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Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

More playgrounds of a challenging variety.
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
No
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Do not support
Pay enough on our rates to cover this.
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year),
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

Already paying enough in rates to cover this.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers
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Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support
Until efforts are made to have producers/importers/manufacturers reduce front end waste I object to paying for them to make bigger profits ...

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

*In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.*

*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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

*If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.*

What do you think of our proposal?

Other

one city one solution

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

*Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.*

*The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.*

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

more effort needs to be put into local procurement at a strategic level ... bringing in outside providers is contrary to the bigger community development vision ... and disempowers local capacity development

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?
consistent local engagement of providers for parks, waterways, etc a local biodiversity plan that involves the community and local providers

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

fair

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

na

Local priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Auckland Council
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

I’ve recently moved into the area and have noticed an enormous amount of waste dumped in the street. This includes furniture and large items as well as little bits of rubbish like packages. There
needs to be more monitoring and collection of this as it makes it unpleasant. I have called in to the 0800 number and had things removed, but they only remove the specific things you call about—not other piles which may be across the road. Perhaps proactive monitoring of particular areas.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Other

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support all of the priorities

I see there is no plan to put in a decent children's playground in Mangere Bridge. We have been asking for the one near the library to be made into something decent for the kids. We would like Shelly Beach to be re-sanded. Many people from Mangere come here as it is the closest beach. Its muddy, gravelly and rocky.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

We need more trees and more rubbish bins
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Mangere Maunga is a terrible mess since all the trees were cut down. Where is the new planting? Where is the playground? The tracks are still rocky and slippery. There is no shade. We need proper toilets on the Maunga.
Submission Form
Draft Tupuna Maunga Operational Plan 2020 /2021

I have been an Auckland resident for 60 years and the Maunga have always been the backdrop to my life. They are very dear to me as places to walk and as leafy sanctuaries. I was witness to the brutal tree massacre on Te-Pane-o-Matahoh/Mangere Mountain last year. I was initially ambivalent about the removal of trees: I thought that even though it was very sad to lose the big trees, it would be wonderful for the Maunga to be covered in natives. I was in favour of the Maunga having more abundant planting, especially of natives.
However as time went on, and I saw the stumps and debris left by the tree fellers, experienced the dismissive attitude of the Maunga Authority to the distress of our community, and then saw the meagre, doomed planting on the tihi. I became disillusioned and horrified this was being allowed to continue unchecked and no-one was holding the Tupuna Maunga Authority accountable. The Maunga now is a wasteland, with no birdlife and no shade. There is increasing erosion on the tihi. I hardly ever go up there anymore. The images show TMA planting- tiny plants in plastic pots stapled to the scoria, dead. The other image shows the amount of erosion on the tihi.

I belong to Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association. We had no prior knowledge of what was to happen on the Maunga. There was no communication from the Maunga Authority. Our later attempts to get answers from the TMA were ignored. When I was invited to speak at our community meeting to answer queries and allay fears, he declined, saying he was too busy and "it is what it is". No representative has ever come to talk to us. We have always had good relationships with Council and they have often come to discuss various community issues with us, so this was a slap in the face, and displayed an ignorance of and indifference to the
work that has been done over the years by the Mangere Bridge Community, including the planting of many memorial trees on the Maunga, and the building of the Playcentre and Football Club. The Maunga Authority’s attitude left us hurt and angry. This is at odds with the TMA value of consultation with community and ‘create richness in relationships’.

I have read the Tūpuna Maunga Operational Plan for 2020-21 and it is very clear that more clarification and detail is needed if the community is to be able to have informed opinions. This year’s plan is no more explanatory than last years. It is very difficult for the average person to make any sense of it and I believe this is deliberate. Aucklanders must be fully informed about what ratepayer money is being spent on. The plan is full of grand vision and promises but few specifics or explanations. Nowhere in the plan is it stated that all but a few non-native trees on Auckland’s volcanic cones will be felled. The phrases ‘removal of exotic or inappropriate vegetation’ and ‘removal of pest trees’ appear frequently. Some trees are classified as sick or dangerous but there are no safety reports on specific trees. This deliberately and miscalculatively minimizes and falsely justifies the un-stated intention to decimate the exotic tree population.

I totally oppose the wanton destruction of habitats of already thriving native bird and wildlife eco-systems. There is no valid reason for mature healthy trees to be cut down, when they play a vital role in a time of climate change and in the ecosystem. The loss of canopy cover would make the Maunga much less pleasant places to be, thus affecting amenity value for decades to come. We all know of the very high melanoma rates in NZ and how important is to be able to be outdoors and yet have shade in our blazing summers, and shelter from the wind and cold in winter.

The TMA must pay heed to its own statement ‘The Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s bespoke co-governance structure recognises not only the important relationship Ngā Mana Whenua have with these sacred places, but also their importance to, and connection with, all the peoples of Auckland. The Tūpuna Maunga Authority is a tangible expression of the spirit of partnership between Ngā Mana Whenua and council.’

I totally oppose the fact that only a token effort to acknowledge the connections and histories of the ‘other’ people of Auckland, when “to recognise European and other histories and interaction with the Maunga” is a value included in the Operational Plan. Little of this makes any sense. Not only are the exotic trees being removed, plaques and memorials and seats are disappearing. It seems that what is occurring is cultural cleansing, which no-one should condone, especially not the Council.

Of particular interest to me is the ‘Winifred Huggins Memorial Woodland’ which sits at the base of Mangerei/Mt Wellington. The woodlands are an amazing mixed arboretum of mainly exotic trees. I note that in the Resource Consent only three trees are mentioned as being likely to be removed but because the TMA has classified poplars, red oak, European Ash and Eucalyptus as pest trees, many more in this precious grove will go. The Woodland is very neglected but worthy of preserving as an historic site. It has a number of plaques that acknowledge Aucklanders of note. If the removed ‘pest trees’ are replaced with all natives or what is more likely, no trees, the intention of the grove...
as a site of many specimen trees will be lost and part of Auckland’s history will be erased.

This destruction is momentous and unthinkable, all Aucklanders have connections to the volcanic cones and want and need to be heard. That this plan has been hatched and hidden in persuasive rhetoric, from Auckland residents is astounding. That Council has aided and abetted this duplicity is shocking, that our elected members have remained silent is shameful. That the Resource Consents were ‘non-notified’ is absolutely unbelievable. All Resource Consents for the Maunga should be notified. The Council has been extremely remiss in passing these as non-notified. That 25 magnificent Morton Bay Figs should be felled at Otahuhu/Mt Richmond, or the iconic Phoenix Palms at the base of Puketapapa/Mt Roskill, or the huge Oaks on Maungawhau is shocking – what kind of organisation would do this !!!! And why are the Council members of the TMA supporting this mass destruction?? And why are Council members not speaking to their constituents about this, as id their job?

The TMA’s plan to remove nearly all the exotic trees is at odds with its stated value of Mana Hononga Tangata/Living Connection. The TMA’s actions and arrogant, entitled attitude, undermine the stated intention to “actively nurture positive relationships”. Opposition to the tree felling continues to grow – not only within Auckland but throughout New Zealand - and the world. There has been enormous confusion and controversy within the community. This lack of transparency is very troubling, as is the seemingly deliberate spreading of misinformation. Any resistance or dissent from concerned members of the public is discounted and shouted down as being racist – this happened to a Mangere Bridge resident at the May 2019 TMA hui. She was subjected to a racist diatribe by , described by a witness, of Auckland:

’a gloves off, out of control, rising racist rant from Josephine Barley, screaming three times to her face that the person delivering this well-reasoned but passionate and forthright challenge was ‘disgusting’, that she needed to get it straight, that Mana Whenua were the OWNERS and masters now, that the tables had turned and she had better like it or leave. On and on. I’m paraphrasing, but that was the gist. A personal attack, based on race. I was shocked at the undisguised racism – that what had been seething underneath, was out at last. This was genuine, naked hate speech.’

And in, interrupt, take control. NOTHING. And neither did any TMA member, NOT ONE.’

This woman’s submission and another from that hui, have not been attached to the Minutes - another example of the TMA’s cloak of secrecy. I note that no videoing, recording or photography is allowed in their monthly ‘huis’. So much is hidden. Why does Council not intervene?

I myself have been racially abused on Facebook for being opposed to the felling of the exotics – a typical response usually contains a few expletives, and some half understood, regurgitated secondhand opinions. It has become an excuse to unleash anger and grievance. As one of the Owairaka/Mt Albert tree protectors, I have been threatened, told to ‘get off our land’ and been told ‘Iwi should build a wall to stop
pakeha coming up here’ and much worse. I was called a racist and shouted at by a man standing with me before the November 2019 hui on Owairaka/Mt Albert. I did and said nothing. - this is not acceptable. I have never experienced anything like it in all my years and it has been a revelation that there is so much hatred waiting to be activated by a policy as divisive and contentious as this. For me this issue, has always been about the trees, the birds and the environment, and I am astounded that such a brutal action as cutting down these trees should be regarded as ‘healing the Maunga’ and ‘restoring mana’. To object to tree felling, is not racist, and does not indicate a lack of willingness to acknowledge the harm done to Maori by Colonisation.

A policy which pits Maori and non-Maori against each other and fosters distrust and antipathy serves no purpose. This is such an opportunity for the various cultural groups in Auckland to work together in an unprecedented way, to restore native vegetation by means of succession planting. It seems the community unanimously supports the large-scale planting of natives, but only if it done in a non-destructive and sensitive manner, without destroying existing big trees and wildlife habitats. In terms of climate change, this is the best way to proceed.
I fully support the planting of natives, but I also believe the exotics should be retained for the duration of their natural span.

Other issues that need discussion and clarification:

- I request that the TMA must ensure future plantings are mulched and irrigated. If this doesn’t happen the plants will die which is another waste of time, effort, and ratepayer money. In a drought like the one we’ve just had, plants won’t survive with no canopy cover and no care. A 90 per cent attrition rate is not sufficient.

- I request that the TMA defines what ‘encroachments’ on the Maunga it intends to remove. Are Sports Clubs considered ‘encroachments’. If they stay, will the costs of leases rise dramatically?

- I am against restrictions on dogs on the Maunga. The TMA must clarify what restrictions will be in place: will they be limited to certain areas? Will they still be allowed off-leash?

- I request what exactly the phrase ‘authority over contiguous land’ implies. Will this affect private landowners? Can private land be confiscated? Can private landowners be told what they can and cannot plant or construct on their land?

- The plan speaks of ‘commercial activities to develop alternative revenue streams to invest in the protection and enhancement of the values of the Tūpuna Maunga’ – what exactly does this mean? Will the Maunga be transformed into theme parks for tourists? How would this be respectful to the Maunga?

- The TMA must engage in ‘good faith’ dialogue and consultation with the community. The TMA claims to have held public consultation but it is not ‘good faith’ consultation when crucial information is withheld. At two public consultations I have attended recently, the answers to the questions I asked were answered with half truths, ignorance and omissions. Public consultations are no more than public
relations displays, much like a Home Show product booth. I have been told that the dead plants on Mangere are in fact alive – this from members of the TMA. The image on the left shows where the dead plants were mulched months after they had died – this is incomprehensible.

UNESCO World Heritage’s Strategic Objectives include the value of ‘Community as one of its key strategies. Ironically, this strategy was put forward by NZ at the 31st Session of the UNESCO Heritage Committee in 2007 in Christchurch:

New Zealand is of the view that linking communities to heritage protection is a ‘win-win’ scenario. In the few instances where it is found that community interests are in direct conflict with some of the existing strategic goals, good faith efforts should be made to reconcile the differences in a meaningful and equitable manner.

I suspect that unless the Maunga Authority begins to adhere to UNESCO requirements, then there is very little chance of Auckland’s volcanic cones becoming UNESCO heritage sites.

New Zealand has a reputation as an environmentally aware country, and we have been viewed as ‘clean and green’ internationally. The TMA mass felling of exotic trees will seriously damage our image. Visitors from overseas that I have spoken to, have been in disbelief, and horrified at what is happening. When Auckland has already lost so many of its large trees in a time of climate change and now the horror of Covid-19 – the TMA and Auckland Council must heed the community and stop this runaway train.
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) to $141.93 (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
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and**
- **$20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).**

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

**What do you think of our proposal?**

**Other**

Households should be encouraged to recycle and compost where they can. A pay as you throw system should encourage this.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

**What do you think of our proposal?**

**Do not support - end the service**

---

**Local priorities**

**Māngere-Ōtāhuhu**

I support all of the priorities

**What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?**
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support
It is a well known fact that 80% of stuff in recycling bins ends up in the dump anyway. The cost of a separate service is not justified.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

There is no reason why the service between north and south is delivered differently. Standardise and treat all parts of Auckland the same.

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Mossey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service.

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support most of the priorities
Affordable housing and better public transport infrastructure is more important

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?
The general street scape and appearance should be upgraded and make it look cleaner and a better place to live. All aesthetic development go to traditional rich areas only.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

[Text box for feedback]
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details

Date received: 24 Feb 2020 17:28
Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.36 a week) 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?

Do not support
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support all of the priorities
Need to urgently looking into cleaner streets and sidewalks. Upgrading transport and more affordable housing. Remove all gambling licences in bars

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?
Other feedback

6. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details
Date received: 24 Feb 2020 17:48
Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Do not support

We should be looking at cost effective recycling. Why are we not paying people to recycle the huge number of drink bottles that make up such a big part of rubbish bins? Many other countries all ready do this. What you are proposing does nothing to incentivise people to deal with their own rubbish-composting for a start. Also, you should be charging the people that produce all this non bio-degradable stuff-food wrappings for instance. Council should be investigating furnaces for burning all the non recyclables. Again, overseas countries do this all ready. We dont want any
more stuff going to landfill. In fact we don't want any more landfills. Why can't we have some innovative thinking on rubbish instead of hitting the property owners all the time!

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by:

- $11.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

I think it is ludicrous that this board is looking to increase the tree cover in the area. On January 19th I was witness to the destruction of 9x 100yr. old oak trees at 36 Ascot Rd Mangere. This was because there was no protection for them!! The area is actually known as Airport Oaks, because of them. Now they are No more. It is time the laws were changed back to give protection for healthy old trees like these. You can’t replace 100 yr old trees with saplings. Council has to get protection first, then add to the green cover.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Protection for old and significant trees, native or otherwise.
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Auckland Council
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details

Date received: 24 Feb 2020 19:02
Attachment:

Organisation name: 
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.36 a week) to $141.93 (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?

Do not support
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

how much does someone not in these areas pay, on average? maybe we should change to pay for what we use as west auckland does esp for 70 yr old couples

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

more should be done to improve the health of the streams
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details
Date received: 24 Feb 2020 19:44
Attachment: 

Organisation name: 
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support

I live in South Auckland. My neighbours regularly fill both their bins to overflowing. I believe if they have to pay to put out rubbish, illegal dumping will increase. Serious education is needed and more bin inspections are needed and fines should be imposed if people regularly flaunt the rules.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Other

If the cost is in the rates, it is a bit invisible. Problem is that landlords will increase rent to cover the costs and tenants who are already struggling will struggle more.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers

The council should aim to connect the sewage to the main sewage pipes.

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities. The priorities around developing parks are important. I sometimes go to the North Shore where my grandchildren live and the playgrounds there are 100 times better than the playgrounds in south Auckland, this is bad. Please give the kids of south Auckland better spaces to play and be active in.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

The priorities around developing parks are important. I sometimes go to the North Shore where my grandchildren live and the playgrounds there are 100 times better than the playgrounds in south Auckland, this is bad. Please give the kids of south Auckland better spaces to play and be active in.
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Develop outdoor areas that are safe, attractive, and well maintained to encourage kids and adults to be more active. For example, better playgrounds, basket ball courts, and skate parks.

Auckland Council
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents
already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw. 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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Quicker removal of illegally dumped rubbish from the kerbs and our beautiful parks. Higher standard of public toilets around and continuous maintenance and improvement on our parks and towns

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details

Date received: 24 Feb 2020 20.23
Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
It’s a reasonable charge.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support
Very affordable.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service
Very little increase actually.

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?
Building a better, safer & cleaner community.

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

I support all of the priorities
Building a better, safer & cleaner community.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Our youth & our community.
### Annual Budget 2020/2021

#### Submitter details
- **Date received:** 25 Feb 2020 07:13
- **Attachment:**
- **Organisation name:**
- **Local Board:** Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

#### Regional feedback

1. **Waste management target rate**

   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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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**
   - The increase is fair and justified
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

it is fair & justified

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

I support all of the priorities
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.
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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support all of the priorities
In particular I resent paying for the local swimming pool so the council can say it is free. This is a lie!

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Auckland Transport is spending vast amounts of money wrecking the roading system by converting roads to cycle ways and bus ways. I object to this especially as it is the motorist paying for this.
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Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) to $141.33 (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?

Other
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Other

Why is the pay as you throw option other areas are using not offered?

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

I do not know what is better but as the rest of Auckland is catered for we should cater for this area. It is too expensive to hook them to the reticulation but they chose to live there. What to do?

Local priorities

Albert-Eden

I do not support all of the priorities

The priorities are unclear. Please bullet point e.g. Widening footpaths on X Road etc. What developments in each park? What type of toilet? What type of restoration of the Media wetland?
Aotea/Great Barrier
I support all of the priorities
Proactive, eco-friendly, inclusive

Devonport-Takapuna
I support all of the priorities
Clear, pertinent and evolving

Franklin
I support most of the priorities
Good to continue with unfinished initiatives

Henderson-Massey
I support all of the priorities
Community focused

Hibiscus & Bays
I support most of the priorities
There seems to be a lack of wider vision. Excellent re Art Centres but more environmental focus and future planning is needed

Howick
I support all of the priorities
Good initiatives that are working. Good focus on pest free.

Kaipātiki
I support all of the priorities
Good eco focus.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu
I support most of the priorities
Need more itemisation of the areas referred to and more focus on community involvement

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?
Shop inspections as there are many shops not up to standards of cleanliness, particular focus on grocery outlets. Safety needs to get a focus. Why are parks allowed to be party and drug venues late at night? (Seaside Park for one) Harbour quality needs reporting and initiatives implemented. Mangroves need to be removed in some areas. Tobacco plant and potato vine and other invasive plants need to be removed from many local council land. Possum eradication. I would like to see myna eradication as they are killing the native birds.

Manurewa
I support all of the priorities
On-going community maintenance

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

I support most of the priorities
Too general - needs bullet pointing and itemisation

Ōrākei

I support all of the priorities
Very proactive

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

I support all of the priorities
Sounds good. Keep at it!

Papakura

I support all of the priorities
Need itemisation but on-going community-focused initiatives

Puketāpapa

I support most of the priorities
Sounds a bit general with not enough bullet pointed eco initiatives. What about the coastline?

Rodney

I support all of the priorities
Huge relevant initiatives

Upper Harbour

I do not support most of the priorities
Very vague and lacking in direction, initiatives and planning

Waiheke

I support all of the priorities
Fantastic!

Waitākere Ranges

I support all of the priorities
Great initiatives and future focus

Waitematā

I support all of the priorities
Good plans and a lot to do
Whau

I support all of the priorities
What an amazing range on positive initiatives

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

We are growing too fast. Services and roads are not keeping up. If immigrants keep over-using Auckland we will become a third world city, which is what they are escaping. How many is too many?
## Regional feedback

1. **Waste management target rate**

   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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?**

   Do not support
These wastes are a product of our lifestyle and therefore should be shared across the board by us all. You could discourage recycling if this was introduced. (Dumping is already a problem in some parts of AK.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Other

I support it, but it is possible for this other area to have a pay as you throw system too? I now have a compost bin etc and my bins (recycled and non-recycle) are often almost empty. I would love to be on a pay as you throw system! I live in Mangere Bridge.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities
What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

I continue to worry GREATLY about housing. With the best will in the world, if both parents are on a minimum wage and trying to rent in AK, they will be totally stressed and much less likely to be able to create families where kids feel secure, happy and have a sense of belonging. That’s going to create HUGE and expensive problems for our society (including our economy) in the future. I’m a teacher so see the flow-ons from low-income families all the time. Having a place where you can put down roots is absolutely necessary if you are going to have a more stable, peaceful society. (There’s a reason that gangs and drugs are attractive to young guys, at present, and it’s not that these people are any more ‘evil’ than your own children.) A basic human need is to belong, and without a home or a stable ‘village’ to belong to, serious social problems will develop.
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feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Other

I would support it if there was an option for people to only have the collection when they have filled their bin. Currently I put mine out nearly empty each week. I would be happy to have it only collected once a month. I do not think families who are careful with their waste should have to subsidize those who are not, or manufacturers who over package. Council should ensure manufacturers use the minimum of packaging or cover the cost of its collection. This includes shops that over wrap.
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Other

I do not like the threat of if we do not agree we will get a general rates rise. My rubbish bin, as with my recycle bin, is rarely any more than a quarter full. If I could opt to have it only collected when full, then I would support an increase. Why should I pay for other people not composting, buying too much and generally being in considerate regarding rubbish?

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

Please stop planting trees such as Kauri along the footpaths, firstly most die, secondly they should grow to be HUGE, there is insufficient space. Plant natives that can withstand climate change or it is a waste of time. While children and communities need the resources for recreation. Please keep in mind the growing elderly population and their needs. Level paths, easier road crossings plenty of seats to rest on. As these apply to those with mobility disabilities and parents of young children, particularly those with prams, it is not a big ask.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

When roads are resurfaced, can the kerb be levelled more, currently it becomes like a bridge for
those in wheelchairs and other mobility assistance as well as prams while those who are less stable get unbalanced. Keeping on resurfacing gets the road higher and higher.

**Other feedback**

**5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?**

There need to be more pedestrian crossings, or more suitably places pedestrian crossings, in areas of high use as the elderly, disabled and children or adults with prams need to be able to cross safely. This applies to access to parks, libraries and other places of activity, not just shops.

---

Auckland Council
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.31 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Other feedback

6. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Pool barrier inspections my feedback is to stay at 3 year inspection fee. Changing this annually is costly to homeowners as inspections are only done during business hours and residents then need to take time off work. Not acceptable
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
Fair to have a small increase, users should pay for service, not all ratepayers.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents
already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
- Support
- Small increase acceptable for guaranteed rubbish collection.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
- Support - continue the service
- Users should pay - would still be cheaper than having it done privately?

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Provision of dog poo bags on popular walkways and more rubbish bins along same. Improved children’s playgrounds.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details

Date received: 28 Feb 2020 21:20
Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support

Property owners in the areas which do have kerb side collection should pay the cost of kerb side collection. However disposal costs increases should be off-set by reduced amount of waste. A
targeted rate does nothing to encourage reducing the amount of waste households produce. Packaging producers should be made responsible for the life cycle of their packaging, and households should be rewarded for minimising the waste they put out in their curb-side collection.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

People will put out the same amount of rubbish or more because they want to get their money’s worth. Focus should be put on enabling households to reduce the waste they put out, and savings made via reduced quantities. A pay as you throw system may help reduce quantities.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu
I support all of the priorities. All the priorities are important. There's not enough focus on environmental protection and improvement - especially waterways.

**What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?**

Focus on waste reduction and clean streets so less rubbish ends up in our waterways. Water quality improvement - Manukau Harbour and tributaries and surrounds including industry. Enabling communities to clean-up their shorelines and parks and streets.

---

**Other feedback**

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Qualify open space - Auckland has some fabulous open space which should be protected and enhanced. The harbours and gulf need some serious work. Continued focus on transport - cycleways, and improving how intersection traffic lights work for cyclists.
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support

I put out my recycling bin about once every two months, and even then it is not full. I would like a system where those who receive a kerbside service are charged by volume of recycling. I would
also like to see more public bins at council venues and facilities for recycling, where people can dispose of their household recycling.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

Auckland City and Manukau City should also be shifted to Pay As You Throw. Subsidies / reduced rates should be available for larger families and those on low incomes.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

If the Waitākere local board area would like the service continued, it makes sense to fund it through a targeted rate for residents in that board area.

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

Greater priority needs to be given to environmental spend, perhaps by combining it with community events: beach and stream clean-ups, clean streets campaigns, etc. There is far too
much rubbish in our public areas, waterways and on our streets, and this needs to be addressed.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

As above, beach clean-ups, clean your street campaigns, stream clean-ups.

Other feedback

6. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

-
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support

The rate above only applies to those that use the service. What if I use this service for some unknown reasons, means I have cardboard this week. Prefer to have a uniform rate.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

For the above reason yes I supported but how would I know that the increment in rate is for this purpose and not for something else?

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

I don’t support neither of the above. Why when delivering this service is higher? what changes in the system is evident and warrant for changes. Are you employing more staff ? or utilized modern technology and lay off staff?

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support neither of the above. Priorities? would this be human life involved? or basic $$ sign issues. It is conspicuous that you’re taking the short cut in all avenues by going straight to the peoples pocket.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

1. keep the hygienic aspect of our street high, public toilets, street and rubbish bags and house holds in view. 2. totally against two storey houses being built knowing that the majority or our people leaving in poverty. Or are they built for overseas buyer? Be honest with your voters
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

what you see is what you get but----have you ever tried to work yourself around what you got? rather than poking out of the voters? so many resources lying around which enriches others....

Auckland Council
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details

Date received: 5 Mar 2020 13:29
Attachment:

Organisation name:

Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.
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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities
I greatly support the parks and open areas focus, and think more money should be spent on this. The area needs more destinations. More people spending time out in the area leads to more money being spent at community business which leads to more private investment in the area. These open areas shouldn’t be playing fields though. There are so many playing fields. The majority of residents are not sports players. We need non sporting destinations.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Perhaps more community clean ups and encouragement to attend them. An initiative to take care of and take pride in our neighbourhoods.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
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Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Training Lights should be put up on Moyle Park

Other feedback
5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Tupuna Maunga Authority should be supported and support the Annual Operational Plan.
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Submitter details

Date received: 5 Mar 2020 20:45
Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already met the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - end the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Should Have Training Lights down Moyle Park and Park should be done up

Other feedback
5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

1) CCOs have become more Centralised and have lost Touch with Local Communities and accountability to those local Communities. There is no mechanism from Board Level of a CCO to their Officers to the the wishes of the Community. 2) I support the Tupuna Maunga Authority and their operational plan 3) I support He Waka Eke Noa and the work they do.
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

Businesses should be forced to use biodegradable packaging. Community Led groups should be funded to educate the communities on how to reduce and and dispose of there waste including rubbish. Should we return the days of milk in glass bottles, bread in paper packaging? Weighing up the impact of our how to better protect our environment and ultimately helping towards saving our planet!
Attachment A

Item 21

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

Businesses should be forced to use biodegradable packaging. Community Led groups should be funded to educate the communities on how to reduce and dispose of there waste including rubbish. Should we return the days of milk in glass bottles, bread in paper packaging? Weighing up the impact of our how to better protect our environment and ultimately helping towards saving our planet.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

I dont think anyone should be excluded to the basic necessities in NZ geez its 2020 not 1814, the need to have these septic tanks for the users and visitors to this area is a human right, although i live in Mangere and dont want to fund this. Keep this service and yes this should be funded by those who live in the area and companies who work in this area.

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

Well firstly, there is no Maori representation on this local board, yet they advocate maori and not one of our local board members are Maori, which makes it hard for us who are maori to connect or resonate with. The unitary plan has been set and has started to take shape in Mangere in terms of the new build of kainga ora housing, kiwi build etc. The impact of increased residents to our
areas on sports parks and facilities has been ignored by the Parks portfolio holders. Stop clipping the ticket or resign.

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Bike tracks are not working, waste of tax payers money, the barriers to this is simply families cant afford to buy there children a bike. We need cheaper fares for our families, kids to access safer and responsible transport options. The sewage ponds still prove to be an ongoing problem with the smell leaking through Māngere please create solutions to reduce and prevent this. Invest money in community led groups to continue delivering educational programs for gardening, reducing waste, re-using waste for compost etc. Māngere is a large area with a growing population, initiatives like this should be funded for the next 10 years to carry and include the families moving into the new houses.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Why wouldn’t I have my say, if I don’t my local board will continue to consult with each other and sell us out like they did with the Unitary plan. My confidence in our Local board has depleted over the past few years and I certainly believe they never fought for Mangere Residents in terms of the new housing builds and the impact this would create to our people our families, it has been swept under the table. Vote of no confidence

Auckland Council
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
• 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

3. Waiākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Maseay and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waiākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waiākere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

'Re: Draft Tupuna Maunga Operational Plan 2020/2021' 1. Under what authority has TMA become responsible for Te Pane-o-Mataaho/ Te Ara Pueru/Māngere Mountain? 2. Given the requirement to agree an operational plan and budget between Council and the TMA, is the Council required to accept the budget submitted by TMA or is a negotiation carried out? Is the Council permitted to reject the budget as presented? 3. Under "Policy and Management": Where is the authority to acquire "contiguous" land, and where has the policy to make land connections between the various mauaunga been approved? 3. Under "Healing": How does the provision of platforms and restoration of archaeological sites fit with the stated policy of not planting seedlings into the soil because digging is not permitted on the tapu sites? Have all of the tapu provisions on or within the mauaunga boundaries been identified and mapped? Without such mapping, how can a budget be developed? 4. Under "Development": does the policy or removing redundant infrastructure mean that sporting and cultural facilities already in place will be removed? Are all of the active facilities to be protected and enhanced? 5. Is the proposed UNESCO World Heritage application and procedure funded in this budget or will future requests be made for Council resources to support this activity? 6. Table 2 is misleading in the way that rows are titled and amounts shown. Separating baseline budgets from inflation included lines is nonsense: all figures should be shown in "then year" numbers. Additionally the lines showing "Total LTP funding requirement 2018-2028" actually only show the total for the year in the column. If the row is to show the
numbers for the range of years the numbers should be cumulative with each year’s total being added to the cumulative amount for the previous year. Thus the actual total funding for 2018 to 2023 is in the range of $130 million rather than the $77.6 million shown...
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Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Newsletters:

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
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Date received: 12 Mar 2020 11:50
Attachment: 
Language: English

Organisation name:  
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
Fair, transparent & equitable system

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support
Fair, transparent & equitable system

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service
Fair, transparent, & equitable system

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities
Proposed priorities cover a wide range of areas of interest in a community setting

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Better planning around parks & playgrounds- so that playgrounds are set in safe setting, ie not next to the road.
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Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
What else options is available?

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities:
- sports clubs to give access for all children
- education -not too sure about the bike lanes, and roads with one-way islands.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
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Language: English

Organisation name: Boxing Club Rising Star Boxing
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) to $141.03 (incl. GST).

If we do not do this, we would have to fund the shortfalls 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

I am look after the youth I am a mentor and I am running I need your help.
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
## Submitter details

**Date received:** 12 Mar 2020 13:50  
**Attachment:**  
**Language:** English  
**Organisation name:** CLM  
**Local Board:** Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

### Regional feedback

1. **Waste management target rate**

   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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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**

   How is communication of new proposals being made known to the community. To make community more aware of what is recycling and where rubbish ends up.

2. **Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City**
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

---

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

---

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Services to the community - love the idea that we have free entrance to the pools in Ōtāhuhu/Māngere L.B.
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### Submitter details
- **Date received:** 12 Mar 2020 14:58
- **Attachment:**
- **Language:** English
- **Organisation name:**
- **Local Board:** Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

### Regional feedback

1. **Waste management target rate**

   *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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. **Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City**

   *In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a...*
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Can get the rich pay a bit more so their cover for low income earner.
### Regional feedback

1. **Waste management target rate**

   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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. **Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City**

   *In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a*
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

Think that it should be the same across the region.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Masse and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support most of the priorities
Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Older people who are ratepayers supported to know they can be entitled to reduced rates.
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Submitter details

Date received: 12 Mar 2020 15:43
Attachment:
Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support
Budget in council cut one exps. Increase in rates by default.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

Cut exps in council. All of Auckland pay.

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

They need to be treated the same as other areas on septic tanks in Auckland. It can't be connected anywhere in Auckland then happy to pay.

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Parks aren't to the same standard as other parts of Auckland.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Need parks in Mangere like Waterview/Takapuna. Playgrounds that are suitable for very adventurous. Mangakieke - needs to develop Riverside especially as new families move in. eg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Shops/facilities in partnership with school &amp; community groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Submitter details
Date received: 12 Mar 2020 16:18
Attachment:
Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.45. Our proposal is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $260 to $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.

If we don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
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Submitter details
Date received: 12 Mar 2020 16:21
Attachment:
Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Do not support
I feel that having a strategy where recycling well can be seen as being rewarded as well as creating more awareness around what is and what isn't recyclable.
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

Supporting the status quo where all residents will have to pay through general rates.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers

Everyone should be responsible for services that can be seen as necessities.

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
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Submitter details
Date received: 13 Mar 2020 10:34
Attachment:
Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities – a lot of the priorities relate to the youth of the community. -Supports the growth of the younger people in the community.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
**Annual Budget 2020/2021 - Hard copy submission**

**Submitter details**
- **Date received:** 13 Mar 2020 10:58
- **Attachment:**
- **Language:** English

**Organisation name:**
- **Local Board:** Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

---

**Regional feedback**

1. **Waste management target rate**

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?**

Do not support

2. **Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City**

*In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a*
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Waitakere Rural area should be supported by rate payers at Waitakere. It is not fair that other area miss out from the same service that Waitakere is getting for free from other areas, south & central.

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

street lights around Mangere Area.
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Submitter details

Date received: 13 Mar 2020 11:13
Attachment:
Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Do not support

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Do not support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities
Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities
With a large youth population in Mangere, would like to see more initiatives to sow into our next generation.

Other feedback
5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

- Tighter restrictions on number of Alcohol retail outlets in Mangere. Still too many. -When is Mangere Town Centre due for an upgrade? -Infrastructure concerns, especially with the number of housing developments currently under construction- schools, public amenities, community services, public spaces, libraries etc. -Transport- cheaper option to do rail link from airport to Puhinui & then onto city. Highest no of users for public transport are workers in the airport vicinity.
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Submitter details
Date received: 13 Mar 2020 11:18
Attachment:
Language: English

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Do not support

Alternative ways to reuse, recycle, schools can use the recycle for other things. Entrepreneurs can be used to create ways to use the waste mgt create jobs this way. Maybe go back to bottle milk drinks. Corporates and businesses need to look into packaging alternatives
2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

In South Auckland what we pay already seems to be OK. We have managed in our household.

---

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers

Living in South Auckland we are happy with what the council are doing for our areas.

---

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support all of the priorities

Increasing wasteage rates may not make things easier. Maybe be smarter and utilise creative ideas from Pacific and how we survive in the islands.

---

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?

Other

Firstly our Mangere community has a large demographic of Pasifika and raising the cost would create more problem/dumping in our parks and streets. At a central govt level for all businesses who are using plastics as a part of the business. A higher levie should be put on those businesses to cover cost of the increase. Reduce cost for recycling by having safe community groups look
after recycling and refuse. “Rubbish talks”. Finance these groups for refuse and recycle. Businesses should be charged a higher levy for using plastic packaging. Save our planet.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities. The Auckland Unitary Plan has not considered the impact on sports clubs. With the newly built homes in Mangere, local sports clubs need facilities and assets to meet the growing-demand to have the capacity to facilitate membership.

Other feedback
5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

| Auckland Council |

---
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
Currently can look at increase on my landrates.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

Commercial business need to take responsibility as contributes to majority of waste.

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service
I do not live in Waitakere region.

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities.
Happy with the progress in my area parks, recreation safety for kids.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Annual Budget 2020/2021 - Hard copy submission
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Language: English
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Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Newsletters:

Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Other
Invest more money in Recycling Education, in homes, schools, work places & businesses.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

User pays will result in other issues like rubbish dumping!

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $280 and $320 a year (incl. GST). This increase would apply from July 2021.

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

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I do not support most of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the renewal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Swimming pools

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Swimming is not a luxury, it’s a necessity. Most of the swimming lessons are so expensive that we can’t afford for our kids. Please do take initiative for free swimming lessons in council pools. Also by keeping them hygiene, YMCS is unaffordable for us. Me as a mother of two needs daily exercise routine, but can’t join a gym due to heavy cost. Please increase the number of yoga,
Annul Budget 2020/2021
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.
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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Auckland Council
Annual Budget 2020/2021
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Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
Definitely only charge those whom use the service.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents
already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

Again pay as you throw is a good initiative. Might get people to think twice about rubbish.

Alternatives have to be given i.e. In South Auckland there is no recycling station to take recycled material.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate.

While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Those in the targeted area fund the service if they want it.

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities

I feel more is needed to be done regarding drugs and alcohol use in the community. Ban any NEW off license alcohol premises. And work to limit the trading hours of current outlets. Given the new large developments in Mangere a large investment in infrastructure and schools in the area needs to be addressed. Large ravamp in the Mangere Town Centre (not just the toilets) i.e. Library and also the Town Centre as it is becoming a dump. Funding to be set aside for the destination playground in David Lange Park. I support the ravamp of Otahuhu and the road between the train station and Town Centre. But it would also be great to create better connections between Mangere - Mangere East - Otahuhu and Mangere Bridge. I.e some cycle lanes or safer walking streets to better connect our local board area and not always have to rely on a car to get from Mangere Central to Middlemore or Otahuhu Train station. With regards to the swimming pools and facilities a small fee should be charged to use facilities to supplement the up keep and also have more staff in these areas. I am tired of waiting until people leave the pools as its overcrowded due to the safety ratio. I feel a small fee or just charge those who don’t live in the local area (proof via
utility bill) to help with maintenance and future renovations as Moana nui a kiwa is already run down and Otahuhu is following suit.

**What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?**

More education around the environment and also incentives and maybe penalties for people to do so. Installing recycling machines in town centers that give 10 cents for every plastic bottle. Having a local refuse station to take recycling or rubbish at a discounted rate for locals. Having park and community volunteers patrolling parks and reminding public to pick up after themselves.

---

**Other feedback**

5. **Do you have feedback on any other issues?**

User pays should be implemented. Each local board to pay a be responsible for waste.

---

Auckland Council
Item 21

Annual Budget 2020/2021

Submitter details
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Attachment:

Organisation name:
Local Board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

User should pay.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

user should pay.

Local priorities

Ōrākei

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Item 21
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.
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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

3. Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitakere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Māngere-Ātāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ātāhuhu?

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?
Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

Also will there be an urgent response to the way we store our rubbish/waste how?

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

How long is temporary. It seems pointless to not pay extra later.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support - continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers

The discounted amount. It doesn’t impact us majorly.

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Manurewa

I support most of the priorities
More youth support would be great

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

-Keep giving myc money please :) -Maori engagement! :) -I’m sorry I still feel unsure. - What are the extra costs covering? -I think $20 is too much, also how does it impact the visits of botanic gardens.
Submission to Auckland Council Annual Budget 2020/2021

Auckland Council is seeking feedback on the Auckland Council Annual Budget 2020/21 and related annual budget policy documents.

The South Harbour Business Association ("Association") welcomes the opportunity to make this Submission on the Auckland Council Annual Budget 2020/21 and related annual budget policy documents.

The Association is located in the Mangere/Otahuhu Local Board district, is light/heavy industrial zoned and has a membership of approximately 75 large (ie O’t Fibre Ltd.) and small (ie Forensic Building Consultants Ltd.) commercial and industrial businesses.

Our feedback covers:

1. Annual Budget 2020/2021 Rating Proposals
2. Concerns regarding the impact of the Coronavirus (COVID-19)
3. Regional Fuel Tax, the New Zealand Upgrade Programme and Climate Change

(1) Annual Budget 2020/2021 Rating Proposals

Our overall feedback is that what businesses need most from Council is a fair, transparent and stable approach to rates.

Business differential

While we appreciate that the business differential is being reduced and look to that being further reduced in the Long Term Plan 2021/31, fundamentally, we do not accept the view that a business differential should be applied to rates especially for reasons that "businesses are better able to manage additional costs than residential properties" or because "businesses can claim back GST and expense rates against tax." These reasons do not justify the business differential, particularly for

---

1 With regard to the amendments to the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy and Revenue and Financing Policy, please treat our feedback below as also being feedback on the amendments to those Policies.

2 As set out in the Additional supporting information to the Long Term Plan 2018/2028. For example, if income for a small business is relatively flat, but there is a significant rates increase, the extra rates expense will impact negatively on the profitability of the business and may even force the business to run at a loss.
small businesses who make up most businesses in Auckland. The Shand Report on Funding Local Government recommended against rating differentials. In 2020/2021 the business differential ratios will be set so that $1.08 per cent of general rates (UARG and value-based general rate) come from business. By comparison, Tauranga City Council has no business rates differential at all.

Waste Management Targeted Rate

Our overall feedback is that while we accept the need to pay for increases in the costs of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) due to international market conditions, constraints from Council’s long term collection contract obligations, and that increasing the targeted rate is the most appropriate way of achieving this, we question whether rates are fair to businesses when the activities funded by this waste management targeted rate (particularly the increases) largely benefit residential users. In addition, we hold concerns that many small businesses are being encouraged to take individual responsibility, especially for food waste, which places additional financial burdens on small businesses.

Refuse Collection in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas

Again, our overall feedback is that while we accept that the new refuse collection contracts (including for food scraps) will increase costs in the former Auckland City and Manukau City areas. We also question whether these rates are fair to businesses when the activities funded by the rates largely benefit residential users.

The Waitakere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

As our business association is not located in the Waitakere Ranges, we won’t be making any specific submissions on this proposal, other than to say that this service should not be funded from all general ratepayers.

(2) Concerns regarding the impact of the Coronavirus (COVID-19)

Concerns expressed from our local business members are that the Coronavirus (COVID-19) is already having a significant impact on their businesses.

The impacts to date include direct financial impacts on businesses (especially hospitality, tourism and some retail categories), supply chain and market disruption as well as effects on production. There are also significant impacts for importers and exporters. Should these impacts be prolonged, the economic impact will be severe.

Although preparations for the Annual Budget 2020/2021 preceded the outbreak of the Coronavirus (COVID-19), we need to alert the Council to the concerns of our local business members. While the Government is due to announce a package to support business, we ask Council to urgently consider measures that it might take to assist businesses. We believe the urgency and significance of the impacts on businesses and the economy necessitate Council considering options such as deferring rates increases, interim rates relief, and accelerating the reduction in the business differential.

---

1 Your Consultation Document says that the cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions. To pay for this you are proposing to charge only those who use the service by increasing the targeted rate by $19.97 a year or $0.39 a week (the total cost changing from $121.06 to $121.45 incl. GST). You say that if Council does not do this, you will have to fund the shortfall by increasing general rates for all ratepayers, including those who don’t get a kerbside collection service.

4 Your Consultation Document says that in the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council area, household 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 you are proposing 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 $134.16 incl. GST), and a $20.91 increase a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.91 to $212.82 incl. GST). You say that if you do not do this, Council will have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those living outside these two areas who would subsidize residents of old Auckland and Manukau city. 
This is set against a back-drop of a minimum wage increase on 1 April 2020, that will further impact the cashflow of many businesses under stress because of the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

We are also conscious that the city has a big year ahead in 2021 with significant international events including the America’s Cup and we need to mitigate the impact on businesses as much as possible in order to benefit fully from the upside when it does come.

(3) Regional Fuel Tax, the New Zealand Upgrade Programme and Climate Change

At a recent BID Manager’s meeting on the Annual Budget 2020/2021, we asked Council finance officers what work is underway regarding the Regional Fuel Tax as BIDs have supported it as an interim measure only. We are concerned that ideas are being canvassed to replace this tax with alternative funding mechanisms (continuation of the tax under another name).

Regional Fuel Tax

Our preference is to introduce initiatives that both manage demand and raise funding equitably as soon as possible, balanced with investment into affordable and more frequent public transport in order to effect sustainable behavioural change. We understand, for example, that technical work on the ‘Congestion Question’ project that has been examining the potential to apply congestion charging in Auckland is progressing. We understand that Council anticipates that the technical investigatory phase of this project will be completed in the first half of 2020 and subsequently be reported to Government and Auckland Council for decisions on any further work. As a consequence, we look forward to this work becoming publicly available.

In the interim, while we have supported a regional fuel tax of 10 cents per litre (plus GST), we ask for greater transparency regarding the spending of this tax on specific transport projects and services. We wish to avoid the regional fuel tax, which is the equivalent of a significant rates increase (especially for transport operators), being used as a ‘top up’ for overall transport budgets.

We are also concerned about the underspend of the Regional Fuel Tax by $268m in its first year. Although we appreciate that the spend of funds raised by the Regional Fuel Tax is planned over the ten-year term of the RFT and that in some years the spend will be less than the revenue (with the balance being held in a specific reserve to be released for projects scheduled later in the decade), you will appreciate we are worried that businesses are being over-taxed if the RFT is being underspent or that infrastructure is not being built at the required pace.

New Zealand Upgrade Programme

The government has allocated $6.8 billion into transport ($5.3 billion on roads and $1.1 billion on rail) with Auckland receiving $3.48 billion of the transport funding. Mayor Goff says this will be put toward the $1.3 billion Mill Road highway, the $411 million Penlink toll road, the widening of State Highway 1 between Papakura and Drury South and the $360 million SeaPath walking and cycling path across the Harbour Bridge.

We understand that Auckland Council is working with central government to establish the impact of the New Zealand Upgrade Programme investment on Council’s budgets. You say that decisions on both revenue settings and/or additional investment will be made through the 10-year Budget 2021-2031 process. We ask that this be managed transparently with a view to making fair and equitable decisions regarding how this government infrastructure package impacts on the levels of the regional fuel tax and rates funding for transport provided for in the LTP 2021-2031.

Climate Change

We note the Council’s emphasis in the Annual Budget on climate change with actions like electrification of the vehicle fleet, moving to sustainable energy at council facilities and tree planting specified.
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 the majority of businesses across the Auckland Region are small to medium sized, we welcome initiatives that support business to make the necessary changes. Funding for education is particularly important to raise awareness and drive change.

**Conclusions**

As we enter a very uncertain period, especially for small and medium sized businesses and those reliant on international markets, we ask the Council to consider carefully whether there are options for Council to consider relief for these businesses in the Annual Budget 2020/2021.
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Regional feedback

1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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
I can understand why the cost has gone up.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don't do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support

I can understand why this has to increase, when is South Auckland and ACC getting user pays?

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don't 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Support - continue the service

---

Local priorities

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support most of the priorities
I support the playground increases especially. I am offended about increase in tree cover when the granddad sacred old memorial trees on Mangere Mountain were helicoped out at huge expense. VERY ANGRY 1) we need the money spent on the helicopter for other things 2) these trees should have been left to grow old and let nature do the job itself! The shade and carbon capture are gone, lost trust in the TMA and council - who is responsible? It is done now but we the community are very sad.
What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

When are we getting a community recycling center and I want to see the tree planting plan asap.

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Yes please see attached
- submission re Volcanic cone policies and operations – Mangere Mountain: Tipuna Maunga Integrated Management Plan and xyz Te Pane O Mataoho

22 March 2020

My ‘gold nuggets’/important bits are in yellow.

GEOLOGY

I can see in the IMP that the values are as below, I personally think that Geological should be its own value as Te Pane O Mataoho special feature is its geological features and there is no other volcano with the features it has, this means this should stay at the forefront for the management plan of Te Pane I Mataoho, it is important it is not lost.
I have had talks with a few council and Tipuna Maunga Authority staff (TMA) and one point was reforestation or planting on the Maunga, I agree this would be lovely but it is imperative this does not cover the geological features. The crater floor has had trees culled over the years to keep this clear so planting down there (a new forest) will be against the protection the geology has (should have).

Also I walked past the kumara pits and they are completely full by kikuyu grass – what is the plan to keep these cleared out so these features can be seen?

The above two important features (crater floor and kumara pits) would be aligned with “cultural and heritage value” mentioned in Part 2 “protect, maintain and improve visibility and understanding of natural, geological and cultural features”.

**FIRE**

With cattle taken off (there were always only a small number used to control the grass on the mountain and they were always young cattle) there is now a fire risk. With the grass being allowed to grow very high (my child cannot walk easily up our path from Wallace Road access way) I believe this is a huge fire risk – I would like to understand the long-term plans for reducing fire risk.

**EROSION**

Part 2 also mentions “reduce erosion and inappropriate surfaces” I would note that the new concrete path that has been laid on the north side of the maunga (with no ability for stormwater to run down it will erode the land away each side of this new path and erode the maunga. I cannot see how this path is an appropriate surface. A DoC like path with wood and gravel would have been more appropriate. An example would have been the path leading up near the education centre and King Tawhiao’s cottage.

Speaking of this cottage, there are two other fenced cottages in the area, one on Mountain Rd and one on Church St, these should all be linked (as they are). I have information on these cottages I am happy to provide to future archives.
We the community need to see the Kings cottage open and used (maybe by high school students studying NZ history?) this is PRECIOUS building and I love it and it needs to be opened up to people. Very sad it has the English box hedge round it and it is there all locked up.

**TREES**

My family have lived in the area 20 years and my husband’s family over 40 years. We are very sad about the way the ‘grandfather trees’ we murdered. This could have been done better, leaving them and their shade (we used to use the ones near the tennis courts as shade on oru whanau walks). I think the TMA have really upset the community. Some of the trees were memorial trees related to the Historical Society for Mangere Bridge. I really cannot believe how this has happened. “if the maunga is well the people is well”. I can tell you the people are not well and are crying. I visited the peak where the trig used to be (where the fire was recently) and with the trees cut down (some of the roots are still there but the path has been widened (by man – not sure this is appropriate) and the spindle bombs (geological feature) we stopped and looked at with local geologists are now GONE!

I am very worried if we get heavy rainfall this side of the mountain will erode, the trees were holding it together. Please consult with all the locals before spending ratepayer money on anything.

*I am TOTALLY not happy to pay for helicopters.* I would rather that money went into the dire in need of money education centre to hire more staff (and leave the trees and plant near them – once a certain size replace).

Thanks for the ability to submit
Attachment A

Michelle Whitaker – submission re Volcanic cone policies and operations – Mangere Mountain: Tipuna Maunga Integrated Management Plan and Te Pane O Mataoho

22 March 2020

My ‘gold nuggets’/important bits are in yellow.

GEOLOGY

I can see in the IMP that the values are as below, I personally think that Geological should be its own value as Te Pane O Mataoho special feature is its geological features and there is no other volcano with the features it has, this means this should stay at the forefront for the management plan of Te Pane I Mataoho, it is important it is not lost.
I have had talks with a few council and Tipuna Maunga Authority staff (TMA) and one point was reforestation or planting on the Maunga, I agree this would be lovely but it is imperative this does not cover the geological features. The crater floor has had trees culled over the years to keep this clear so planting down there (a new forest) will be against the protection the geology has (should have).

Also I walked past the kumara pits and they are completely full by kikuyu grass – what is the plan to keep these cleared out so these features can be seen?

The above two important features (crater floor and kumara pits) would be aligned with “cultural and heritage value” mentioned in Part 2 “protect, maintain and improve visibility and understanding of natural, geological and cultural features”.

FIRE

With cattle taken off (there were always only a small number used to control the grass on the mountain and they were always young cattle) there is now a fire risk. With the grass being allowed to grow very high (my child cannot walk easily up our path from Wallace Road access way) I believe this is a huge fire risk – I would like to understand the long-term plans for reducing fire risk.

EROSION

Part 2 also mentions “reduce erosion and inappropriate surfaces” I would note that the new concrete path that has been laid on the north side of the maunga (with no ability for stormwater to run down it will erode the land away each side of this new path and erode the maunga. I cannot see how this path is an appropriate surface. A DoC like path with wood and gravel would have been more appropriate. An example would have been the path leading up near the education centre and King Tawhiao’s cottage.

Speaking of this cottage, there are two other fenceable cottages in the area, one on Mountain Rd and one on Church St, these should all be linked (as they are). I have information on these cottages I am happy to provide to future archives.
We the community need to see the Kings cottage open and used (maybe by high school students studying NZ history?) this is PRECIOUS building and I love it and it needs to be opened up to people. Very sad it has the English box hedge round it and it is there all locked up.

TREES
My family have lived in the area 20 years and my husband’s family over 40 years. We are very sad about the way the ‘grandfather trees’ we murdered. This could have been done better, leaving them and their shade (we used to use the ones near the tennis courts as shade on our whanau walks). I think the TMA have really upset the community. Some of the trees were memorial trees related to the Historical Society for Mangere Bridge. I really cannot believe how this has happened. “if the maunga is well the people is well”. I can tell you the people are not well and are crying. I visited the peak where the trig used to be (where the fire was recently) and with the trees cut down (some of the roots are still there but the path has been widened (by man – not sure this is appropriate) and the spindle bombs (geological feature) we stopped and looked at with local geologists are now GONE!

I am very worried if we get heavy rainfall this side of the mountain will erode, the trees were holding it together. Please consult with all the locals before spending ratepayer money on anything.

I am TOTALLY not happy to pay for helicopters, I would rather that money went into the dire in need of money education centre to hire more staff (and leave the trees and plant near them – once a certain size replace).

Thanks for the ability to submit

Michelle Whitaker
MSc Environmental Management in Protected Area Management
021 574 266
Annual Budget 2020/2021
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate

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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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?
Do not support
Our recycling service does not recycle. It collects and disposes. As long as we treat this as a cost that is covered by a targeted rate we will not advance towards a closed loop system. We need a solution, then we can optimise the payment method.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?

Do not support

Same reason as above. Our waste collection is a landfill service. It collects and disposes. As long as we treat this as a cost that is covered by a targeted rate we will not advance towards a closed loop system. We need a solution, then we can optimise the payment method.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?

Local priorities
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

I support all of the priorities

What activities would you like to better care for our local environment in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu?

Long term re-creation of harbour edge activities on the manukau harbour. It doesn’t have to have instant results, after all its taken 80-100 years of neglect to get us to where we are today. Silted up waterways, harbour glimpses overtaken by mangroves, shellfish beds poisoned, etc etc. There are waterside communities all over the manukau estranged from their waterways.

Other feedback
5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Auckland Council
Please find below my submission on the TMA draft operational plan.

I am a resident of 18 years of Mangere Bridge and have been completely devastated by the destruction of many mature trees on Mangere Maunga – Te Pane-o-Mataoho.

It is one year on now and I have even less faith that your intention is to “cloak the maunga in natives”. I walk and cherish this maunga at least 3 days a week for the past 18 years and have a personal record of what your felling has done to the birdlife. It has diminished considerably. The most notable bird on the maunga today is the magpie (6th March 2020), a few Tui. Since your robust culling in 2019 I have never seen a Heron or Kereru and we do not hear Ruru at night.

I have tried to keep faith in TMA and the new plantings as your own marketing and assurances claim to have already planted 800 new natives. Where are they? There are approximately 40 or so dead or dying plants that have been left in their plastic pots on the tihi and the other slightly healthier specimens on the Coronation Road near the Education Centre pathway. If this equals 800 I would be very surprised!

The beautiful old trees that provided shade and oxygen and homes for birds and other insects for 100s of years have been ruthlessly torn down. You are not agreeing to your own mantras. To tread lightly is not in my opinion to bring in helicopters, mulchers, and heavy cranes but won’t ‘dig’ into the mountain to plant new shrubs.

In regards to the replanting and cloaking the maunga with natives. I believe this is a completely false report that you use as a smokescreen to calm the so called ‘hysteria”. Your own reports show that over 90% of the new native plantings are in fact not trees, mainly flaxes and shrubs.

If I look at Te Pane-o-Mataoho today we have ‘apparently’ 800 new natives. So including the completely dead and nearly dead shrubs and flaxes we have 4 trees next to the War Memorial Hall, the currently stand about 1m tall at most. These are the ‘replacements’ of approx 15 poplars.
Where is all the signage gone, why has it been removed for over 1 year? So many questions that I know through my experience of trying to garner information will never be answered.

Your community consultation and your necessity to consult with public is poor to say the least. If we as ratepayers ask a question or challenge the TMA especially if this is in person we are shouted down and insulted. You constantly refer to the word “some” when talking of removals, and resource consent is non notified due to minimal disturbance. This is also untrue, the ‘disturbance’ was massive i.e. birdlife flew away and never returned and to work from home under the noise of choppers was not minimal.

Look at the statistics and if you are true to your word that you are a true Kaitiakitanga of all of Tamaki Makarau you will listen to ALL the people not just those who sit with you at meetings. We all love these maunga and we do have connections regardless of our race and this should be respected and considered.

We are in time of climate emergency, this is not just my personal belief but one that the NZ government talks about often along with local government and yet for some bizarre reason (one that we are not privvy to as ratepayers), you deny this and continue to try to forge ahead and cull 2,000 trees at the same time.

So in closing I, 100 percent OPPOSE your plan to fell 2,000 exotic trees which are home to many birds and in the case of Owairaka home to the Kaka which is listed as vulnerable. These birds need these trees to survive especially in winter when the natives don’t provide enough sustenance.

Plant more natives absolutely and I will be the first there to help. But plant them under the mature trees and use them as a nursery. Like a grandparent would help raise a youngen. This is happening now. The only new native shrubs that are thriving are the ones under the shelter of a mature trees.

Just simply put a stop to this culling and concentrate the effort and the money on true regeneration.
Nga Mihi for taking the time to read and consider.
MANGERE BRIDGE RESIDENTS AND RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Submission re Tupuna Maunga Authority Draft Operational Plan 2020-21

We request that this submission be minuted

Attention: Paul Majurey
Chairperson Tupuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority
29th February, 2020

Dear Sir,

Re: Mangere Bridge Resident and Ratepayers Association’s concerns for the future of Mangere Mountain.

We write to you today on behalf of our Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers and our wider community, to express our deep concerns over Tupuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority’s (TMA) management, and plans for our mountain and its facilities, for which we have fundraised and had built over many decades.

We wish to express to you and your members the deep frustration felt by everyone, at the lack of any response to our letters, invitations and submissions made to TMA by our members, as well as any meaningful communication with the greater community.

In March 2019, the residents of Mangere Bridge were left in total despair and grief, as we watched helicopters remove giant healthy trees, limb by limb, from our much-loved Mangere Mountain. The shock, sadness, heartache, and anger, felt by our residents was real and today emotions still run deep about what happened that month, without any apparent warning.

The reasoning for TMA’s dramatic destruction of 152 trees within the short space of two weeks, from Mangere Mountain has never been explained to our community.

We are concerned that the Authority did not hold open and honest consultation with the local residents. I came up to the first two ‘Love your Maunga’ events to try to get permission to plant some more memorial trees for Life Members of the OMUSC (Onehunga Mangere United Sports Club), of which I am one. I have spoken to Paul Puru and later to Nick Turoa and pointed out that no-one has ever bothered to ask for the history of tree planting on the mountain. I showed them just where the memorial trees are to be seen, around the two pitches, and several plantings on the JC.
field (now Playground). We now feel tricked and manipulated that the free family events hosted by TMA in 2018 and 2019 were used as a guise for consultation. To the best of our collective knowledge the removal of the trees was never discussed or raised in any manner of communication with any of our community groups and residents.

The lack of concern for our highly valued Galipolli Pine, is an insult to the Community that it was gifted to several years ago. It has never been staked as we requested some considerable time ago. It appears to have been hit by perhaps the lawn mower and is on a very precarious list now.

Those members who have made written submissions, have had them rudely rejected, and those who made them in person have been literally shouted down and humiliated.

We obviously could not stop the felling of the trees, but feel that insult was added to injury, when the Authority publicly claimed to have planted 13000 new trees and shrubs on Mangere Mountain between May and August. We have noted only 45-50 shrubs -not planted- on the summit that have consequently wilted and died. Very few trees were planted opposite the Memorial Hall to replace the Poplars and Flame tree that were removed. We feel that this is neither replanting nor regeneration.

Another concern has been the high risk of fire to residents properties that are just over the fence from the long grasses and weeds now rampant on the slopes, now that the grazing animals have been removed. The fire on the mountain seemed inevitable after those evidently lit by vandals, on two other volcanoes stripped of exotic trees. Was the rapid spread of the fire caused by lack of fire management?

Because all other correspondence has failed to receive any responses, we are taking this opportunity at this Love your Maunga event hosted by your Authority, and within our community to present this letter to you.

We are requesting that you demonstrate your love for our Maunga by reporting your intentions and engaging our community with some answers to the following queries and concern:-

The Authority claim to have held consultations with our community around plans for the mountain, its regeneration and replanting, after the removal of 152 exotic trees. Can you tell us who you consulted and when, as we have not been able to locate anyone so far?

Was a Bird study carried out before the removal of the trees? We are close by the Bird Sanctuary at Ambury Park and many birds lived and roosted in these large pine trees e.g. Herons and Moreporks who fly in at night. It appears that we have lost these birds from their familiar roosting spots.

Have you any data of where the many trees, not shrubs, have been planted, or will be planted on our mountain? Will those that have died be replaced? We realise that the drought has had damaging effect on all our trees in our own gardens.

We would love to know which species you have selected for planting and why these were chosen. Have you any plans to protect them in the future. We are very concerned at the lack of protection afforded our treasured Galipolli Pine that appears to have been knocked by the mowers and never had the staking as we requested some considerable time ago.

The fact that runners from the Poplars removed from in front of the War Memorial Hall, have started to send out multiple runners that appear to have got into the stormwater drains.
Several of the trees on the main walking track are also showing signs of regrowth. Are you intending to remove or manage the post tree removals? We are interested to know which weed killers were used during the planting. Do they have toxins as we are worried that any may leak into our water coming from streams down the mountain?

Can you explain to us how you manage the effects on our wetlands Bird Sanctuary.

The walking tracks to the summit are showing signs of erosion now shade trees have been removed. Are there any plans to upgrade this and make it available to those in mobility scooters or electric wheelchairs?

Concern has been expressed at the removal of the livestock who munched their way through the ever growing grasses and weeds. Can you tell us of future plans to maintain the length of grass and inevitable weeds. We are interested to know how you intend to deal with the Rats which live in the long grass and they are no doubt the culprits, killing native birds.

Can you reassure us of your fire management plans. The long dry grass, which in places is over 1.5m high is an obvious target for those vandals who light fires, and houses are just over the fences in many cases. No doubt our rates have to pay for the cost of getting Fire Brigade vehicles up the Mountain. Fire spreads so quickly and your neighbours are very concerned.

We are curious to know if children from the local school were invited to plant shrubs or grasses on the Mountain. Waterlea, Mountainview, Favona, Koru, and Viscount Schools are all in proximity to the Maunga. Will they, or others who have expressed a wish to plant trees there, be invited to do so?

As a Life Member, as are other R & R members, of the venerable (almost 100 years old) Onehunga-Mangere United Sports Club, I am concerned for its future. Do you have any plans for this area that is so important to the many young people as well as adults who play Football and Softball and summer soccer there? I certainly hope that there are no problems renewing their leases etc. Many years were spent raising finances to build the Clubrooms and improve on the council’s one cold tap in the changing rooms. People of Mangere Bridge village have a deep love of their neighbourhood.

The many buildings designated by Manukau Council to be placed around the base of the mountain on Taylor Rd, were all built with volunteer community labour, under the guidance of qualified builders:- Sports Club, Memorial Hall, Bowling Club, Tennis Club, Scout Hall, Plunket rooms, Playcentre.

We have read that there is to be a $1,000,000 playground built on what was known as the J.C. Field. We would love our children and parents to have some input into these plans. Is this possible?

Rumours have circulated that a 5G tower is to be erected on the top of the mountain. Does this include any other 5G facilities? Will this happen?

Mangere Bridge Residents and Rate payers cordially invite you and other members of the Authority to come to one of our meetings held at St James Hall, Church Rd, at 7.30, on the 2nd Wednesday of the month. We would like you to address what we feel to be our legitimate concerns, and engage with our members in consultation and communication.

Our members and Association has a long history of co-operative dealings with many varying organisations, including NZTA over improvements to road safety and placement of pedestrian crossing in our Village, the replacement of the old Mangere Bridge etc.
I am sure that acceptance of our invitation and engaging in meaningful consultations, will go a long way towards the development of cohesive and constructive relationships and uniting the enjoyment of future developments, projects and events on Mangere Mountain by everyone.

Kind Regards,

Chairperson, Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association
Annual Budget 2020/2021 - Hard copy submission
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Regional feedback
1. Waste management target rate
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 $20 a year (or $0.38 a week) 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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
In the old Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas, households pay for rubbish through a
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Targeted rate. This targeted rate no longer meets the cost of collection. In other areas, residents already meet the full cost of rubbish collection via pay-as-you-throw.

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 a year), and
- 20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91 a year).

If we don’t do this, we would have to increase general rates for all ratepayers, including those who live outside these two areas who would subsidise residents of old Auckland and Manukau City areas.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out service funded by a targeted rate. While feedback indicated a willingness to go ahead with the removal in the Henderson-Massey and Upper Harbour local board areas, residents of the Waitākere Ranges local board area want to keep the service.

The cost of delivering this service is higher than the current targeted rate of $198.43. Our proposal 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 don’t 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.

What do you think of our proposal?
Support - continue the service

Local priorities

Are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Ōtara-Patapotoe

I support all of the priorities

Other feedback

5. Do you have feedback on any other issues?

Attachments
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RE: PROPOSED TARGET RATE FOR POOL INSPECTIONS

Please kindly refer to your letter of 22 February 2020.
The pool at the above property is safe surrounded by a stable fence.
We are comfortable with an annual rate as proposed.
Yours sincerely,

CONSUL GENERAL
Kia ora

Attached is a letter that our Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association via our Chairperson Val Payne, delivered to the Chairperson of Te Maunga Authority on the 29th February at the Love Your Maunga Festival.

We would like it to be recognised as our submission regarding the draft Operational Plan 2020. It covers a range of issues stemming from the concern and affection that our community has for our Mangere Maunga, for the exotic trees that were felled without fully researching their background, and the birdlife that has been impacted on by this devastation.

Our residents have been extremely upset by what they perceive to be inadequate consultation so we strongly advocate more comprehensive consultation in the future regarding the maunga and offer our Association as a first point of contact when the views of our community are required.

There is still much to be done in helping to restore the mana of our maunga which has been trampled on by the Authority and its kaimahi. We are keen to be involved in helping to address this challenge.

Kia kaha, kia maia, kia manawanui
MANGERE BRIDGE RESIDENTS AND RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Chairperson Tupuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority

29th February, 2020

Dear Sir,

Re: Mangere Bridge Resident and Ratepayers Association's concerns for the future of Mangere Mountain.

We write to you today on behalf of our Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers and our wider community, to express our deep concerns over Tupuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority's (TMA) management, and plans for our mountain and its facilities, for which we have fundraised and had built over many decades.

We wish to express to you and your members the deep frustration felt by everyone, at the lack of any response to our letters, invitations and submissions made to TMA by our members, as well as any meaningful communication with the greater community.

In March 2019, the residents of Mangere Bridge were left in total despair and grief, as we watched helicopters remove giant healthy trees, limb by limb, from our much-loved Mangere Mountain. The shock, sadness, heartache, and anger, felt by our residents was real and today emotions still run deep about what happened that month, without any apparent warning.

The reasoning for TMA's dramatic destruction of 152 trees within the short space of two weeks, from Mangere Mountain has never been explained to our community.

We are concerned that the Authority did not hold open and honest consultation with the local residents. I came up to the first two ‘Love your Maunga’ events to try to get permission to plant some more memorial trees for Life Members of the OMUSC (Onehunga Mangere United Sports Club), of which I am one. I have spoken to and later to and pointed out that no-one has ever bothered to ask for the history of tree planting on the mountain. I showed them just where the memorial trees are to be seen, around the two pitches, and several plantings on the JC field (now Playground). We now feel tricked and manipulated that the free family events hosted by TMA in 2018 and 2019 were used as a guise for consultation. To the best of our collective knowledge the removal of the trees was never discussed or raised in any manner of communication with any of our community groups and residents.

The lack of concern for our highly valued Galipolli Pine, is an insult to the Community that it was gifted to several years ago. It has never been staked as we requested some considerable time ago. It appears to have been hit by perhaps the lawn mower and is on a very precarious list now.
Those members who have made written submissions, have had them rudely rejected, and those
who made them in person have been literally shouted down and humiliated.

We obviously could not stop the felling of the trees, but feel that insult was added to injury, when
the Authority publicly claimed to have planted 13000 new trees and shrubs on Mangere Mountain
between May and August. We have noted only 45-50 shrubs no larger than a thumb, placed in black
pots -not planted- on the summit that have consequently wilted and died. Very few trees were
planted opposite the Memorial Hall to replace the Poplars and Flame tree that were removed. We
feel that this is neither replanting nor regeneration.

Another concern has been the high risk of fire to residents properties that are just over the fence
from the long grasses and weeds now rampant on the slopes, now that the grazing animals have
been removed. The fire on the mountain seemed inevitable after those evidently lit by vandals, on
two other volcanoes stripped of exotic trees. Was the rapid spread of the fire caused by lack of fire
management?

Because all other correspondence has failed to receive any responses, we are taking this opportunity
at this Love your Maunga event hosted by your Authority, and within our community to present this
letter to you.

We are requesting that you demonstrate your love for our Maunga by reporting your intentions and
engaging our community with some answers to the following queries and concerns:-

The Authority claim to have held consultations with our community around plans for the mountain,
its regeneration and replanting, after the removal of 152 exotic trees. Can you tell us who you
consulted and when, as we have not been able to locate anyone so far?

Was a Bird study carried out before the removal of the trees? We are close by the Bird Sanctuary at
Ambury Park and many birds lived and roosted in these large pine trees e.g. Herons and Moreporks
who fly in at night. It appears that we have lost these birds from their familiar roosting spots.

Have you any data of where the many trees, not shrubs, have been planted, or will be planted on
our mountain? Will those that have died be replaced? We realise that the drought has had damaging
effect on all our trees in our own gardens.

We would love to know which species you have selected for planting and why these were chosen.
Have you any plans to protect them in the future. We are very concerned at the lack of protection
afforded our treasured Galipolli Pine that appears to have been knocked by the mowers and never
had the staking as we requested some considerable time ago.

The fact that runners from the Poplars removed from in front of the War Memorial Hall, have
started to send out multiple runners that appear to have got into the stormwater drains.

Several of the trees on the main walking track are also showing signs of regrowth. Are you intending
to remove or manage the post tree removals? We are interested to know which weed killers were
used during the planting. Do they have toxins as we are worried that any may leak into our water
coming from streams down the mountain?

Can you explain to us how you manage the effects on our wetlands Bird Sanctuary.

The walking tracks to the summit are showing signs of erosion now shade trees have been removed.
Are there any plans to upgrade this and make it available to those in mobility scooters or electric
wheelchairs?
Concern has been expressed at the removal of the livestock who munched their way through the ever-growing grasses and weeds. Can you tell us of future plans to maintain the length of grass and inevitable weeds. We are interested to know how you intend to deal with the Rats which live in the long grass and they are no doubt the culprits, killing native birds.

Can you reassure us of your fire management plans. The long dry grass, which in places is over 1.5m high is an obvious target for those vandals who light fires, and houses are just over the fences in many cases. No doubt our rates have to pay for the cost of getting Fire Brigade vehicles up the Mountain. Fire spreads so quickly and your neighbours are very concerned.

We are curious to know if children from the local school were invited to plant shrubs or grasses on the Mountain. Waterlea, Mountainview, Favona, Koru, and Viscount Schools are all in proximity to the Maunga. Will they, or others who have expressed a wish to plant trees there, be invited to do so?

As a Life Member, as are other R & R members, of the venerable (almost 100 years old) Onehunga-Mangere United Sports Club, I am concerned for its future. Do you have any plans for this area that is so important to the many young people as well as adults who play Football and Softball and summer soccer there? I certainly hope that there are no problems renewing their leases etc. Many years were spent raising finances to build the Clubrooms and improve on the councils one cold tap in the changing rooms. People of Mangere Bridge village have a deep love of their neighbourhood.

The many buildings designated by Manukau Council to be placed around the base of the mountain on Taylor Rd, were all built with volunteer community labour, under the guidance of qualified builders:- Sports Club, Memorial Hall, Bowling Club, Tennis Club, Scout Hall, Plunket rooms, Playcentre.

We have read that there is to be a $1,000,000 playground built on what was known as the J.C. Field. We would love our children and parents to have some input into these plans. Is this possible?

Rumours have circulated that a 5G tower is to be erected on the top of the mountain. Does this include any other 5G facilities? Will this happen?

Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers cordially invite you and other members of the Authority to come to one of our meetings held at St James Hall, Church Rd, at 7.30, on the 2nd Wednesday of the month. We would like you to address what we feel to be our legitimate concerns, and engage with our members in consultation and communication.

Our members and Association has a long history of co-operative dealings with many varying organisations, including NZTA over improvements to road safety and placement of pedestrian crossing in our Village, the replacement of the old Mangere Bridge etc.

I am sure that acceptance of our invitation and engaging in meaningful consultations, will go a long way towards the development of cohesive and constructive relationships and uniting the enjoyment of future developments, projects and events on Mangere Mountain by everyone.

Kind Regards,

Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association
To whom it may concern.

We have recently moved to Otahuhu and are appalled to hear that Council/TMA are planning to cut down exotic trees on the Mt Richmond maunga. It makes no sense to us at any level:

- If it is to plant natives then the large trees provide perfect shelter for natives to grow. There is plenty of evidence for this as young native trees, particularly totara, are growing under the large exotics. We know that the recent tree removal and planting on Mangere Mountain has proved a failure because the young trees had no nursery trees to protect them.
- If it is to carry out archaeological work this can be done on a section by section basis without disturbing trees unless they are in the way of something significant.
- The trees are a significant habitat for native birds, insects, lizards, and probably bats. We note that with the recent removal of the olive trees the morepork population has apparently disappeared.

In addition, the area is a significant place of recreation in a socially and economically deprived region. We and many others use this area regularly, particularly when it is too hot in other more open places. To cut down mature trees in this age of climate change defies logic.

The area could be heavily promoted as an activity area for young people. We know they would even love to be involved in the planting of natives. Young people value participation in their community.

We understand Otahuhu is zoned for high density housing and a recent report shows urban canopy loss is the greatest in Otahuhu. Council should be protecting this significant green/public space as a duty of care to the people of Otahuhu.

This resource consent application by TMA seems to lack proper consultation, transparency and cohesion. How, for instance does this plan and the plans for the other Maunga fit with Council’s Ngahere policy? Also, please see the following link, an article written by an ecologist that further supports our submission. [https://www.elocal.co.nz/Articles/elocal-Digital-Edition/2560](https://www.elocal.co.nz/Articles/elocal-Digital-Edition/2560) As the late Sir Rob Fenwick stated recently: "......We need (trees), desperately. As our summers get hotter, relief from the scorching heat will become paramount......We must have more trees working to extract carbon from the atmosphere."
17 March 2020

RE: Submission on Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s 2020/21 Draft Operational Plan

Please accept my submission on the Tūpuna Maunga Authority’s 2020/2021 Draft Operational plan.

1. AMBIGUITY

As was the case with last year’s Operational Plan and Integrated Management Plan (IMP) - the Authority has continued to use vague and misleading wording that hides its true intentions across all areas of planning and the management of Auckland’s Tūpuna Maunga.

Like and the IMP and the Plaques and Memorial policy the draft Operational Plan is worded in such a manner that it does not make many of the Authority’s intentions clear.

It is exceptionally difficult to respond to a document lacking in fact and filled with vague and deceptive statements that hide the Authority’s true intentions.

For example:

Under Prioritised projects:
- Under the value Mana Whai a Rēhia /Recreational - recreational activities consistent with tikanga Māori - Manage activities: progressively implement the Recreation Strategy and the individual Tupuna Maunga to align activities to the values of the Tupuna Maunga e.g. bylaw reviews, remove and reinstate or repurpose leased assets and/or areas where leases are not renewed.
  What does “consistent with tikanga Māori and align activities to Values” mean?
  Does this mean that non-Māori activities will be removed?
  Presently there are many activities from Archery to Kindergarten, Soccer to Scouts to being facilitated on these grounds. Does this mean that these activities will be progressively removed?
- Under the value Whai Rawa Whakauka / Economic and Commercial -
develop (or facilitate the development by 3rd parties) new facilities or repurpose existing assets and areas – Which assets and areas does the Authority intend to repurpose? What commercial activities are planned?

- Under Wairuatanga / Spiritual - The words “Removal of redundant infrastructure” is vague, it leaves uncertainty for all those who utilise buildings from Soccer Clubs to Kindergartens.

In response to the use of guised language under Section 6 of this document I will clearly state my objections in order to extricate any hidden intentions of the Authority.

2. INDIVIDUAL TŪPUNA MAUNGA PLANS

Since 2014 the Authority has undertaken significant works on individual Maunga and the allocation of spending in the draft Operational Plan indicates specific projects for individual Maunga. For example, $1,000,000 for Playground - Mangere Mountain, $350,000 for Parking - Mt Richmond and $100,000 for Information Centre – Mt Eden etc.

The Operational Plan under Prioritised Projects – Planning states “develop individual Tūpuna Maunga plans to provide direction on how the Values, Pathways, guidelines and strategies should be reflected on each Tūpuna Maunga.” and under Network-wide Programmes - Capital Expenditure Programme it states “a number of programmes ... require further project planning to determine how they will be applied to each maunga. Once this has occurred, the individual maunga sections will be updated at the next available opportunity.”

Yet, no dates are provided or set for the Individual Maunga plans to be completed and/or provided to the public for consultation.

Why have the individual plans not already been provided? What is the reason that these individual plans have been delay? When can we expect these?

If the Authority is undertaking specific work and has allocated specific budgets to specific projects how are they doing this without the indivual plans?

Significant concerns are being raised by communities, the peoples of Auckland as to the plans and intentions of the Authority for each individual Maunga. Speculation, rumor and gossip spread, and fears are fueled within the communities utilizing the facilities of the Maunga (for both organized and passive activities). Has the Authority simply not released the individual plans to avoid consultation on controversial project works?

Essentially this work has been undertaken without fully consulting the specific communities on these indivual plans first. Lack of community consultation might cause any future UNESCO World Heritage to bid for the Tūpuna Maunga to fail.
The draft Operational plans indicates that you have specific intentions for each Maunga, but the details of these plans are not being shared by way of providing the individual Tupuna Maunga plans to the public for consultation.

For example, $1,000,000 is allocated towards a playground at Mangere Mountain but the community has never been asked if this was a priority nor has a specific plan been presented. It is rumored to be a skatepark, others say it’s a playground. Will it have toilets, will it have security, will it suit all ages, will it have mobility access?

The placing of “dots on artistic images” presented at the recent Love your Maunga festival was engaging. However, this is not consultation. The Authority has not engaged local business, schools, kindergartens, playgroups, Ratepayers Associations or churches on their needs and concerns.

Similarly, $800,000 has been allocated to develop a crater rim track, without providing the opportunity for feedback on individual plans. Creating a void of consultation and engagement of the community.

The engagement of communities on the Individual Tupuna Maunga Plans for each Maunga must begin with urgency.

3. EXPENDITURE

The majority of the expenditure, $7,085,000* over three years falls under the Individual Maunga budgets to the development of track networks to improve access.

The second highest expenditure, $4,310,000* over 3 years falls under the Network-wide Programme to remove vegetation and reinstate and/or revegetate.

Followed closely by $3,495,000* over three years to the installation of entrances under the Individual Maunga budgets.

There are only 3 areas of significant investment into the reserves: tracks, entrances and removal/re-vegetation.

Over $4,000,000 spend on entrances is excessive and disproportionate. Grand imposing entrances are nonessential to a park or reserve space. Seemingly wasteful spending smacks of either ignorance or arrogance both distasteful behaviors.

Aside from the $1,000,000 allocated to the Mangere Mountain playground there is no other significant spending in the area of community facilities.
if the Authority consulted the peoples of Auckland and the local communities in a meaningful and robust way it will surely discover more useful, profound, meaningful, ways to allocate this significant spend.

Other than Wiri Mountain that is allocated $100,000 spend in 2020/21 under Vegetation removal, revegetation and stream/wetland restoration, the rest of the spend for vegetation removal and revegetation all falls under the Network-wide programme to remove vegetation and reinstat and/or revegetate. This is surprising as in a media release by the Authority on 19 August 2019 it states specific numbers of Native Trees and shrubs for specific Maunga planned by 2021 including,

Ōhuiarangi / Pigeon Mountain – 33,300*
Te Pane o Mataho / Te Ara Puero / Māngere Mountain – 13,200*
Maungarei / Mt Wellington – 12,100*
Ōwairaka / Te Ahi-kā-a-Rakataura / Mt Albert – 10,100*
Matukutūruru / Wiri Mountain – 5,400*

Why then are there no individual budgets under this category?

Any tree removal is costly, and increases spend significantly, so it appears that the Authority is hiding the allocation to hide their intentions of exotic tree felling on specific Maunga.

*Figures are approximate

4. POTENTIAL TRANSFER AND ADMINISTRATION OF LAND CONTIGUOUS TO OTHER TŪPUNA MAUNGA

The following items appear in the Operational Plan are extremely concerning. They suggest that the Authority has yet unrevealed plans for properties adjoining the lands it administers on Auckland’s Maunga, as well as nearby properties. (Ref page 11)

- Potential transfer of administration of land contiguous to other Tūpuna Maunga
- Remove encroachments on the Tūpuna Maunga and reinstate...
- Influence developments in Auckland to ensure that the Tūpuna Maunga remain markers in the landscape and their cultural and natural features remain visually apparent...
- advocate for the acquisition/transfer land to enable the Maunga Authority to manage adjoining land that comprise the true extent of the Tūpuna Maunga to enable integrated management and development.

The Authority must inform the public of its intentions. Which adjoining land to the Maunga it wishes to “integrate”, “manage” and/or “develop”.

Does the Authority mean to restrict development on adjoining land?
Do you mean to “take over” private land, land held in Trust and even public land or reserves?
Without explanation these notes can be viewed as the Authority aiming towards a “land grab”.
5. CHANGES I WOULD LIKE TO SEE TO THE OPERATIONAL PLAN

5.1. Clarity of intentions in Operational and Management plans, removal of vague and ambiguous wording. State what the Authority intends to do and why. Speak plainly.

5.2. Expedite the full engagement of communities and the people of Auckland you serve. Allow robust and meaningful engagement. Hosting a festival is not genuine engagement. It is only part of reputation and relationship building that currently smack of duplicity.

5.3. Expedite the Individual Management Plans, communities across Auckland have been left with feeling of deepening uncertainty. The vacuum allows for conjecture and distrust.

5.4. Regarding land contiguous to other Tūpuna Maunga, I ask the Authority to clarify its intentions and amend the plan accordingly.

6. OBJECTIONS

6.1. I do NOT support the removal of community buildings a facilities like Plunket Rooms, Memorial Halls, Clubs, Club Rooms, Scout Halls Sports fields such as soccer, archery, bowls, rugby, softball, football and any other sports of recreational activity our communities currently enjoy within the boundaries of any of the Maunga of Auckland.

I do NOT support the removal of “non-indigenous activities” from the Maunga, many of which are vital to our community’s unity and wellbeing.

I call you to your Value Mana Whai a Rēhia /Recreational – to encourage informal inclusive recreation activities therefore to not only to retain but to enhance and improve on the above facilities.

6.2. I do NOT support the removal of religious symbols of any religion from the Maunga.

The Authority caused offence to both the wider community and Christian community by the sudden removal of the Christian Cross from Mt Roskill.

The Authority is in breach of its value - Waituatanga/Spiritual: “tread gently” and in Mana Aotūroa/Cultural and Heritage: “recognising European and other histories and interaction with the Maunga” (Refer to pages 7 and 8 of the plan)

6.3. I do NOT support the removal of the obelisk or Sir Campbell’s tomb from Maungakiekie.

Mana Aotūroa/Cultural and Heritage: “recognising European and other histories and interaction with the Maunga”
6.4. I do NOT support the future construction of any type religious structure(s) on the Maunga. This includes but is not limited Buddhist, Muslim, Christian, Seek and Maori gods and or mythical beings. It is offensive, unjust and potentially unlawful to represent a single religion as those of ALL the peoples of Auckland.

“You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.” Exodus 20:2-6

“For you shall worship no other god, for the Lord” Exodus 34:14

Under the Value Mana Aotūroa/ Cultural and Heritage - restoring customary practices and associated knowledge. This does not mean the stripping bear of other customary practices and knowledge. Or placing a single native religion over ALL the Peoples of Auckland.

And he said to them, “You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God in order to establish your tradition” Mark 7:9 ESV

6.5. I do NOT support the removal of any type of memorial or plaques from the Maunga. As it would be deeply offensive to Maori to destroy the resting places of their ancestors it is equally as offensive to remove the resting places and memorials of those of “other origins” or “white settlers”.

The gravitas of the removal or destruction weather or not “redundant” in the eyes of the Authority is irrelevant. If I applied this same thinking to the ‘redundancy’ of past Maori middens and burial grounds it would be unthinkable. The very reason for the protection of the Maunga is to protect the resting grounds and sacred places of ALL those memorialised there whether viewed as redundant by our present society’s standards or not.

Once again the Authority’s is in breach of VALUE - Mana Aotūroa / Cultural and Heritage “recognising European and other histories and interaction with the Maunga” (Refer to pages 7 and 8 in the plan)
7. REMOVAL OF EXOTIC TREES

In December 2019, I received a letter from The Tūpuna Maunga Authority thanking me for my feedback on the Proposed IMP Strategies but noted that feedback received dealt with the removal of trees on the Maunga rather than the Tūpuna Maunga Strategies document ... implying it was irrelevant and not considered.

I reject this statement; it is not an accurate account of my submission as my submission dealt with many aspects of the Strategies document however in an effort to avoid such another outright rejection and to ensure that the earlier part of this submission can be considered in full, I will firstly address the planned felling of exotic trees as a separate matter.

- I do NOT support the Authority felling healthy, mature exotic trees.

- The Authority’s justifications for removal of these trees being pests, weeds and sighting health and safety reasons is misleading. The Authority has referred to ALL the other trees as 'inappropriate' or a 'visual distraction' in the plan.

- The Authority’s explanation for clear felling at one time being due to minimizing the impact of heavy machinery is also false and misleading.

The Authority has and continues to deliberately disguised tree-felling references in the work programme (pages 10 and 11) using vague wording that hides its true intentions for the felling of ALL exotic trees on the Maunga under its control.

Page 10 – ‘Work programme (Protection and restoration of tīhi) Vegetation management - remove weed species, manage health and safety risks and inappropriate exotics...’

As an example, only 7 individual trees of the 345 trees on Mt Albert are classified as 'pests' under the Auckland Regional Pest Management Strategy and NO health and safety expert report for Owairaka / Mt Albert’s trees.

The Authority continues to turn a blind eye to climate change and declared global and local climate emergencies. The Authority it is therefore in breach of its VALUE - Mauri Pūnaha Hauropi / Ecology and Biodiversity “Maunga tū mauri ora, maunga to Makaurau ora / if the Maunga are well, Auckland is well”

The Authority is in breach of its VALUE - Takotoranga/ Landscape preserve the visual and physical integrity of the munga as landmarks of Tāmaki - active restoration and enhancement of the natural features of the Maunga. The stump graveyard and dead ‘plantings’ that now greets any person climbing Mangere Mountain summit are testify to this fact.

"They are exotic", "they are not from here", "they do not belong" is an inadequate and an offensive explanation offered by the Authority. The message it sends is that if something is not originally from here there is no place for it, it must go.
If the Oaks, Ginseng, Olive, Eucalyptus and Palm trees must go, does this mean English, Dutch, Chinese, Italian, Australian and Pacific naturalized citizens should be removed too?

The Authority is in breach of its VALUE - Mana Hononga Tangata / Living Connection: “Actively nurture positive relationships”

I call on the Authority to CEASE EXOTIC TREE FELLING and to independently assess each individual tree prior to removal in order to show that prior to removal this specific tree;

- is either a Health and Safety risk or a pest tree is a pest.
- is not necessary to bird life or insect life, across ALL times of the day and ALL seasons.
- is not or could not offer primary protection to new saplings
- is not of significances to preventing soil erosion or water table disturbance
- is not of significant beauty and amenity value to the Maunga and its community and people of Auckland
- will not harm the broader environment
- will be replaced by a scientifically calculated number of sapling trees and specifically when and where these replacement trees will be planted and that these are recorded and monitored over the lifetime taken to replace the original tree that is removed.
- That the neighbours and wider community has been fully and completely consulted as to the removal of the tree and all facts surrounding the removal have been fairly and openly presented.

8. CONCLUSION

I thank the Authority for the work they are doing, I urge you to consider,

- Meaningful, robust and full consultation of communities connected to the Maunga and all people of Auckland
- Re-distribution of funds set for exotic tree removal and excessive entrances to other community focused development.
- Cease clear felling of exotic trees from Maunga and reconsider regeneration strategy
- Make plain to landowners and the public the intentions for land acquisition, management and or development
- Expediate the release of draft plans for the individual Maunga

Yours Sincerely,
Submission Form
Draft Tupuna Maunga Operational Plan 2020 /2021
18th March 2020

I was born in Mt Eden, at the foot of Maungawhau, in 1952. The day I was born, my mother’s waters broke on the front step of our house, facing up to the Maunga. I lived there, right through to my twenties. We literally lived in the shadow of the Maunga, and for us kids, Maungawhau was our adventure playground, - we spent so much time up there. As an adult it has been a place to walk, and enjoy the stillness of nature, the shade of the big trees, and looking out over our beautiful city and harbours. I feel a deep spiritual connection to Maungawhau. - I feel I have some understanding of the relationship of Maori to the land. I have made a number of award winning documentaries that feature Maori and Maori issues ( including ‘Te Whaea-Mother of Change’ about Ana Tia and her work with Maori in the prisons). I understand the need for cultural redress and fully support healing the damage done to Maori by colonisation. However the TMA’s policies are divisive and destructive and will satisfy some people’s need for redress, but overall more will be lost than will be gained.

I now live in close to the base of the Maunga. I witnessed the destruction of the plant, tree, and terrain on this Maunga, last March. Not only was that campaign brutal, relentless, and absolute folly in these times of global warming, the ‘re-planting’ that has been done since, is an abysmal failure, and consequently, there is a good deal of ongoing erosion, particularly on the summit. The many butchered, stumps of large trees remain, as a sorry reminder of ‘what once was’. I have heard it expressed by a few people, that these bleaching stumps are reminiscent of the bodies of beached whales - impressive creations of nature, brutally cut down without good reason.

It is very depressing for me to go up on Te Pane-o-Mataoho /Mangere Maunga now, - so I avoid it.
I also note that I belong to the Mangere Bridge Residents and Ratepayers Association. We have had very poor communication from the TMA - which is extremely disappointing.

The following are my comments on the current TMA Operational Plan.

- I disagree with the felling of all or any of the healthy exotic trees on the Maunga of Auckland. I believe the intended felling goes against the stated principal and practice of ‘treading lightly’, as thriving bird and wildlife habitats will be destroyed for no reason.

- The Operational Plan mentions ‘restoration’ frequently – no restoration is needed, as there are already plentiful habitats and food sources provided by the existing trees, of all sorts. Its clear that the existing broad range of indigenous and introduced species of birds, wouldn’t be on the Maunga, if there wasn’t sufficient of the necessary food sources to sustain life.

- I am very much in favour of there being more native plantings on all of the Maunga, in the shelter of the existing trees. There is plenty of empty space. This process, known as ‘succession planting’, would ensure a much more successful survival of the fledgling trees, growing in shelter, with better protection from damaging or drying winds and heat. Most amenity value would be lost if there is no shade, no wild areas, and no birdsong.

- I am in favour of the teaching and celebration of Maori culture on the Maunga.

- I believe it would take decades for new trees to grow, especially as no trees will be planted for several years. The flax and groundcover the TMA have planted so far, will not provide a habitat for native birds.

- I am in favour of the public having the opportunity of seeing more transparent and detailed plans, as to how the money requested by the Tupuna Maunga will be spent: nowhere in the current or previous Operational Plan is it explicitly stated that the TMA’s intention is to remove nearly all of the exotic trees - this is deliberately dishonest. It denies any chance of informed consultation with the public.
- I am against Auckland Ratepayer money being spent on needlessly cutting down trees, when there are many urgent needs in Auckland that require the ratepayers’ money.

- The TMA’s actions so far, do not inspire confidence in their ability to successfully carry out their plans. As mentioned above, the evidence, as seen on Māngere, our local Maunga, is a sad and sorry sight, - a lot of wasted time, and even more wasted money. Clearly, there needs to be a detailed performance review and evaluation, before any more funding is approved.

I trust that in this time of climate change emergency and the Covid-19 virus and its consequent unknowable effects, the Tupuna Maunga Operational Plan will be revised and no more money wasted on cutting Down perfectly healthy trees. This is a time for us to unite for the common good.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $20 a year)

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $15 small bin - $25 large bin a year). Those who use the service should be the ones to pay, no point in people paying for a service they are not using.
3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: General rate increase for all including those who do not use the service

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: General rate increase for all including those who do not use the service
3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $20 a year)

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $15 small bin - $25 large bin a year)

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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

Attachments
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 don't 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Other
[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $20 a year)

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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?

Other
[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $15 small bin - $25 large bin a year)

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

What do you think of our proposal?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support most of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $20 a year)

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $15 small bin - $25 large bin a year)

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

What do you think of our proposal?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support most of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):
Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?
Other
[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $20 a year)

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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?
Other
[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $15 small bin - $25 large bin a year)

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

What do you think of our proposal?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support most of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $20 a year)

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 former 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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?

Other

[Question misled submitter about the reason for the increase] Selected: User pays (increase $15 small bin - $25 large bin a year)

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

What do you think of our proposal?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support most of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Do not support

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $194.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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?

Do not support

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support most of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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?

Do not support.

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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?

Do not support.

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support most of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
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Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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?

Other

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $200 and $220 a year (incl. GST).
This increase would apply from July 2021. If we don't 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?
I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: This feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision-making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 don't 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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?

Do not support

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $280 and $320 a year (incl. GST).
This increase would apply from July 2021. If we don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):
Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $280 and $320 a year (incl. GST).
This increase would apply from July 2021. If we don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don't 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

3. Waitākere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 don’t 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 - continue the service

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: This feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don't 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $280 and $320 a year (incl. GST).
This increase would apply from July 2021. If we don’t 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?**

4. Local Board priorities

**Which local board would you like to provide feedback to?** Mangere-Otahuhu

**In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?**

I support all of the priorities

---

**Important privacy information**

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: This feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere 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 don’t do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitakere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service.

What do you think of our proposal?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):

Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

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 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), and
- $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $280 and $320 a year (incl. GST).
This increase would apply from July 2021. If we don't 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Otahuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 1993. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. You should familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.
Annual Budget 2020/2021

Note: this feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing hard copy submissions received via community engagement partner organisations that were unable to be translated (where necessary) and delivered to Council in person due to the COVID-19 lockdown. In the interests of including all public feedback received for analysis and decision making, this form incorporates the closed responses of these submissions.

Organisation (if applicable):  
Your local board: Mangere-Otahuhu

Your feedback

1. Waste management targeted rate

   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

2. Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

   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 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), and  
   - $20.91 a year or $0.40 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191.00 to $211.91).

   If we don’t 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

3. Waitakere rural sewerage targeted rate

   Last year we consulted on removing the septic tank pump-out 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 Waitakere 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 Waitakere Ranges local board area who want the service, is to recover the full cost by increasing the targeted rate to between $280 and $320 a year (incl. GST).
This increase would apply from July 2021. If we don’t 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?

4. Local Board priorities

Which local board would you like to provide feedback to? Mangere-Ōtāhuhu

In your opinion, are the priorities right for the local board area in 2020/2021?

I support all of the priorities

Important privacy information

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