties above.

45. Officers considered either requiring commercial landlords in financial stress, and/or allowing those not in financial stress, to apply for postponement if they were passing the benefits on to their tenants. However, commercial landlords have a long-term interest in the viability of their tenants and therefore should take the first responsibility for managing the economic challenges.

Not for profits

46. Many not-for-profit community organisations may also be struggling as their donor pool is impacted by a contracting economy. Key fund-raising activity may also have been curtailed by the restrictions on activity during Alert Levels 3 and 4. Rates postponement should also be available to these groups given their important role in supporting communities and bringing people together.

47. Not for profit properties will be assessed under criteria above based on the rating classification for the property, or part of the property, for which the application is made. However, given that many not for profit community organisations do not have robust financial positions, applications for properties classified as residential will not need to have a mortgage to qualify.

Qualifying conditions

48. Allowing ratepayers to postpone their rates imposes costs on the council and presents risks to council, the ratepayer and other lenders.

Statutory land charge

49. The proposed scheme does not require a statutory land charge (SLC) to be placed on the title of a property postponing rates but reserves the right to do so. The council will record the outstanding rates under this scheme on any requested Land Information Memorandum (LIM). However, unlike placing a SLC on the title and because LIMs are not sought in every case, this does not guarantee that lenders and potential buyers will be aware of the outstanding rates. To increase the chances that lenders and buyers are aware of this element of our new postponement scheme we will communicate with all the relevant institutions (realtors, lawyers and lenders) and their professional bodies.

50. Our current remission policy requires a SLC to be placed on the title for a property on which rates have been postponed. Placing a SLC on the title does not materially improve the council’s security of payment in the majority of cases as rates are a charge on the land by statute. On the sale of the land rates would almost invariably be required to be fully cleared by the buyer from the proceeds of sale. However, a SLC prevents further registration against the title without the consent of the Council. This also ensures that other lenders whose debt is secured against the property and potential buyers are aware of the outstanding rates. This additional security may be useful in certain circumstances. The placement and removal of a SLC costs $165 plus staff time.
Postponement fee

51. Officers recommend that the proposed postponement scheme provide for the addition of a postponement fee to cover the council’s interest and administration costs. This will ensure that the costs of the support are borne by postponing ratepayers and only those who need the additional time to pay take up the offer.

52. The council will incur costs associated with additional borrowing to replace the delayed receipt of the cash from rates deferral. The interest cost would add around $50 to the postponed rates for the average residential ratepayer in the first year and an additional $100 if the ratepayer does not repay until 30 June 2022. If the council were to require a statutory land charge, as discussed above, for a one year postponement the postponement fee would be around $200 or 8 per cent of average residential rates. If the council were to meet these costs for residential ratepayers, the cost would be around $160,000 for every 1,000 postponing ratepayers.

Other terms and conditions

53. The other terms and conditions that can be used to address these issues are discussed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of postponement</td>
<td>• Full or partial at ratepayers’ discretion</td>
<td>• Provides time for all ratepayers to recover their financial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows ratepayers discretion to set payment period to suit their circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows ratepayers to spread repayment over a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment</td>
<td>• In full at end of postponement period or</td>
<td>• Allows ratepayer to withdraw as their financial position changes or to effectively postponement for less than a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Up to 30 June 2022</td>
<td>• Postponement not required if no longer owning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early termination</td>
<td>• Early termination at ratepayer’s discretion</td>
<td>• Current policy requires ratepayer equity over 20 per cent (after postponed rates, mortgages and other encumbrances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At sale</td>
<td>• Current policy has no time limit so accumulated rates and compound interest may erode equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only a 3 per cent of mortgage holders are in negative equity or have less than 20 per cent equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One years of postponed rates is very small proportion of property value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity requirement</td>
<td>• No minimum equity requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast uptake

54. For the 2020/2021 year it has been assumed that up to $85 million of rates will be postponed under the proposed COVID-19 Rates postponement scheme.

55. This assumes that only the most impacted businesses, such as accommodation providers, will wish to continue to postpone their rates for the 2020/2021 year. Most businesses that deferred their rates for the fourth quarter will not seek to take up ongoing postponement and will seek to clear any outstanding balance during the next rating year. Some additional businesses may join the scheme, but most small and medium sized businesses will not want to take on additional debt in what will still be an uncertain trading environment. Overall, we forecast around 6,000 business ratepayers will apply for rates postponement of around $78 million.
56. Historically residential ratepayers haven’t been attracted to rates postponement and we don’t expect this to change. While many residential ratepayers have taken out mortgage holidays, we aren’t forecasting this to translate into equivalent rates postponements. Mortgage repayments are much higher than rates obligations and accordingly these mortgage holidays will address many ratepayers cash flow situations.

57. In addition, banks usually require mortgage holders to keep up with their rates payments. Over the next six months most financially stressed ratepayers will have determined whether they can meet their mortgage repayments and rates and have resolved their financial situation going forward. As a result, the council will continue to receive the rates for these properties. Overall, we forecast between 3,000 and 5,000 residential ratepayers will apply for rates postponement of between $8 million and $13 million.

**National rates postponement scheme**

58. Auckland Council along with other growth councils are promoting a national rates postponement scheme. A terms of reference for this work is presently being prepared for consideration by the Department of Internal Affairs. A national postponement scheme financed with third party capital would eliminate cashflow risk to the council from a higher than expected volume of uptake of the postponement scheme proposed in this report.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

59. There are no climate implications based on decisions requested in this report.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

60. The annual budget is an Auckland Council Group document and includes financial information consolidated at a group level. Consultation items and updates to budgets to reflect decisions and new information may include items from across the group.

61. Forecast uptake of the proposed new postponement scheme were prepared in association with the Chief Economist.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

62. Local board representatives have been involved in workshops with the Emergency Committee on issues relating to the Emergency Budget consultation 2020/2021. This includes discussion on the proposed new rates postponement scheme discussed in this report.

63. Following Emergency Budget 2020/2021 consultation in June, local boards will also have opportunity for input at workshops and decision making meetings in July before the Annual Budget 2020/2021 and the COVID-19 rates postponement scheme is adopted.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

64. Māori have a lower than average home ownership rates so will benefit less from the proposed postponement scheme. Residential tenants needing support can access central government’s accommodation supplement scheme.
65. Remissions for Māori land currently offered by Auckland Council will not be affected by the proposed postponement scheme. Current support for Māori land includes remissions for:
   • unused Māori land
   • land used for community benefit
   • Māori land rates that are in arrears
   • marae and urupā
   • land unable to developed to its full potential
   • multiple units used as a single economic unit
   • tenants of Maori housing developments that are unable to access the rates rebate scheme because they occupy the property under a license to occupy.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
66. The financial implications of the proposed postponement scheme are discussed in the report. The council can manage the reductions in cashflow arising from the forecast increase in ratepayers taking up the option to postpone their rates.

67. Ratepayers postponing rates under the proposed scheme will meet the council’s additional borrowing costs and the cost of registering a statutory land charge. If the scheme is popular the council will incur some additional administration cost which can be managed within current resources.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
68. There are no risks associated with the recommendation in this report to consult on a draft postponement scheme.

69. There are two risks associated with the subsequent adoption of the scheme proposed in this report. The first is that the uptake of the scheme exceeds the forecasts above. This will be managed by the monitoring the uptake of the scheme. If the scheme looks likely to exceed our forecasts the council can make amendments to the scheme to ensure it remains affordable. Any amendments would require consultation.

70. There is also the risk that some ratepayers not requiring assistance may apply for postponement to take advantage of the councils relatively low interest rates. This will be managed by requiring applicants to declare that they are in financial difficulty and to provide evidence to support that claim. Council staff will review the evidence supplied by all applicants. In addition, we will undertake an in-depth audit of a sample of applicants.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
71. Decisions on the consultation items will be made by the Emergency Committee and Governing Body on the 21 May 2020. Adoption of the Consultation Document and Supporting Information will be sought from the Emergency Committee and Governing Body at their 28 May 2020 meeting. All consultation material will then be finalised and made available online in time for the start of the consultation at 12 noon on 29 May 2020. Copies of the material will also be available at libraries, local board offices and service centres on request.
72. The key steps for finalising the Emergency Budget are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Closes</td>
<td>19 June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Performance Committee workshop: present feedback from consultation</td>
<td>8 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Performance Committee and Local Board workshop: present Local Board Views</td>
<td>14 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Performance Committee and Governing Body meetings: Annual Budget decision-making</td>
<td>16 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Body adoption of Annual Budget</td>
<td>30 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Postponement of rates for non-residential property owners impacted by COVID-19

Objectives
The objective of this scheme is to provide ratepayers who are financially stressed as a result of the economic or health impacts of COVID-19 with assistance with their rates for the 2020/2021 year to allow them the time to reorganise and recover their financial position.

Criteria
Postponement of rates under this policy is not available to:

- Ministries and Departments of the public service, State-owned enterprises, Crown entities or utilities,
- or
- ratepayers already in arrears at 26 March 2020.

The ratepayer must meet the following criteria.

1. The ratepayer must have owned the property for which the ratepayer seeks rates postponement as at 26 March 2020 unless the council is satisfied that the owner of a property purchased after this point has been impacted by the effects of COVID-19 that couldn’t have been reasonably foreseen before the purchase was entered into.

2. A ratepayer seeking postponement for a residential or lifestyle property must be in financial hardship in the opinion of the council and:
   - be a citizen or permanent resident of New Zealand and
   - have a mortgage on the property for which the rates are to be postponed or
   - be a charity or incorporated society:
     - that is registered with the New Zealand Companies Office or the Department of Internal Affairs and
     - that is physically located in New Zealand and
     - the employees of which legally worked in New Zealand as at 26 March 2020.

3. A ratepayer seeking postponement for a business or farm property must be in financial hardship in the opinion of the council and:
   - be registered and operating in New Zealand which means that a business, charity or incorporated society is:
     - registered with the New Zealand Companies Office or the Department of Internal Affairs and
     - physically located in New Zealand and
     - their employees (if any) legally work in New Zealand as at 26 March 2020.

4. Companies seeking postponement of rates for residential or lifestyle properties will be assessed under criteria 3 above.

Residential, farm, business and lifestyle property are identified based on the classification of the property in the council’s rating information database as at 30 June of the year preceding that in which the postponement is applied for.

The ratepayer or the ratepayer’s authorised agent must apply to the council on the prescribed form.

The policy provides for the postponement of the obligation to pay rates for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council by resolution may extend the application of this policy to cover the rates for the 2021/2022 and subsequent years.
Conditions

1. The ratepayer acknowledges that council recommends that ratepayers considering postponing their rates seek advice from a financial adviser on the financial impacts and appropriateness of postponing their rates.

2. Applications for postponement of rates under this scheme must be received by 31 December of the rating year for which the ratepayer seeks postponement.

3. The council will postpone payment of the residual rates (what is left after any optional payment) up to a maximum of $20,000 (GST incl.) per property in each rating year that the postponement is offered.

4. The council may add a postponement fee for each year that the rates are postponed. The fee will cover the period from when the rates were originally due to when they are paid. The fee will not exceed the council’s administrative and interest costs of the postponement.

5. The postponement will apply from the beginning of the rating year in which the application for postponement is made, although the council may backdate the postponement application, depending on the circumstances.

6. Any postponement will apply until the earliest of the following, at which time the postponed rates (and any postponement fee) will be immediately payable:
   a) the ratepayer’s death for a residential property or the company owning the property ceases to trade;
   b) the ratepayer ceases to be the ratepayer for the rating unit; or
   c) the last day of the rating year (30 June) immediately following the rating year for which rates have been postponed.

7. The ratepayer may pay all or part of the postponed rates at any time prior to the circumstances set out in condition 6.

8. The applicant can choose to postpone the payment of a lesser amount of rates than the full amount that they would be entitled to postpone under this policy.

9. The council may register the postponed rates as a statutory land charge on the rating unit’s title.

10. Ratepayers wishing to apply under this policy will be required to make a written application or declaration and to supply such evidence as may be requested to verify that a postponement should be granted under this policy.
Annual Budget 2020/2021 Emergency Budget public consultation approach

File No.: CP2020/05993

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To agree the proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021 Communications and Engagement approach to support the public consultation process.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
The report would normally go before the Finance and Performance Committee, however, in light of COVID-19, it must now be considered by the Emergency Committee

2. As a part of the Annual Budget process, the council consults the public to get feedback on proposals which include significant or material differences from what is set out in the council’s 10-year budget. The council carried out consultation on its proposed Annual Budget 2020/21 in February/March 2020, the results of which were presented to the Finance and Performance Committee on 13 May 2020.

3. Due to the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic the council is proposing to consult on further matters for the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

4. A range of online, mail and phone options will be available across the region enabling Aucklanders to have their say on the engagement while maintaining and encouraging compliance with the COVID-19 regulations around social distancing. Targeted engagement will take place for the various groups specifically affected by specific proposals in addition to general engagement on other topics.

5. This engagement with Aucklanders will inform and lead to high quality decisions.

6. Once the Emergency Budget is adopted, the decisions made will be communicated widely to all submitters and stakeholder groups involved in the process.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Emergency Committee:

a) agree to recommend to the Governing Body to endorse the recommended engagement approach for further consultation on the Annual Budget 2020/2021, noting:
   i) public consultation will run from 29 May 2020 to 19 June 2020
   ii) feedback can be provided through written, telephone and digital channels
   iii) regional and local reports will be prepared to provide a summary of public feedback received across all channels
   iv) a summary of the final decisions made will be prepared in July and widely communicated.
b) agree to recommend to the Governing Body to delegate to the following elected members and staff the power and responsibility to engage with the public via online webinar events as part of the consultation approach on proposals for the Annual Budget:

i) Councillors

ii) Local board chairs and local board members

iii) Tier two and tier three staff and any additional staff approved by the Group Chief Financial Officer

Horopaki

Context

Engagement at Auckland Council

7. The Council views engagement as a genuine dialogue with Auckland’s communities to help us make better decisions. High quality engagement with Aucklanders will allow us to make robust decisions that benefit communities and produce plans that are fit for purpose.

8. We are also statutorily required to engage with communities on decision making through the Local Government Act 2002 and other statutes. Our engagement practices must meet any applicable obligations, including the principles of consultation set out in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Significance and Engagement Policy

9. Auckland Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy was adopted on 1 December 2014 as required under the Local Government Act 2002. The policy specifies how and when communities can expect to be engaged with about decisions and enables council and our communities to understand the significance that council places on certain issues. The recommended approach is consistent with this policy.

Annual Budget

10. Once every three years, councils are required to adopt a long-term plan (referred to by council as the 10-year Budget), and in the intervening years an annual plan (referred to by council as the Annual Budget). In 2018 the Council adopted the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and this year will adopt an Annual Budget called the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

11. Attached to this report is a summary of the feedback received during the first round of consultation in February/March 2020. The scope of feedback includes written submissions, digital channels and feedback comments recorded at community events. The summary aims to capture key views and preferences rather than detail every point of feedback received.

---The council is now proposing to undertake further consultation. This is because of the changes caused by the economic and social impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As set out in this report, this further consultation is scheduled for May/June 2020.

Best practice for engagement

13. Auckland Council follows the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) approach, which is the most widely recognised international body for public participation.

14. The wording and format of the feedback questions to be contained in the consultation document have also been peer reviewed by experts at the University of Auckland to ensure technical alignment with best practice.
The options for managing the second round of consultation on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 are:

- **Option 1** of using a digitally led engagement approach with the additional option of providing feedback via phone calls and the availability of hard copy feedback forms upon request at libraries, service centres and local board offices that are open at Level 2.

- **Option 2** which includes all of option one as well as a letter drop to all Auckland households to alert people to the consultation and how to give feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Online webinars</th>
<th>Call centre option</th>
<th>Online engagement</th>
<th>Paper material posted on request</th>
<th>Texts or emails to those with mobile numbers</th>
<th>Addressed physical mail to ratepayers</th>
<th>Key considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Option 1 Recommended Standard Engagement | | | | | | | - Reaching those with and without internet.  
- Wide reach using several databases meaning ratepayers and non-ratepayers will be contacted directly  
- Low cost |
| Option 2 Standard Engagement with mailed letter to those on ratepayer database | | | | | | | - Every resident will have clear information on the proposal  
- Prohibitively expensive (approx. 300k additional to Option 1))  
- Bauer Media /Our Auckland no longer an option |
Have Your Say events

16. To enable social distancing, in person Have Your Say events will not be held across Auckland. In order to meet the requirement to provide people with a reasonable opportunity to become informed on the consultation topics, we are instead proposing to have online events where people can ask questions of and receive information from decision makers, SME’s and other council staff online.

17. These online events will be scheduled webinar style events which will accommodate up to 100 people maximum and allow elected members and subject matter experts to answer questions. We do not plan to receive feedback at these events but provide information to attendees and then direct them to give feedback online.

18. A regional stakeholder event for interest groups will be conducted through online streaming rather than in person, but the format would be the same as for previous years.

19. People who attend these online events will be asked to register for the event. At this stage they will be asked to provide contact details and demographic information. This will not be compulsory but should give an indication as to who has participated at these events.

Digital Activity

20. The consultation will be promoted via Council’s official digital channels:

- Auckland Council and the 21 local board Facebook pages.
- OurAuckland online (multiple articles each week over the course of the consultation period).
- Auckland Council Twitter.
- Auckland Council Instagram.
- A schedule of online advertising across external websites.

Communications: Media Channels

21. Promotion of the campaign will run across a range of non-digital channels, including print, and radio. The council magazine, OurAuckland, is not currently in production and is therefore unable to be used for this consultation.

- Press: advertising will run across the NZ Herald, Stuff’s 11 local community newspapers, and a number of complementary local community and ethnic newspapers.
- Radio: a schedule of activity across multiple stations.
- Posters: depending on availability and COVID-19 alert levels, posters will be used across council facilities and by community partner organisations.
- Targeted communications, where appropriate, will be sent to customers to highlight the opportunity to give feedback.
- Targeted placements within radio, print and digital will upweight reach against Maori, Pasifika, ethnic and youth audiences.

Engaging with diverse communities

22. Auckland is home to communities of many different cultures and backgrounds and Auckland Council is committed to supporting and including voices from diverse communities across Auckland.

23. Our community partners will deliver a range of online activities and digital forums to reach different demographic groups and communities while keeping within COVID-19 protocols.
**Consultation documentation and translations**

24. In order to support Aucklanders to be able to provide feedback, all information will be available online and in hard copy. Hard copies will be available upon request at those libraries, service centres and local board offices that are open at Level 2.

25. To enable a wide reach across Auckland’s diverse communities, a high-level summary and the feedback form will be translated into New Zealand Sign Language, Te Reo Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Korean and simplified Chinese.

26. All consultation material will also be available online at [www.akhaveyoursay.nz](http://www.akhaveyoursay.nz) which takes users through to the Have Your Say section of the Auckland Council website. People will be able to read through all the reference information before providing their feedback in an online form.

**Independent quantitative survey**

27. The option to run an independent quantitative survey alongside the consultation is being prepared and was presented to councillors 13 May 2020. There is a significant risk that the consultation process will only represent the views of a narrow cross-section of Aucklanders due to its scale. Given the significance of the decisions to be made, this survey ensures the views of Aucklanders is statistically representative of the Auckland population at regional and local board level. Survey sampling would use socio-demographic quotas and statistical weighting to ensure representativeness by variables such as age, gender and ethnicity. A stringent peer review process conducted by the University of Auckland to verify the reliability of the survey results is also included. Fieldwork dates for this survey would align with the consultation dates with a report due to councillors in early July. The investment required for this independent survey is less than 50% of the cost of the LTP survey conducted in 2018.

**Engagement Channels to collect feedback**

28. Feedback will be gathered in a number of ways:

   - Written feedback received through feedback forms (online and hard copy) and emails
   - Letters, etc. and proforma submissions
   - Verbal feedback conducted via phone
   - Social media comments which are in scope of the engagement, although people will be encouraged to go to the online form to make a formal submission.

**Processing Feedback**

29. All Annual Budget feedback will be analysed and collated into a report for decision makers to consider prior to making decisions on the final plan.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

30. With option 1, digital feedback channels will be used almost exclusively with paper copies available upon request from libraries, service centers and local board offices that are open at Level 2. No physical events will occur limiting impacts of travel. However, with option 2 there would be paper copies sent to houses in Auckland.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
31. Subject matter experts (SMEs) from across the council will work to analyse the feedback in order to produce a summary of feedback report for the Annual Budget for political consideration prior to final decisions being made.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
32. Auckland Council has obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Significance and Engagement Policy to take special consideration when engaging with Māori to enable Māori participation in council decision making to promote Māori well-being.
33. The engagement programme includes:
   • Raising awareness of the opportunity to give feedback through the current Māori database
   • Mana whenua meeting with the Governing Body and Independent Māori Statutory Board on 17th June 2020: opportunity to discuss priorities and feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021.
   • Targeted Māori community engagement through partners, covering our high population areas and regionwide, supporting feedback through online and hard copy submission forms.
   • Live discussions and Q&A with elected members and SMEs through Radio Waatea, with a focus on high population areas in the West and South and including the opportunity for audience and online feedback direct to decision-makers.
   • Māori-focused social media campaign.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
34. The role of local boards in the public consultation process is an integral part of the engagement approach. If local board priorities are included in the consultation material, additional locally targeted engagement activities will be held to collect feedback on local issues.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
35. The overall budget for consultation is $281,100 which is made up of $210,100 for engagement, research and consultation analysis and $71,000 for communications. The budget for the first consultation in February 2020 was $194,100. Due to the compressed timeframe and safety considerations during COVID-19 a different approach needs to be taken to ensure we engage with our communities, including additional research, which while relatively expensive will provide quantitative data for consideration.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

36. Risks and mitigations are discussed in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confusion about further consultation on new proposals for the</td>
<td>Clear and simple information explaining the reason for the further consultation and that previous feedback is still included in the decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual budget and what council has done to the feedback provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited chances to engage with those without or unable to use the</td>
<td>Options set up for people to give feedback over the phone and availability of hard copies on request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public concern that the consultation is happening under restricted</td>
<td>Communications explaining the need to consult at this time and the constraints due to COVID-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditions as a chance to avoid thorough consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for extra trained staff to receive feedback online and via</td>
<td>Use existing council staff to assist with phone calls, coding and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps

37. Consultation will take place from 29 May 2020 to 19 June 2020.

38. Following consultation, all Annual Budget feedback will be analysed and collated into regional and local briefing reports to provide summaries of public feedback received across all channels. A summary of the final decisions made will be prepared and widely communicated with all submitters following adoption of the Annual Budget 2020/2021 in July 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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<table>
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</tr>
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<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annual Budget 2020/2021 Consultation – summary of feedback received

Purpose

This report summarises the feedback received during the first round of consultation on Auckland Council’s Annual Budget 2020/2021 in February/March 2020. The scope of feedback includes written submissions, digital channels and feedback comments recorded at community events. It aims to capture key views and preferences rather than detail every point of feedback received. This report does not include any advice or recommendations for decision making.

Executive Summary

Consultation items were agreed by the Governing Body on 12 December 2019. The Consultation Document and Supporting Information were adopted by the Governing Body on 12 February 2020. Public consultation ran between 21 February and 22 March 2020 and was run in combination with the Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) Review consultation.

Feedback to inform the Annual Budget was received through written feedback (including online and hardcopy) and in-person feedback (e.g. Have Your Say events).

- In total we received just over 4750 pieces of feedback.
- Written responses totalled 3820. Two thirds of these were received digitally.
- Over 900 people attended one of 53 Have Your Say or community events, providing over 930 feedback points.
- Around 675 submissions gathered by community engagement partner organisations were received during the consultation period but were unable to be delivered to us until after COVID-19 restrictions had been put in place. These submissions were accepted and included in the analysis, however at the time of presenting this report we are unable to provide these submissions in their original form. A replication of these submissions is provided instead.

Council consulted the public on a number of key issues and local board priorities, including: a proposed increase to the waste management targeted rate, a proposed increase to refuse rates for former Auckland City and Manukau City ratepayers, and a proposed increase to the targeted rate for the Waitakere rural sewerage service. In addition, Council also sought feedback on how we charge for pool fencing inspections, the introduction of HomeFit assessments to the Retrofit Your Home Scheme, Business Improvement District rates, Clevedon water and wastewater systems, as well as adjusting some other fees and charges.

In summary, analysis of the responses indicated the following:

1.0 Consultation items

1.1 An increase to the waste management targeted rate base service charge

- Overall, 67 per cent of responses supported the proposal, whilst 24 per cent did not support. A further nine per cent provided partial support or another comment without a clear stance.

1.2 An increase to refuse rates for former Auckland City and Manukau City ratepayers

- Overall, 65 per cent of responses supported the proposal, whilst 23 per cent did not support. A further 12 per cent provided partial support or another comment without a clear stance.
1.3 An increase to the targeted rate for the Waitakere rural sewerage service

Overall, 67 per cent of responses supported the proposal to continue the service with full cost recovery, while 23 per cent did not support the proposal and called for an end to the service. A further 10 per cent did not support the proposal, wanting to continue the Waitakere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers.

1.4 How Council charges for pool fencing inspections

Overall, 40 per cent of responses did not support the proposal, whilst 36 per cent supported the proposal. A further 24 per cent provided partial support or another comment without a clear stance.

1.5 Adjusting our fees and charges

1.5.1 Consent fees

24 feedback points were received on e-scooter fees. 12 feedback points were in support of a fee for licencing scooters whilst 10 feedback points were not in support.

1.5.2 Proposed increase on high impact commercial event permits

18 feedback points were received on this topic. 10 feedback points did not support the commercial event fee whilst eight feedback points supported.

1.5.3 Proposed entry fee for international visitors to the Auckland Botanical Gardens

55 feedback points were received on this topic. 34 feedback points were not in support whilst eight feedback points supported a proposed entry fee for international visitors.

1.5.4 Clevedon water and wastewater systems

Seven feedback points were received on this topic. All were in support of the proposal.

1.5.5 Proposed changes to Retrofit your home scheme

Five feedback points were received on this topic. Four feedback points supported the proposal.

1.5.6 Proposed changes to Business Improvement District rates

Four feedback points were received on the BID proposals with two supporting the establishment of the One Warkworth BID and one opposing the expansion of the Glen Innes BID.

2.0 Other feedback

Feedback on topics outside of those directly consulted on can be found in Attachment Four in the appendix. A summary of some of the most commonly mentioned themes is provided in the body of the report.

3.0 Local Board Priorities for 2020/2021

Feedback on local board priorities will be considered by local boards, therefore is not part of this report.
The Engagement Approach

The Annual Budget consultation, and the early engagement for CCO Review and Local Board Plans were presented at the same time to Aucklanders.

A variety of engagement activities were rolled out during the period but, with the rapidly escalating pandemic situation, face to face engagement was curtailed in the last week. The face to face have your say events that did go ahead included:

Events (53 planned, 44 actual):
- Community partner run events/sessions
- Pacific event (one Fono south)
- Māori events (including Maatawaaka live panel discussion)
- Regionally held existing events (e.g. Diversity Festival, Kumeu Show)
- Local Board held events
- Regional Stakeholder event

Online engagement included:
- Targeted emails to affected ratepayers (swimming pool owners and Waiākoro septic tank owners), Have Your Say site and feedback form, Consultation document and supporting documents, People’s Panel, previous submitters, stakeholder emails, social media (#ARHaveyoursay).
  (Feedback forms, consultation document and supporting documents were also made available at the HYS events)

Offline engagement:
- Summaries and supporting documents in libraries/service centres/local board offices (including translations).
Key terms used in summarising this feedback are defined below.

**Glossary of terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pieces of feedback</td>
<td>Summation of all written submissions and feedback points from in person engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Where a submission has answered the question (support, do not support, or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback point</td>
<td>An individual point made by a submitter (in addition to support, do not support, or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Includes hand-written forms or letters, emails or emailed forms, and forms completed online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro forma</td>
<td>A submission that has been prepared from a template provided by a community group or other external organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYS event</td>
<td>Have Your Say event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 An increase to the Waste management targeted rate base service charge

Question 1: The cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions.

To pay for this we propose to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate by $19.97 a year or $0.38 a week (the total cost changing from $121.06 to $141.03 incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.

What do you think of our proposal?

- Support
- Do not support
- Other

![Waste management targeted rate base service charge chart](attachment:A/Item%2012/Waste%20management%20targeted%20rate%20base%20service%20charge.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>Written feedback</th>
<th>In person feedback</th>
<th>TOTAL pieces of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.1 Key findings

Key findings across feedback that was specific to the proposal are:

- Most respondents supported the proposal to increase the targeted rate for recycling collections to enable Auckland Council to meet the cost of international market conditions. The majority of these did not provide any reason explaining why they supported the increase.

- The main theme noted by respondents was support for a system that more fairly charges those who use the service most.

- The terminology 'user pays' was used in many submissions, to describe a way of ensuring those who use the service more pay more, or to charge those who benefit from the service the true cost of delivering the service.

1.1.2 Written feedback received

The council received and analysed 2864 written responses to this question. The themes mentioned most frequently were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support - 67%</td>
<td>Most respondents (1283) supported the increase with no further reason given. Themes in other comments included that the service should be user pays – that is a targeted rate for those that receive the service (227 feedback points) and that the proposed increase is understandable and needs to be done (174 feedback points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support - 24%</td>
<td>Most respondents (267) who did not support the increase provided no reason. Other themes included that rates are already expensive and not everyone can afford to pay more (72 feedback points), the current system needs improvement (71 feedback points) – including the provision of local recycling services, and everyone should pay and/or the financial burden should be shared as one community (67 feedback points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - 9%</td>
<td>A range of topics were covered, including the need to improve the current recycling system, concern around increasing the cost of rates, as well as a call for onshore recycling within New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 Feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events

101 people provided feedback points on the proposed increase to the annual base service waste management charge through Have Your Say, Māori and community events, with a majority in support of the proposed rate increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support – 71%</td>
<td>The majority of respondents supported the increase with no further reason given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support – 13%</td>
<td>The most common theme was that rubbish and recycling already costs too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – 16%</td>
<td>Two of the responses provided by those who selected other were that the service is too expensive, and business should take more responsibility for reducing packaging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.4 Māori feedback

Of the 271 submitters that identified as Māori, 49 per cent supported the proposed targeted rate increase to cover the cost of recycling collections, and many of the comments were centred around fairness, that only those who receive the service should have to pay for it. 17 per cent did not support the proposal whilst a further 34 per cent provided partial support or a comment where a clear stance was not given.

1.1.5 Mana whenua feedback

Mana whenua did not provide any specific feedback on this proposal.

1.1.6 Regional stakeholder feedback

Submissions on a targeted rate increase for recycling collections were received from 13 regional stakeholders.

**Generation Zero**

Generation Zero supported the targeted rate increase proposed. Comments called for more support to help communities transition to reducing the amount of material placed in recycling, increase access to food waste collections and places to recycle e-waste. Generation Zero commended the council’s efforts to increase funding to develop recycling infrastructure in Tāmaki Makaurau to reduce reliance on shipping material overseas.

**Federated Farmers of New Zealand**

Federated Farmers supported the proposal to increase the targeted rate for the kerbside recycling service so that it covers the true cost of delivering the service.

**Business Associations (including: Takapuna Beach, Panmure, South Harbour, Parnell, Business North Harbour, Ellerslie, Rosedale, Remuera and Onehunga Business Associations)**

The Associations supported the targeted rate increase for recycling. However, the Associations challenged whether these rates are fair to businesses when the services largely benefit residential users.

The Associations were concerned that many small businesses were being encouraged to take individual responsibility, especially for food waste, which places additional financial burdens on them.

1.1.7 Local stakeholder feedback

In addition to the submissions received from the regional stakeholders above, council also received submissions from three local stakeholder groups.

**Tāmaki WRAP Charitable Trust**

Tāmaki WRAP did not support the targeted rate increase. The comments provided indicate that the current system needs to change, local and sustained markets for recycling need to be created, and Aucklanders need to be supported to know how to avoid waste in the first place, to reduce reliance on single-use items. A comment supporting the increase to the landfill levy was included.

**Mangere East Family Services**

Mangere East Family Services did not support the increase to the targeted rate for kerbside recycling services as proposed. The reason given was that businesses need to be seen making an effort to reduce packaging at the front end before the community is asked to pay more to dispose of the waste created.

**The Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc.**

The Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc supported the targeted rate increase for recycling, adding that Auckland Council has been initiating a “user pays” collection system in other areas, and that philosophy should be extended across the region.
1.1.8 Feedback by local board area

Whau Local Board had the highest level of support for the recycling targeted rate increase as proposed with 76 per cent, followed by Franklin and Waitakere local boards, each with 74 per cent support.

Respondents from the Waiheke Island Local Board area had the highest level of opposition to the proposal – 34 per cent did not support the proposed increase, followed by Howick and Papakura local boards with 31 per cent and 30 percent not supporting the proposal respectively.
1.2 An increase to refuse rates for former Auckland City and Manukau City ratepayers

Question 2: In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. In other parts of the city, residents pay for their collection via Pay As You Throw. The targeted rate for the Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas no longer meets the cost of collection.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by $14.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 incl. GST), and a $20.91 increase a year or $0.49 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191 to $211.91 incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those living outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau cities.

What do you think of our proposal?

- Support
- Do not support
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>Written feedback</th>
<th>In person feedback</th>
<th>TOTAL pieces of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.1 Key findings

Key findings across feedback that was specific to the proposal are:

- Almost two-thirds of respondents support the proposed targeted rate increase for refuse in legacy Auckland City and Manukau City areas, with many seeing it as fair that the cost of the service be paid for by the recipient.
- Some comments from respondents outside of these two areas suggested belief the user-pays areas were ‘subsidising’ collections in rates-funded areas.
- A significant number of respondents across all response categories questioned why Auckland did not yet have a standardised refuse collection methodology for the whole region.

1.2.2 Written feedback received

The council received and analysed 2731 written responses to this question. The themes mentioned most frequently were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support - 65%</td>
<td>Most respondents (1273) supported the targeted rate increase with no further reason given. The most common response (231 feedback points) was in support of the cost of the service being paid for by the recipient (user pays). 127 feedback points recognised that if costs are increasing, it is fair and necessary for people to be charged more for the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support - 23%</td>
<td>Most respondents (271) did not provide a reason why they did not support the proposal. Others indicated support for a user pays service (93 feedback points), felt it was already too expensive (58 feedback points), felt the current system needed improving (48 feedback points), and felt everyone should pay, suggesting support for a general rate (36 feedback points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - 12%</td>
<td>Of those who selected ‘other’, some supported a user pays system (84 feedback points) through the comment they provided. A range of other topics were covered, including the need for more equity and a consistent charging system across the region, as well as better waste minimisation education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.3 Feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events

106 people provided feedback points on the proposed targeted rate increase for legacy Auckland and Manukau refuse collections through Have Your Say, Māori and community events, with a majority in support of the proposed rate increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support – 68%</td>
<td>No significant themes were raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support – 18%</td>
<td>No significant themes were raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – 16%</td>
<td>Of the 17 pieces of feedback that selected ‘other’, seven indicated they did not support the proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.4 Māori feedback

Of the 269 submitters that identified as Māori, 123 (46 per cent) supported the proposed targeted rate increase to pay for rubbish collections in legacy Auckland City and Manukau City areas. 19 per cent did not support the proposal whilst a further 35 per cent provided partial support or a comment where a clear stance was not given.

1.2.5 Mana whenua feedback

Mana whenua did not provide any specific feedback on this proposal in their submissions.

1.2.6 Regional stakeholder feedback

Submissions on a targeted rate increase for refuse in legacy Auckland and Manukau City were received from 14 regional stakeholders.

Generation Zero

Generation Zero supported the proposed targeted rate increase for refuse, noting that raising general rates would negatively impact lower income communities for a service that they do not use. A targeted rate to continue the delivery of the service would be the best approach as it would charge those who directly benefit from the service while preventing negative environmental impacts.

Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Federated Farmers agreed that it is appropriate that the targeted rate for refuse collections should be raised so that it covers the cost of delivering the service.

Business Associations (including Takapuna Beach, Panmure, Newmarket, South Harbour, Parnell, Business North Harbour, Efteling, Rosebank, Remuera and Onehunga Business Associations)

The Business Associations supported the targeted rate increase for refuse. The Association challenged whether rates are fair to businesses when the services largely benefit residential users.

1.2.7 Local stakeholder feedback

In addition to the submissions received from the regional stakeholders above, council also received submissions from three local stakeholder groups.

Tamaki WRAP Charitable Trust

Tamaki WRAP did not support the proposed targeted rate increase for refuse, instead suggested introducing ‘Pay as You Throw’ across the region in order to support and encourage better waste reduction and recycling.

The Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc.

The Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc supported the targeted rate increase for refuse, adding that Auckland Council has been initiating a “user pays” collection system in other areas, and that philosophy should be extended across the region.

Mangere East Family Services

Mangere East Family Services selected “Other” stating that collection services need to be consistent across the region. “One city, one solution.”
1.2.8 Feedback by local board area

Feedback shows those living outside the Manukau City and Auckland City areas more strongly support the proposed targeted rate increase (70 per cent) than those who live in the local board areas affected by the proposed increase (50 per cent).
1.3 Phasing out the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Question 3: Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pumpout service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal of this service in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area said they wanted to keep the service. The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43.

Our proposal, for those in the Waitākere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $260 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.

If we do not do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitākere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

What do you think of our proposal?

- Support the proposal - continue the service through a targeted rate
- Do not support the proposal - end the service
- Do not support (continue service subsidised by all general ratepayers)

![Waitakere rural sewerage service targeted rate](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>Written feedback</th>
<th>In person feedback</th>
<th>TOTAL pieces of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support the proposal</strong> (continue the service through a targeted rate)</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support</strong> (end the service)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not support</strong> (continue service subsidised by all general ratepayers)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.1 Key findings

Key findings across feedback that was specific to the proposal are:

- The preferred option, both regionally and for residents in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, was for the service to be continued and the rate to be fully-funded through a targeted rate. This is consistent with the council’s proposal.

- Most of those who provided comments feel that the user pays model was the most equitable way of providing this service.

- Many respondents feel that the council needs to have some oversight of onsite wastewater, whether through providing the pump-out service, monitoring maintenance compliance, or facilitating alternatives to onsite wastewater systems.

- Some submissions from areas that have onsite wastewater systems but do not receive this service (e.g. Franklin, Waiheke, Aotea Great Barrier, and Rodney Local Board areas) noted that they are able to maintain their own systems without council involvement, and that it should be the same level of service across the region.

- Many residents with onsite wastewater systems in more remote communities who oppose the user pays model feel they do not have access to many of the services provided by the council, and that it is fair for their service to be partly subsidised by general rates.

1.3.2 Written feedback received

The council received 2346 written responses that provided specific feedback on this issue. The themes mentioned most frequently were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support (continue through targeted rate) - 64%</td>
<td>The most common response (245 feedback points) was that it was fair that households receiving a service pay the full cost of that service. Other points raised included that other households in the region pay the full cost of their wastewater, as most of the region does not receive a pump-out service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support (end the service) - 25%</td>
<td>108 responses indicated that the service was not equitable, given other households arrange their own pumpouts. Some feedback also indicated that the programme was no longer fit for purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support (continue the service subsidised by all general ratepayers) - 11%</td>
<td>55 feedback points noted that many households currently receiving this service do not have access to most other services provided by the council, such as public transport or reticulated water connection. Others felt that increasing the cost would put undue financial stress on low income households.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.3 Feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events

61 people provided feedback points on the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate through Have Your Say, Māori and community events. Drop-in events were held on this topic in Te Henga, Piha, and Huia. An additional event was requested by the Whenuapai Residents and Ratepayers Association, but could not be arranged due to public gathering restrictions as a result of COVID-19. The themes mentioned most frequently at these events were.
### Summary of Have Your Say feedback on Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support (continue through targeted rate) – 70%</td>
<td>Seven feedback points noted that without an alternative form of wastewater disposal, the service should continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support (end the service) – 13%</td>
<td>Four feedback points indicated a preference for options other than council providing the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support (continue the service subsidised by all general ratepayers) – 16%</td>
<td>Six feedback points acknowledged the lack of services in these communities, and the environmental and convenience benefits of council controlling the service if the service subsidy were retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>An additional 13 feedback points raised questions about the scheme or did not indicate a strong preference for any option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.3.4 Māori feedback

Of the 432 submitters that identified as Māori, 76 per cent support the proposal to continue the service with full cost recovery, 16 per cent wanted to end the service, and eight per cent wanted to continue the service subsidised by all general ratepayers.

#### 1.3.5 Mana whenua feedback

Mana whenua did not provide any specific feedback on this proposal in their submissions.

#### 1.3.6 Local stakeholder feedback

A number of communities serviced by the Waitākere rural sewerage service targeted rate have active residents and ratepayer associations. Submissions on this service were received from seven stakeholders based in the local boards where this service is provided (Henderson-Massey, Upper Harbour and Waitākere Ranges local boards). Two support the proposal, noting that the service should be user pays and that the service provides an environmental benefit. Four submissions wanted to continue the subsidy so that the higher cost would not adversely affect low-income earners and recognising the recreational benefits of the Waitākere area. One submission supported ending the service as it was not fit for purpose.

#### 1.3.7 Feedback by local board area

Three local board areas are specifically impacted by this proposal. In the Annual Budget consultation in 2019, the majority of respondents from the Henderson-Massey Local Board and Upper Harbour Local Board supported ending the service. These local boards supported this and so the 2020 consultation was solely focused on retaining the service in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area.

During the 2020 consultation period, feedback was received from 225 submitters from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area, 133 submitters from the Henderson-Massey Local Board area, and 149 submitters from the Upper Harbour Local Board area.

The overall feedback is summarised in the table below. The comments were similar to those received from the rest of the region.

Staff were not able to definitively identify feedback from those who currently receive the service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the proposal (continue the service through a targeted rate)</th>
<th>Waitākere Ranges Local Board (225 submissions)</th>
<th>Henderson-Massey Local Board (133 submissions)</th>
<th>Upper Harbour Local Board (149 submissions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support (end the service)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support (continue the service subsidised by all general ratepayers)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 How Council charges for pool fencing inspections

There was no specific question for this topic in the feedback form. All feedback on this topic was captured through question 5. Other feedback. There were 451 feedback points on the proposed changes to swimming pool inspection fees.

![How Council charges for pool fencing inspections](image)

### 1.4.1 Written feedback received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support – 36%</td>
<td>Common themes included people feeling that it would spread the financial burden for pool owners (8 feedback points) whilst others felt it would be more efficient (6 feedback points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support – 40%</td>
<td>The most common theme was that they did not want to pay in advance as the council would be unfairly benefiting from additional revenue prior to providing the service (36 feedback points). Others mentioned that pool inspections are not necessary (21 feedback points) whilst some mentioned pool inspections should be included in general rates (10 feedback points).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – 24%</td>
<td>62 feedback points noted that they do not want the three yearly inspection changed to an annual inspection. Others mentioned that they had recently paid their inspection fee and expressed concern that they did not want to be charged before their next inspection was due (23 feedback points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4.2 Feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events

Four people provided feedback points on this issue through Have Your Say community events, all were against the proposed changes.

Other feedback points were received through the council’s consultation on the proposal to amend the Revenue and Financing Policy to include a swimming pool fencing inspection targeted rate. This feedback on proposed changes to swimming pool fencing inspections fees will be discussed in full in the report to the council on the proposed amendments to the Revenue and Financing Policy.
1.5 Adjusting our fees and charges

There was no specific question for this topic in the feedback form. All feedback on this topic was captured through question 5. Other feedback.

1.5.1 Consent fees (30 feedback points received)

24 feedback points were on the topic of e-scooters and four were on charging for marine farms.

Of the 24 who commented on e-scooter fees, there were 12 feedback points in support of a fee for licencing scooters, four commenting that these businesses should pay. 10 feedback points were not in support with seven commenting that it would discourage the use of e-scooters.

Four submitters, including Coromandel Marine Farmers Association Inc and Western Firth Marine Farming Consortium, were not in support the current resource consent annual charge for marine farms and commented that the method to calculate the fee was not transparent.

1.5.2 Proposed increase on high impact commercial event permits (18 feedback points received)

10 feedback points did not support the commercial event fee while eight feedback points supported. Those who were not in support commented that the commercial event fee is unreasonable and may discourage event holders.

1.5.3 Proposed entry fee for international visitors to the Auckland Botanical Gardens (55 feedback points)

34 feedback points were not in support whilst eight feedback points supported a proposed entry fee for international visitors. Of those who did not support, seven commented that the proposed entry fee was too high and a further four commented that an entry fee would be unmanageable due to the multiple entry points and the cost to collect the fee. Others thought that the proposed fee was too high, with six commenting that they would support the fee if it were lower.

*Feedback received through Have Your Say, Māori and community events*

One person providing feedback on this issue through Have Your Say community events was against the proposed charge.

1.5.4 Clevedon connection (7 feedback points)

All of the seven feedback points received on this topic were in support of the proposal to help Clevedon residents connect to the water and waste-water systems. One commented that it should be mandatory for new business and houses to connect to the system.

1.5.5 Proposed changes to Retrofit your home scheme (5 feedback points)

Five feedback points relating to the Retrofit Your Home scheme were received. Four expressed support for the inclusion of a mandatory HomeFit assessment for all Retrofit Your Home loans above a threshold value of $2,000.

1.5.5 Proposed changes to Business Improvement District rates

Four feedback points were received on the BID proposals with two supporting the establishment of the One Warkworth BID and one opposing the expansion of the Glen Innes BID.
2.0 Other Feedback

The consultation invited the public to provide feedback on issues that were important to them. The question was kept broad and open ended “Do you have any other feedback on any other issues”. Some key topics are summarised below. For a full table of topics please refer to attachment four in the appendix.

Roads and footpaths

296 feedback points received. Most comments addressed road issues that need to be fixed or are not being fixed, a lot of frustration with the management of road works and with traffic congestion.

86 of the 296 feedback points were from Rodney residents with most wanting more of the budget for road sealing to be brought forward so that the spend over 10 years is spread more evenly, to see their roads sealed sooner.

There were also concerns about road and pedestrian safety, and road infrastructure to support housing development.

Public transport

211 feedback points received. Over half (128 feedback points) address public transport services, mostly wanting to see more accessible and affordable public transport, including comments requesting services to more rural areas.

70 feedback points discussed the provision public transport infrastructure, including requests for more park and ride facilities, bus shelters and public transport infrastructure in general for the growing population.

Feedback from stakeholders Generation Zero and Hapai Te Hauora was supportive of measures to decrease carbon emissions and electrify Auckland buses and the Council fleet.

Environmental services

185 feedback points received. Generally, feedback expressed concern over the state of our environment and support for its protection in response to the negative impact people and development have caused.

Other notable themes include concern for the state of our harbours, beaches and waterways; requests for better or more pest, plant and animal management; and some general concern about climate change, with support for initiatives to mitigate the effects of climate change and minimise our carbon footprint.

Feedback from stakeholders Hapai Te Hauora supported the investment to prevent the spread of kauri die-back and the water quality improvement plan.

AKBIDS (Business Improvement Districts of Auckland) outlined that BIDs are involved with a variety of initiatives relating to climate change, such as supporting mode shift in transport, electrification of the bus fleet and sustainable waste initiatives. As most businesses across the Auckland Region are small to medium sized, they welcome initiatives that support business to make the necessary changes, particularly education.

Rosebank Business Association suggested Council’s actions toward climate change should be far more ambitious.

Feedback on other issues related to rating and financial policy

137 feedback points suggested that the council was not prioritising its spending correctly. The feedback suggested a range of activities on which the council should not be spending included: cycleways, culture and wellbeing, tree removal, “feel good” or vanity projects.

73 feedback points commented that council should cut their spending or be focused on core business.

15 feedback points were that the rates paid did not flow through to the submitter’s local area.

There were 72 feedback points received in support of prioritising spending on specific issues. The issues were; road sealing in the Rodney area (29 feedback points), streetscaping of the St George’s Bay Road area (23
feedback points) and funding to enable re-opening of the Leys Institute building (20 feedback points). Ten feedback points supported the implementing the living wage for Auckland Council contractors.

**BID feedback relating to business differentials**

In addition to feedback on Business Improvement District rates an additional fourteen submissions were received on business differentials, including twelve regional stakeholders:

- Business North Harbour Business Association
- Ellerslie Business Association
- Howick Village Association
- Newmarket Business Association
- Onehunga Business Association
- Panmure Business Association
- Parnell Business Association
- Remuera Business Association
- Rosebank Business Association
- South Harbour Business Association
- Takapuna Beach Business Association
- Joint submission on behalf of Business North Harbour, Heart of the City, Greater East Tamaki, Newmarket and Parnell Business Associations
- The Property Council.

The submissions argued that business differentials cannot be justified and that the *Shared Report on Funding in Local Government* recommended against rating differentials. They commented that although business differential ratios were decreasing in the Annual Budget 2020/2021, by comparison, Tauranga City Council has no business rates at all. Business North Harbour gave additional feedback that the business differential should not be applied to any targeted rates.

The Property Council suggested that the rates differential be replaced with alternative funding mechanisms such as user charges (ie congestion charges), targeted rates, public private partnerships and special purpose vehicles.
2.1 Request for funding

In total, nine requests for funding were received during the consultation phase. Of these, five were directed to the appropriate local board to consider. The remaining four are summarised in Attachment 2 of this report.

3.0 Priorities for each local area for 2020/2021

Feedback on local board priorities is being considered by local boards therefore is not part of this report.
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ATTACHMENT 1: ANNUAL BUDGET 2020-2021

WHO WE HEARD FROM VIA WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

The tables and graphs below indicate the demographic information of those that provided demographic information, i.e. the percentages do not represent all submitters. All data points can be connected to providing a piece of feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Gender diverse</th>
<th>Total submitters providing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Diverse</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 +</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total submitters providing data</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Māori</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/Latin American/African</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total submitters providing data</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR ATTENDEES AT EVENTS
The tables and graphs below indicate the demographic information collected at events. These show the demographic profiling of those who attended. There is no record of receiving direct feedback from attendees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total submitters providing data</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Peoples</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total event attendees data collected</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 +</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total event attendees data collected</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 2: Requests for funding

Submitter: Noeline Hodgins for Bruce Pulman Park

Submission number: 3220

Local/Regional: Regional and Local

Local Board/Council area: Parks, Sport and Recreation (Papakura)

Description of request: This submission includes two funding applications:

1. A facility operating grant of $150k per annum for Pulman Arena – an indoor arena providing quality, and much needed, facilities for basketball, indoor netball, volleyball, Futsal, Turbo touch, Martial Arts and a 350m running track - all supported by changing rooms, a gym, café, medical and meeting rooms. This facility is also used by disability sports and community users, primary school clusters and college sport as well as sporting codes and regional, national and Pasifika events.

2. A capital grant of up to $600k for the rubberising of the outdoor courts in the netball centre further to the grant already approved by Council for $900k received in May 2019. This project has been graded priority 1 by the assessment panel of the Auckland Sport Sector: Facilities Priority Plan.

Value of request: $600,000 and $150,000 per year ongoing

One off or ongoing? One-off and Ongoing

Current State (existing funding level, confirmed agreements/plans; relevant historic info):
Auckland Council has a ground maintenance agreement with the Bruce Pulman Park Trust which provides an annual sum of $525,000. This was increased by $150,000 in 2019, from $375,000.

Officer comment:

There is currently no funding allocated to the operations of the Pulman Arena. Council supported the development of the Arena through a facility partnership grant of $4 million. The facility partnership agreement sets out the community access terms and conditions. A grant of $900,000 was approved through the Sport Facilities Investment Fund in May 2019 towards the rubberising of the netball courts. The Trust is required to secure the balance of the project costs, total project cost of $2.3 million, prior to council releasing the $900k funding.
Submitter: Tony Miguel for Whau Coastal Walkway Environmental Trust

Submission number: 3315
Local/Regional: Regional and Local
Local Board/Council area: Parks, Sport and Recreation (Whau)

Description of request: We also request that Council considers providing a grant of $40,000 to provide the Trust with the resources for the activities that are necessary to deliver the project in 2020/21, including:

- Securing non-Council funding, this requires a significant input in liaising with funding agencies and lodging the applications;
- Iwi and community consultation;
- Implementation of the Project’s non-physical (construction) objectives, as priority we plan to develop an Environmental Restoration Action Plan for the Whau River Catchment as a council/community partnership;
- Project planning, delivery and administration.

Value of request: $40,000
One off or ongoing? One-off

Current State (existing funding level, confirmed agreements/plans; relevant historic info):
The Whau Coastal Walkway Environmental Trust has received an annual grant from the Whau Local Board for the last 4 years of between $10-20K. The purpose of the Grant is to support the administration and operations of the Whau Coastal Walkway and Environmental Trust to promote Te Whau Pathway.

Officer comment:
This grant is reapplied for annually. The Whau Local Board have indicated a reduction in the funding from $20,000 to $15,000 for 2020/2021.
Submitter: Italia Tipelu for Netball Manurewa Inc.

Submission number: 3462

Local/Regional: Regional and Local

Local Board/Council area: Parks, Sport and Recreation (Manurewa)

Description of request: Netball Manurewa is requesting a shared maintenance model with Auckland Council and the Manurewa Local Board. Future development investment requests include:

- Stage 3 of the master plan encompasses
  - New roof on pavilion – the current roof leaks every time there is a heavy downpour (estimated cost $550,000)
  - Solar panels to help with power costs (estimated cost $110,000)
  - Children’s playground on the court 1 location would be very much appreciated for the children to play on while the parents are either playing netball or utilising one of the other games on offer (estimated cost $350,000).
  - Adult exercise equipment would be utilised in training regimes (estimated cost $180,000)
  - Enclosing the veranda area to create meeting room/office space for community use (estimated cost $800,000).

- Stage 4 of the master plan (long term) includes (estimated cost $4.5 million):
  - Roofing over courts 9 to 12 with covered link to building
  - Adjustment to fencing
  - New courts (no. 13-15).

Value of request: Up to $1,970,000 for Stage 3

One off or ongoing? One-off

Current State (existing funding level, confirmed agreements/plans; relevant historic info):

Auckland Council funded the development of Stage 1 and 2 of the Manurewa Netball facility development, allocating approx. $3 million from 2012-2016.

A further $1 million was allocated through Panuku in 2019 through proceeds of the sale of land at Vodafone Events Centre, for rubberization of the courts.

Officer comment:

There is no ongoing funding agreement in place.
Submitter: Rochana Sheward for Belong Aotearoa (formerly Auckland Refugee and Migrant Services)

Submission number: 3058
Local/Regional: Regional
Local Board/Council area: Community Services

Description of request: That Belong Aotearoa has a five to ten year funding contract of $80,000 per year from Council in order to provide the organisation with the ability to sustain and continue towards fulfilling Auckland Council strategic outcomes, objectives and community outcomes at a regional level.

Value of request: $80,000 per year for 5-10 years
One off or ongoing? Ongoing

Current State (existing funding level, confirmed agreements/plans; relevant historic info):
Strategic relationship grant approved of $30,000 per annum for 3 years, FY20 – 22 from Regional Community Development Grants.

Officer comment:
Belong Aotearoa plays a leadership role in Tāmaki Makaurau supporting the refugee and migrant sector and addressing the root and systemic causes of disparities and barriers to the successful settlement and integration of refugees and migrants. They do this by delivering outcomes that address barriers and discrimination and developing capacity across the sector. Priorities are delivering outcomes that contribute to systems change and addressing critical disparities (such as poor social cohesion, lack of sense of belonging, civic participation, inequitable access to systems such as housing, employment, health and disempowerment) in the settlement and integration experience for newcomers. They have a focus on strengthening existing leadership and supporting the development of new ethnic leaders which will help promote greater participation of ethnic communities throughout Auckland. Belong Aotearoa’s new strategic intent was a result of cross-sector research in 2018 and has framed future work.

The Community grants policy allows for Auckland Council to enter multi-year funding relationships with a small number of strategic organisations operating at the regional level who have an existing relationship with Auckland Council and are able to demonstrate a clear track record of achievement. The fiscal year 2020 Regional Community Development grant total pool was $295,000 and received applications for funding totally $1.6 million. Belong Aotearoa were awarded $30,000 per annum as a strategic relationship grant for three years. However, if the amount of money available through regional community development grants had enabled more funding, staff would have recommended an increased amount per annum be paid to Belong Aotearoa in order to support the valuable work that they do in Tāmaki Makaurau with a sector of the community that tends to be less empowered and disproportionately disadvantaged. Multi-year funding would provide a level of funding certainty to enable stability of programme delivery in an area of high need that delivers on and supports Auckland Council’s strategic outcomes.
### ATTACHMENT 3: Local board breakdowns

#### 1.1 Waste management targeted rate base service charge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Otāhuhu</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orākei</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitāmatū</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.2 An increase to refuse rates for former Auckland City and Manukau City ratepayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākai</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoeto</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitomata</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.3 An increase to the targeted rate for the Waitakere rural sewerage service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Support - continue the service through a targeted rate</th>
<th>Do not support - end the service</th>
<th>Do not support - continue service subsidised by all general ratepayers</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Ótahuhu</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara-Papetoetoe</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukekohepapa</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATTACHMENT 4: Other feedback received

Below is a summary of feedback topics that were collected but not directly consulted on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>In person</th>
<th>Total pieces of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-Transport</td>
<td>6.1-Roads and footpaths - existing</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2-Roads and footpaths - new</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3-Roads and footpaths - other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4-Road safety</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5-Public transport infrastructure - existing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6-Public transport infrastructure - new</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7-Public transport services - existing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8-Public transport services - new</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9-Public transport - other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.10-Walking and cycling improvements</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.11-Parking and enforcement</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.12-Other transport comments</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Water</td>
<td>7.1-Water supply</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2-Wastewater</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3-Stormwater</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Regional Community Services</td>
<td>8.1-Regional community services</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2-Regional libraries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3-Regional parks, sport and recreation</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4-Regional arts, culture and events</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5-Regional social housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Regional planning</td>
<td>9.1-Spatial, strategic and infrastructure planning</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2-Bylaws</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3-Homelessness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4-Housing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Sub-theme</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Total pieces of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5-Air, land and water monitoring and management</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6-Regulatory services</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7-Other planning comments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Other regional services</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-Solid waste services</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2-Environmental services</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.1-Climate change</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.2-Mililn trees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3-Auckland emergency management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4-Governance and support</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5-Mayoral Office</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6-Maori outcomes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Rating and funding</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1-Focus on core services</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2-Expenditure/debt</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3-Fees and charges</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4-Living wage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5-Asset sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6-Rating policy</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7-Local Board Funding Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8-Contributions policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.9-Grants and subsidies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10-Business Improvement Districts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11-Other rating and funding comments</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Tupuna Maunga</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Council Controlled Services</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1-Panuku Development Auckland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2-America's Cup</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3-Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4-Economic growth and visitor economy (ATEED)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Sub-theme</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>In person</td>
<td>Total pieces of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5-CFO Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6-Third party amenity and grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-General comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1-Question/information request</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2-Generally agrees with the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3-Generally disagrees with the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4-General comments about the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5-Suggested amendments to the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6-General comments about summary information</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7-General comments about the feedback form</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8-General comments about the online form</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.9-General comments about HYS events</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.10-Out of scope</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Emergency Committee

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

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

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. | s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.  
s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).  
In particular, the report contains information around potential financial implications and emerging financial risks of COVID-19 in a highly uncertain environment. The release of this information could prejudice the position of the council and CCOs in sensitive commercial arrangements and negotiations. | s48(1)(a)  
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. |