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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 Declaration of Interest

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

Specifically, members are asked to identify any new interests they have not previously disclosed, an interest that might be considered as a conflict of interest with a matter on the agenda.

The following are declared interests of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Organisation/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mark Allen   | - Community Waitākere – Executive Officer  
               - Bethells Valley Fire – Senior Fire Fighter  
               - Waitākere Licensing Trust – Trustee |
| Michelle Clayton | - Glen Eden Community House – Treasurer  
                         - Glen Eden Residents’ Association – Treasurer  
                         - Waitākere Community Organisation Grants Scheme (COGS) – Committee Member  
                         - The Personal Advocacy and Safeguarding Adults Trust – Trustee  
                         - Glen Eden Returned Services Association (RSA) – Member  
                         - Glen Eden Railway Trust – Member |
| Sandra Coney | - Waitematā District Health Board – Elected Member  
                         - Women’s Health Action Trust – Patron  
                         - New Zealand Society of Genealogists – Member  
                         - New Zealand Military Defence Society – Member  
                         - Cartwright Collective – Member  
                         - Community Waitākere – family member has contract |
| Greg Presland | - Whau Coastal Walkway Environmental Trust – Trustee  
                         - Combined Youth Services Trust – Trustee  
                         - Glen Eden Bid – Member  
                         - Titirangi Ratepayers and Residents Association – Member  
                         - Waitākere Ranges Protection Society - Member  
                         - Titirangi RSA - Member  
                         - Maungakiekie Golf Club – Member |
| Saffron Toms | - Titirangi Community House – Secretary |
| Ken Turner   | Nil |
Member appointments
Board members are appointed to the following external community groups and organisations for the 2019-2022 triennium. In these appointments board members represent Auckland Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External community group or organisation</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group</td>
<td>Mark Allen</td>
<td>Saffron Toms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark in the Park</td>
<td>Mark Allen</td>
<td>Sandra Coney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Arataki and Waitākere Regional Parkland Incorporated</td>
<td>Michelle Clayton</td>
<td>Sandra Coney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eden Business Improvement District (Glen Eden Business Association)</td>
<td>Michelle Clayton</td>
<td>Greg Presland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eden Playhouse Theatre Trust</td>
<td>Ken Turner</td>
<td>Mark Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Uru Waitākere Contemporary Gallery</td>
<td>Mark Allen</td>
<td>Saffron Toms and Sandra Coney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rural Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Ken Turner</td>
<td>Saffron Toms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Leave of Absence
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

5 Acknowledgements
At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

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

7 Deputations
Standing Order 7.7 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

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

8 Public Forum
A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.
Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

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

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

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

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

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

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."
Local board decisions and input into the Annual Budget 2020/2021

File No.: CP2020/05362

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval for local financial matters for the local board agreement 2020/2021, which need to be considered by the Governing Body in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 process.

2. To seek feedback on regional topics in the Annual Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

3. Our Annual Budget contains 21 local board agreements which are the responsibility of local boards to agree with the Governing Body. These agreements set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures.

4. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements (Consultation part 1).

5. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council is now considering what those impacts are likely to be, and plan to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council's proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (Consultation part 2).

6. Local boards are required to receive the feedback on the proposals in consultation part 1, which are not affected by the changes being considered by the council and therefore will not be subject to further consultation and make decisions on them. This must be done before consultation part 2 can get underway, so the scope of consultation part 2 is clear.

7. This report seeks decisions on local financial matters for the local board agreement, including:
   a) any new/amended Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rates
   b) any new/amended local targeted rate proposals
   c) proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects outside local boards’ decision-making responsibility
   d) release of local board specific reserve funds.

8. The council received feedback in person at community engagement events and through written forms, including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters.

9. This report summarises consultation feedback on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021, including on local board priorities for 2020/2021.

Feedback on Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021

10. The local board consulted on the following priorities:
   - activating Glen Eden Town Centre with events and planning for its regeneration
   - progressing designs for a new park in Swanson and Oratia Halls Reserve
Item 10

- supporting restoration of Shadbolt House for a future writer’s residency
- restoring significant ecological areas in our local parks and assisting private property owners to restore these areas
- progressing an application for the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area to become an International Dark Sky Park
- supporting community resilience planning in our coastal villages
- advocating to secure regional funding to develop Te Henga quarry for use as a park
- increasing our focus on climate action
- providing a high level of service from quality parks and playgrounds, libraries, and community facilities

11. A total of 143 submissions were received on the Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, with 77 percent supporting most or supporting all of the local board’s priorities.

Feedback on regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area

12. This report seeks local board views on regional Annual Budget topics including:

- the changes to rates and fees, key proposals:
  - Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate
  - Waste management targeted rate
- other budget information.

13. Local board views on these regional matters will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the Annual Budget.

14. Out of the 4,673 submissions received on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021, 254 submissions were from people living in the Waitākere Ranges Local Board local board area. The Waitākere Ranges had the third highest number of submission responses when looking at local board areas across the region.

15. Auckland Council also consulted on the Council-Controlled Organisations (CCO) Review at the same time. The feedback received on this will be presented at a later date.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

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

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

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

d) provide feedback on the proposed Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate to the Governing Body.
e) provide feedback on the Annual Budget 2020/2021.
f) recommend that the Governing Body approves any proposed Locally Driven Initiative (LDI) capital projects, which are outside local boards’ allocated decision-making responsibility.

**Horopaki Context**

16. Local board agreements form part of the Auckland Council’s Annual Budget and set out local funding priorities, budgets, levels of service and performance measures.

17. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 and local board priorities to be included in the local board agreements. This is now referred to as consultation part 1.

18. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. Work to date on the proposed Annual Budget will need to be adjusted to consider the new financial realities facing Auckland.

19. The financial report presented to the Emergency Committee during April 2020 indicated potential reductions in cash revenue of $350-650m for financial year 2020/2021, depending on the length and extent of the disruption caused by COVID-19. The Emergency Committee requested staff provide further information to the Governing Body on the impacts of the various scenarios modelled against a rates increase of between 0 per cent and 3.5 per cent. They also resolved that further public consultation on the Annual Budget would include considering whether to adopt a 2.5 per cent rather than 3.5 per cent general rates increase for the 2020/2021 financial year, among a suite of other measures aimed at offering support to all ratepayers, including businesses, facing hardship due to the impacts of COVID-19.

20. The council is planning to ask Aucklanders for their views on certain aspects of Auckland Council’s proposed ‘emergency budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19. It is anticipated this will be carried out from late May until mid-June 2020. This will be in addition to the Annual Budget 2020/2021 consultation we have already carried out from February to March 2020. This is referred to as consultation part 2.

21. Consultation part 2 is unlikely to revisit any of the specific proposals in consultation part 1. Therefore, the local boards and the Governing Body are required to receive the feedback on these proposals and make decisions on them. This must be done before consultation part 2 can get underway so it is clear what decisions have already been made, and what decisions will be made after consultation part 2.

22. Further, some of the proposed changes to fees and charges required a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) and the requirements for this were met in consultation part 1. It is important to complete this statutory process, especially where consultation part 2 will not be relevant to the decisions on these fees and charges.

23. This report includes analysis of the consultation feedback on the Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, and on the regional proposals in the Annual Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Waitākere Ranges local board area.

**Local financial matters for the local board agreement**

24. This report allows the local board to agree its input and recommend other local financial matters to the Governing Body in May. This is to allow time for the Governing Body to consider these items in the Annual Budget process.
Local targeted rate and Business Improvement District (BID) targeted rate proposals

25. Local boards are required to endorse any new local targeted rate proposals or BID targeted rate proposals in their local board area (noting that any new local targeted rates and/or BIDs must have been consulted on before they can be implemented).

26. The Glen Eden Business Improvement District targeted rate is $84,226. There is no change to the BID rate proposed in next year’s budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID area</th>
<th>Amount of BID grant 2020/2021</th>
<th>Amount of BID targeted rate revenue 2020/2021</th>
<th>Rate in the dollar for 2020/2021 to be multiplied by the capital value of the rating unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eden</td>
<td>$91,920</td>
<td>$84,226</td>
<td>0.00091947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI)

27. Local boards are allocated funding annually to spend on local projects or programmes that are important to their communities. Local boards can approve LDI capital projects up to $1 million, projects over that amount require approval from the Governing Body.

28. Local boards can recommend to the Governing Body to convert LDI operational funding to capital expenditure for 2020/2021 if there is a specific need to do so. Governing Body approval may be needed for the release of local board specific reserve funds, which are funds being held by the council for a specific purpose.

29. Local boards can defer LDI projects where there was an agreed scope and cost, but the project/s have not yet been delivered.

Local board input on regional plans

30. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the context of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of Auckland Council. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to provide input on the Annual Budget.

31. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements and input into regional plans.

Council-controlled organisation (CCO) review

32. An independent panel was appointed by Auckland Council to examine three areas: (1) the CCO model, roles and responsibilities, (2) the accountability of CCOs, and (3) CCO culture. Local boards had the opportunity to provide input into this in March 2020.

33. Auckland Council also consulted on the review of CCOs during the same period as the Annual Budget, 21 February to 22 March 2020.

34. After receiving feedback, the panel will report on key issues, community and stakeholder feedback to council in May 2020.

35. The panel will provide a final report and recommendations to Council in July 2020.

Types of feedback

36. Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 4673 people in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:
   - Written feedback – 3,880 hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
   - In person – 793 people provided feedback at Have Your Say events and community events.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice
Feedback received on Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021

37. The local board consulted on the following priorities:

- activating Glen Eden Town Centre with events and planning for its regeneration
- progressing designs for a new park in Swanson and Oratia Halls Reserve
- supporting restoration of Shadbolt House for a future writer’s residency
- restoring significant ecological areas in our local parks and assisting private property owners to restore these areas
- progressing an application for the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area to become an International Dark Sky Park
- supporting community resilience planning in our coastal villages
- advocating to secure regional funding to develop Te Henga quarry for use as a park
- increasing our focus on climate action.

38. In the consultation material, the “Message from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board Chair” set out a mission statement for areas of investment which in addition to the local priorities identified above, included improving walking and cycling, reducing waste, showcasing sustainability, energy efficiency of council buildings, improving public transport with a shuttle service to serve villages.

39. A total of 143 submissions were received on the Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, showing 77% support most (49%) or support all (28%) of the local board’s priorities. Just under a quarter did not support most (10%) or did not support any (13%) of the local priorities.

40. Key themes across all feedback received (through written, in person and social media channels) were:

Parks, sport and recreation

Local priorities

- providing a high level of service from quality parks and playgrounds, libraries, and community facilities.
• restoring significant ecological areas in our local parks

• progressing designs for a new park in Swanson and Oratia Halls Reserve

• advocating to secure regional funding to develop Te Henga quarry for use as a park

Submission themes

41. Most submissions supported some or all local priorities. There were around 20 submissions with specific comments relating to parks, sport and recreation. What they said:

• increase recreational access - open up closed park tracks; improve swimming pool access (West Wave); dog walking areas too restricted

• improve parks amenity - need more children’s play areas, picnic areas, shade sails, Piha skate park, riding tracks

• develop specific parks – Te Henga Quarry, Kowhai Park, Swanson parks generally.

• park maintenance was a concern for a few submitters including overflowing bins and rubbish in parks and beaches, public toilet cleaning, maintenance of walkways and cycleways

• support ecological restoration

Arts, community and events

Local priorities

• activating Glen Eden Town Centre with events and planning for its regeneration

• supporting restoration of Shadbolt House for a future writer’s residency

• supporting community resilience planning in our coastal villages

Submission themes

42. Most submissions supported some or all local priorities. There were 14 who commented specifically on the arts, community and events theme. What they said:

• libraries were highlighted as doing a great job

• community safety was highlighted as concern relating to police visibility and perception of crime rates.

• more needs to be done around supporting diversity in the local area

• support for resilience and community services, and Glen Eden town centre

• request support for the Glen Eden Pataka Kai (open street pantries) movement
Shadbolt House was not supported as a priority by the seven who commented on it. Two noted support for the arts generally, while others ‘core services’ should be the priority.

Environment

Local priorities

- restoring significant ecological areas in our local parks and assisting private property owners to restore these areas
- progressing an application for the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area to become an International Dark Sky Park
- increasing our focus on climate action
- reducing waste, showcasing sustainability, energy efficiency of council buildings

Submission themes

Most submissions supported some or all local priorities. There were around 30 submissions that provided comment on environmental issues including climate action, water quality, the dark sky project, kauri dieback and ecological restoration. Environmental issues attracted the most comment and it is noted that these relate to both regionally and locally funded activities. A summary of what they said:

- Water quality – the need to do more to clean up beaches and waterways came through as a strong theme in the submission. The west coast lagoons and Manukau Harbour beaches such as Wood Bay and Tiritangi Beach were specifically mentioned. Submissions on the Waitākere rural sewage rate also highlighted concern about water quality.
- Ecological restoration – reduce pests in WRHA, dealing with weeds on public and private land should be a big priority, increase spending on the environment, clear river of weeds and willows to reduce flood risk, support more focus and funding to protect waterways, bush and wildlife.
- Climate action and sustainability – this was strongly supported by most who responded to this topic. One respondent suggested more support for businesses to respond to climate change.
- Dark Sky Park – around 10 people comments on this proposal and they were evenly divided over whether they supported it or did not support it. Those that supported it seemed to see it as an important priority, while those that did not support either thought it was not feasible to have a dark sky park so near metropolitan Auckland, or that it just was not a priority when looking at other things like track closures. One respondent suggested there should be an overall ecological plan for the area.
- The Waitākere Ranges Protect Society and Piha Residents and Ratepayers Association provided detailed feedback on this theme, which are attached along with other submissions to read in detail (see Attachment C).
Item 10

Transport

Local priorities
• walking and cycling, improving public transport with a shuttle service to serve villages.

Submission themes
44. Most submissions supported some or all local priorities. There were 26 comments on transport matters, most of which relate to Auckland Transport activities.
• Walking and cycling – more bike paths needed; greenways and local links to reduce car trips and link to public transport, Captain Scott Road cycle path.
• Public transport – extend to rural areas, west Auckland seen as under-served, train service improvements suggested
• Rural footpaths – pedestrian safety and a lack of footpaths in rural areas was highlighted by some submitters
• Road maintenance was highlighted as an issue in some areas with Piha Road and Bethells Road noted as being of concern.

Planning

Local priorities
• activating Glen Eden Town Centre with events and planning for its regeneration

Submission themes
45. Most submissions supported some or all local priorities. Those that commented on planning for Glen Eden’s regeneration were generally supportive.
46. The need to improve infrastructure for rural communities came across as a theme in a number of submissions which mostly related to transport. One submitter highlighted the need to improve infrastructure provided by utility services such as power and communications.

Feedback received
47. 143 submissions were received on Waitākere Ranges Local Board priorities for 2020/2021, showing that the majority of people either support most (49%) or support all (28%) of the local board’s priorities.
48. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board held three Have Your Say events, two of which were drop-in sessions at Glen Eden and Titirangi libraries, with a third formal Have Your Say event at the local board office.
49. There were three local events focused on the proposed change to the Waitākere rural sewage service and targeted rate. These were held at Te Henga, Piha and Huia.

Requests for local funding
50. Requests for local funding included:
• Request 1: parks development, for example Te Henga Quarry, Kowhai Park (Kaurilands), shade sails in local parks, skate park in Piha
• Request 2: improving walking and cycling
• Request 3: increase funding for environmental initiatives, improving water quality
Information on submitters

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

52. In summary, 83% of people who submitted were aged between 35-75 year old. There was only one submission from a person under 25.

**Age groups of submitters**

![Age groups chart]

53. Most submitters were European or NZ European (86%), compared to the 74.5% of people in the area who identify as being European. Maori participation was low at 3%, compared to the 12.7% of the area’s population who identify as Maori. Pacific participation was also low at 4%, compared to the 11.7% who identify as being Pacific. Asian participation was 9%, compared to the 14% who identify as being of Asian ethnicity.

**Ethnicity of submitters**

![Ethnicity chart]

**Overview of feedback received on the Annual Budget from Waitākere Ranges Local Board area**

54. The Annual Budget 2020/2021 sets out our priorities and how we’re going to pay for them. The regional consultation on the proposed Annual Budget focused on changes to rates and fees, the key proposals were:

- Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate.
- Waste management targeted rate
- Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City
55. The submissions received from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area on these key issues is summarised below, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

**Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate**

56. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the targeted rate for the Waitākere rural sewerage service to cover the full cost of providing the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 do not do this, the council could end the service, or continue to subsidise the cost of the service to septic tank users in the Waitākere Ranges local board area from all general ratepayers, including those who don’t use the service. |

57. The proposal to move to a full cost recovery model had a stronger level of support across the region than it did in the Waitākere Ranges area where the service is to be provided and the rate is levied.

58. In the Waitākere Ranges 51% of submitters supported the proposal, while 49% did not support it, and either supported ending the service (27%), or continuing the service with a subsidy from general rates (22%).

59. Across the region the proposal to continue the service with all costs paid from the targeted rate was favoured by around two thirds (67%) of the submissions.

60. The local and the regional response were more or less the same in agreeing the service should continue, at 73% and 77% respectively. The main point of difference was whether it should be a full cost recovery model through the targeted rate or a mixed model with a subsidy from general rates.

61. The level of support for ending the service was similar at a local (27%) and regional level (23%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waitākere rural sewage service and targeted rate</th>
<th>Waitākere Ranges submissions</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support - continue the service</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support - end the service</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support - continue the Waitākere septic tank service subsidised by all general ratepayers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. There is a diverse range in the reasoning when looking at the comments made in responding to the proposal, the comments show many had given the matter a lot of thought, and a few noted it was a hard decision to make as to which option they supported. The table in Attachment B gives a thematic overview of the reasons people gave, and full comments can be read in submissions in Attachment C.

63. Waitākere residents who supported the proposal most commonly said they liked the convenience, were concerned about the environmental impacts of not doing it, and supported it being a user pays service. Many were concerned that if it stopped some would forget to pump out their tanks. What people have said in supporting the proposal:

- service is a necessity and council has a role to play
- concern people will forget to get a regular pump out and water quality /environment will suffer
- support for regulation
- helps to financially plan for service
- private contractors will try to up-sell
- concern about increased cost and want council to negotiate a good rate
- cost to general ratepayer over-emphasised
- question increased costs for service
- upgraded to a modern system and don’t want to subsidise those who haven’t
- support adding a full inspection service

64. Those that supported the service continuing with a subsidy from general rates praised the current service, had concern about the cost increase, though in the interests of equity thought it fair to have some cost paid for from general rates. A summary of what people have said:

- disbelief at the costs, increase too high
- support a ‘swings and roundabouts’ approach to who pays - ratepayers often pay for services they don’t use
- concern about equity – rural residents pay for many urban services protect WRHA – legal obligation
- praise for the current service, and positive examples given
- support adding a full inspection service

65. Those that supporting ending the pump out service often said they would rather get it done privately as it would be cheaper. Some had gone as far as getting quotes.

- support for individual responsibility - want to take care of it myself
- cost increase seen as excessive, would rather get service when needed
- some with holiday baches and smaller households commented the three year pump out frequency was too much
- concern that responsible residents paying for those who do not look after their systems
- service not seen as improving water quality

**Waste management targeted rate**

66. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the waste management targeted rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: Waste management targeted rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The cost of responsibly dealing with our kerbside recycling (paper, cardboard and plastics) has increased due to international market conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. In Waitākere Ranges 155 people made submission responses to this topic. The majority, just over two thirds supported the proposal, while just under a quarter did not.

69. Some submitters provided additional comments. Below is a summary of what people said:

**Support**
- Support making recycling viable
- More education is needed for the general public about what to recycle
- Let's look at how we might recycle in New Zealand
- Lobby the government for a recycling plant for plastics in NZ, and charges on plastic
- Concern that recycling is not being recycled but ending up in landfill

**Don't support**
- Prefer a user (disposer) pays system as with general waste
- Too expensive, find savings from general rates to cover the cost
- Concern that we are not recycling if its is just shipped offshore
- Flat rate unfair for those with holiday baches with infrequently need of service
- Support more product stewardship, and cutting down on waste in the first place
Refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City

70. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to increase the refuse collection in former Auckland City and Manukau City targeted rate.

Question 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 the Auckland City and Manukau City Council areas no longer meets the cost of collection.

To cover this extra cost we propose increasing the targeted rate in these areas by $14.23 a year or $0.27 a week for a 120 litre bin (the total cost changing from $129.93 to $144.16 incl. GST), and an additional $6.68 a year or $0.13 a week for a large 240 litre bin (the total cost changing from $191 to $211.91 incl. GST).

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

71. The graphs below give an overview of the responses from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area.

72. Aucklanders were asked what is important to them and if they had any feedback on any other issues.

Rating and funding

73. A proposed change to how we charge for pool fencing inspections was a key consultation topic. Of the 17 responses from Waitākere residents, 10 supported and 6 did not.

74. Six submitters highlighted a need for council to focus on providing core services. There were a range of views of what those core services were: clean up beaches; drainage, sewage, maintain footpaths and cycleways; improve amenity for coastal areas; stop funding festivals; increase support for community led initiatives.

75. Three submitters noted the difference in funding between local board areas, and wanted to see more funding for outer areas, and recognition of the special needs of the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area.

76. Others highlighted dissatisfaction with services and how rates are spent: “it’s like council wants our money but doesn’t want to provide services”, “stop taking from us to pay for Auckland infrastructure”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>66%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other feedback
Feedback on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021

77. No feedback was received on the draft Tūpuna Maunga o Tamaki Makaurau Authority – Operational Plan 2020/2021.

Feedback on other regional proposals with a local impact

78. Feedback was received from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board area on other regional proposals and activities, such as regional park track closures, public transport, walking and cycling, water quality, environmental services. These have largely been reflected in the summary of local priorities earlier in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-Transport</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Water</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Regional Community Services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Regional planning</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Other Regional Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Rating and Funding</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

79. The decisions recommended in this report are procedural in nature. New targeted rates and the release of reserve funds will not have any climate impacts themselves.

80. Some of the proposed projects these would fund may have climate impacts. The climate impacts of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

81. Some of the proposed projects these would fund will be specifically designed to mitigate climate impact, build resilience to climate impacts, and restore the natural environment.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

82. The Annual Budget is an Auckland Council Group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. Consultation items and updates to budgets to reflect decisions and new information may include items from across the group.

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

Local impacts and local board views

83. Local board decisions and feedback are being sought in this report. Local boards have a statutory role in providing local board feedback on regional plans.

84. Local boards play an important role in the development of the Annual Budget. Local board agreements form part of the Annual Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Annual Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

85. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the Annual Budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.

86. Local board plans, which were developed in 2017 through engagement with the community including Māori, form the basis of local priorities. There is a need to continue to build relationships between local boards and iwi, and the wider Māori community.
87. The analysis included submissions made by mana whenua and the wider Māori community who have interests in the rohe / local board area.

88. Ongoing conversations between local boards and Māori will assist to understand each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.

89. Some of the proposed projects these would fund may have impacts on Māori. The impacts on Māori of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

90. This report is seeking local board decisions on financial matters in local board agreements that need to then be considered by the Governing Body.

91. Local boards are also providing input to regional plans. There is information in the consultation material for each plan with the financial implications of different options.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

92. Local boards are required to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Annual Budget by 8 May, in order for the Governing Body to be able to make decisions on them when considering the Annual Budget in May.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

93. Local boards will approve their local board agreements and corresponding work programmes.

94. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant Governing Body committees for consideration during decision making at the Governing Body meeting.

95. The dates of these meetings are yet to be determined as the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown are taken into account.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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Submission comments on local priorities and services

Arts, community and events

136 Do not support council providing houses for “writers” or “the arts”.
153 Police do not patrol the Scenic Drive Neighbourhoods.
431 Provide better sculptures and art. We don’t need a resident writer in Titirangi.
483 I do not support the writer in residence project restoration of Shadbolt House for a future writer’s residency—private sector sponsors should be found for this.
833 Why is Shadbolt house a priority as a writers dwelling is another area I do not support it’s hard to see the benefit to the residents and community as a whole with priorities such as: supporting restoration of Shadbolt House for a future writer’s residency I think money is being wasted on places like Shadbolt house. This is not what we pay rates for. I would prefer rates be spent on upgrading roads (like the bottom of Atkinson Rd, near Captain Scott Rd), and footpaths, and weed & pest eradication rather than more events in Glen Eden.
1151 I think more needs to be around supporting diversity in the local area — building community social cohesion particularly in acknowledgement of increased housing which will not only impact the population of the area, but schools, businesses, roads, and other public spaces. How is our infrastructure supporting this growing diverse community? You need to think about the safety of the residents with the rising crime rates out west and the overwhelming issue of rubbish everywhere... dumping, littering... its out of control.
2523 Mobile kiosk to be accessible to our community to engage in such an exercise.
2704 Would like more investment in Swanson I do NOT support the restoration of Shadbolt House. I definitely support the arts generally and writers (who find it hard to attract funding for their important but very consuming work). However restoring a property to support a single writer at a time does not seem like a good use of scarce funds to me. The fact that it was once owned by a writer is beside the point. If you really want to support writers (which I would heartily endorse), create a small annual contestable fund and offer cash grants to Waitakere—based writers or writers wanting to create Waitakere—based work. You could give a large number of these grants out and support a huge amount of work for the same amount of money you’d spend restoring a pile of old bricks and mortar. In my experience most writers already have a home and would rather find a way to subsidise precious writing time than go and stay somewhere rent—free for a while. After all they’d still have bills to pay at home! Yes by all means spend some money on supporting Waitakere writers — but don’t waste it on Shadbolt House.
2721 I support more spending on climate action, resilience and community services, and on Glen Eden town centre Our libraries do a great job in delivering quality services for people of all ages to be able to enjoy a variety of reading material and also provide a venue for reading and study and a place for activities for young children and teenagers.
3418
Environment

You need to prioritize clean up of beaches green bay wood bay titirangi, it’s shameful how terrible these are. Invest in our future and for our kids.

Please keep the Piha Rd clean of rubbish — it’s embarrassing to have overseas visitors drive Piha Rd, it looks like a dump.

Clean up the lagoon at Bethells. If this means that the home owners need to upgrade their septic systems then so be it.

Anything to do with climate change really perturb me. Much money is being spent on wrongly diagnosed reasons for what is happening with climate and I do not like to see ratepayer money being spent this way.

I strongly support all initiatives, large and small, for climate action. I am in favour of the ranges becoming a dark sky reserve.

I believe the key areas for focus are environmental sustainability and reducing the country’s carbon footprint.

Auckland has a serious waste issue. Proper education at school levels should be implemented. Companies should share responsibility in the cost of disposing their packaging, etc, not solely the consumer. We should be looking at what works in rapidly growing cities, and implementing similar tactics to future proof our city.

The Dark sky proposal is not appropriate due to the strong effect of Auckland city lights. An over-arching ecological area plan is needed before this can be effectively implemented progressing an application for the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become an International Dark Sky Park—with current kauri die back and access issues this is not a priority supporting community resilience planning in our coastal villages—what’s this supposed to mean?? creating jobs? subsidising the wastewater management and servicing regime? increasing our focus on climate action—by what and how? in a global context where India, Russia, USA and China do little is this tokenism or reality?

Like having the river cleared of noxious weeds and willows to reduce the risk of flooding.....if you want to keep covering the land with concrete and housing make sure the water can get away easily via our waterways not our homes.

For the foremost, I support the initiatives. However more focus and funding is needed to protect our environmental areas. Waterways, bush, wildlife, wetlands, flora and fauna. We are residents of the land, poor management of our environment (land, sea and air) will see it continue to decline.

I cannot see how an International Dark Sky Park in the Waitakere Ranges could be achieved when the main light source in the park is from the biggest city in New Zealand Greenways and local links is one of the No 1 ways to reduce short car journeys and link people to public transport, and should be supported through the climate work, integrating lands planning, environmental outcomes and active transport outcomes

Climate resilience is essential work

I support more investment into climate change actions, as weather issues usually precedes major incidents of unrest. I think more support around local businesses that are promoting climate change and inclusion/diversity needs to be funded as it aligns with not only local board goals but wider council goals

Please promote the reduction of introduced pests in the Waitakere Ranges, more specifically — domestic cats. In no other Heritage park I know of are domestic cats allowed to live, roam and destroy native birds & animals. It’s an absolute hypocrisy to claim we respect our native environment and yet we still allow residents to keep cats. Birds are the species that need protecting, not Waitakere residents!

The state of pollution in the Piha lagoon is shameful — it should be clean enough for kiddies to swim in.
Please focus just on clean waterways — I live at Titirangi Beach and it absolutely stinks like a Bombay sewer where the stream meets the ocean. A clean Manukau harbour is vital — they cleaned up the Sydney harbour years ago & it is amazing now. Just put money back into water infrastructure and stormwater improvements.

NO KILLING ANIMALS NO POISONING NO TRAPS NO SHOOTING.

the overwhelming issue of rubbish everywhere…. dumping, littering…. it’s out of control.

Nice to have park areas but not nice to have overflowing rubbish bins on Sunday

mornings and streets covered in rubbish and litter.

Prioritise climate action, and dark sky and community resilience in coastal villages.

These are important to me to care for our planet.

Most important is parks and green areas as environmental protection is paramount in view of global climate change. More accent on clean water planting trees developing green areas as protection for our future

I particularly support the Dark Sky Policy for the Waitakere Ranges heritage area, for the benefit of both the natural environment and the humans who live there.

They seem to be about non—essential improvements or to things that are not urgent or the summary is just too vague in terms of how the money will be used in relation to the issues of greatest concern to community and environmental well-being. For example 1/

Cleaning up the Manukau Harbour’ should be #1 and involves stopping all pollution into the harbour with monitoring and fines. This should be especially stringent on companies or BIG producers of effluent or contaminants of any kind. This would be far more worthwhile than trying to catch an individual who dares to merely walk in the public parklands for spiritual or mental health reasons and is fined $20,000 which is insane.

2/ The whole Kauri dieback programme seems to be mistaken because it not address the real causes of the disease (ozone depletion/over exposure to sun, climate Crisis carbon emissions, Electrosmog and other chemicals in water, air, soil etc) Council pours ratepayer money into chemical shoe wash stations, ugly signage/fencing, misguided Park Police, rather than Forest healer guides, etc 3/ Most of the priorities in this plan seem like window dressing. The priority should be on dramatic reduction of herbicides like carcinogenic glyphosate. SPEND our ratepayer money on non—toxic methods. 4/ Real concern about Climate Crisis and protection of birds, bees, babies and trees would include restricting installation of 5G antennas. The fewer the better and must require Local Board application and consent process. This is where Council can charge the user pays fee. 5/ Another priority should be protection of mature trees on private and public land as too many are being chopped down for the wrong reasons. If the Auckland and Waitakere are serious about mitigating Climate Crisis then restoring Tree Protection policy is imperative. Yes this would require employing Tree Wardens, arborists, etc but employing people/humans is good. Do not use more and more surveillance technology and AI to take the place of humans. Put ratepayers money into people and non—toxic solutions. 6/ Another priority is transformation of waste into either energy or GENUINE recycled products. It is shocking to see that most waste still goes to landfills and recycled waste is being dumped as well. In addition, the priority should be the old annual FREE kerbside recycle. Council should focus on a plan to sort and treat this rubbish to maximise the opportunity to make it a productive enterprise rather than leaving it to the individual and private business.

The Weed Management Policy has been seriously neglected and its objective to reduce agrichemicals needs to be implemented now! The erecting of 5G towers needs to be subjected to RMA resource consents. General blanket tree protection needs to be re-instated. The Tupuna Maunga Operational Plan needs to have its consents notified when it comes to tree removals.
Dark Sky Park considered of little priority because it is too close to Auckland, you can see its glow from Piha!

I support more spending on climate action, resilience and community services, and on Glen Eden town centre. I think dealing with weeds on public and private property (e.g. through War on Weeds bins) and ecosystem protection/regeneration should be big priorities for Waitakere.

Manukau Harbour water quality improvements — please keep up the momentum on this key work.

There is a need to track n fine people who dump rubbish illegally along the side of the roads esp useless household items including cars abundant. Cars parked and abundant should be auctioned and also a fine to the registered owners.

Great ideas and good focus on our environment and making this area an even more fantastic place to live.

Kauri Dieback. The Waitakere Ranges is a treasure for all Aucklanders. Together we all need to do what ever we can to look after this environment. Council needs to campaign government to help with Kauri dieback disease before it is too late.

I would like to see increased spend on environmental initiatives. I am happy to see ecological and climate priorities included. Our local board has an opportunity to lead in these areas and set an example for Auckland. I hope that continuing to develop and implement ways of addressing kauri dieback are included as part of these priorities.

A Pest free Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area (animal and weed pests); Waitakere Ranges tracks that are open for use by all

Please see attachment for comments.

Healthy lagoons that are swimmable year round; safe roads that serve not only the local community, but visitors from Auckland and the nation; a Pest free Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area (animal and weed pests); Waitakere Ranges tracks that are open for use by all; a Council that provides services in line with its own and national legislation.

WRPS recognises that water quality is a concern for parts of the WRHA. Several streams, lagoons and beaches on the west coast and Manukau Harbour are being polluted by overflows from ageing sewerage and stormwater systems. This results in some lagoons, streams and beaches being unsafe for swimming, and some being permanently closed. For example the Piha lagoon has been closed for the past few summers by Auckland Council due to its health hazard.

We support the continuation of the pump—out sewerage service and the necessary increase in targeted rates, however WRPS disagrees with excluding inspections as part of this process. WRPS believes it would be most efficient for comprehensive inspections to be part of the pump—out service, but that Council should put requirements on to property owners to upgrade their septic tank systems. It is the ageing systems which are a serious problem in the overflow and and pollution caused by sewerage systems.

The WRPS acknowledges the key issues and challenges laid out on (page 11) of the consultation document regarding water quality, the environment, and climate change. WRPS supports that the budget is including upto $40 million to improve the quality of harbours, beaches, streams via the Water Quality Targeted Rate.

It is a necessity to improve New Zealand’s freshwater lakes, rivers, wetlands. WRPS agrees that degradation of our natural water source must be stopped and reversed — if we want to be able to safely swim, fish, gather mahinga kai, as previous generations have been able to. It is incredibly important to the health of the ecosystems to improve the freshwater quality in the Waitakere Ranges. Reports have described “chronic microbiological water quality contamination” of the lagoons, and more must be done to stop further degradation. The pollution of freshwater degrades
the natural environment, stigmatizes the communities and poses a public health risk. WRPS supports the allocation of up to $38 million to tackle pests, weeds and that threaten native species, and notes the specific mention of including upgrading 40km of tracks to manage kauri dieback disease. WRPS supports the priorities described for the Waitakere Ranges Local Board. In particular we support the focus on protecting and restoring the environment, and the recognition of the urgent need to improve water quality in the Waitakere Ranges area with the goal that all beaches get to a point where they are always safely swimmable. WRPS supports restoring Significant Ecological Areas as a priority, agrees with the significance placed on climate change, and acknowledges the board is progressing an application for the WRHA to become an International Dark Sky Park.

Parks, sport and recreation

72 A skate park in Piha would be a great community asset.
More funds to ensure the tracks closest to the residential neighbourhoods on Scenic Drive and Mountain road get opened in the next calendar year. Fairy Falls isn’t even on the schedule for track openings.
153 The local beaches have more restrictions than ever on dog off lead.
320 Need some budget for Swanson parks. They are quite old.

What about making the Waitakere Ranges National park better for all users. We need the tracks open and we need more childrens play areas. West Auckland has no decent childrens playgrounds with longer walks etc and places for families to relax in a lovely environment. You are enhancing Glen Eden central village which is definitely needed however where can residents walk for a decent walk and have a picnic except Parrs Park and the walk around this is not long enough or beautiful enough. What about establishing better places in the Waitakere Ranges.

The main thing important to me at the moment is getting our Waitakere Ranges track open without wasting too much money on this. Why should you be boardwalking everything it is so un natural. The information given to us about kauri dieback is so unproven and I feel you have closed these tracks without serious scientific evidence that it is humans creating the spread. See the now overgrown tracks pig rooting and if we can move the virus then a pig or dog can too!!! I think it is totally unreasonable and is affecting many of the lives of those who live in this area specifically so we can walk regularly in a bush environment. You should be focussing on re planting or Kauri tree big time in any other areas that we can. There are plenty of areas that would benefit from new kauri to be planted to at least advance the rate of the re population. School and community areas would love to plant kauri.

Also your area of ensuring developers re plant as part of resource consent is a joke. this should be for more than two years after the new builds. I see developers all the time plant small scrubs or trees as part of a resource consent and they are dead and removed within 3 years from the house build by the new owners and council does nothing. This tree planting should be a condition for permanent. Widen footpaths, more shade sails at local parks, better local swimming facilities for everyone. West wave is overcrowded. Fix up/ improve playgrounds. Make a waterpark like potters park out west somewhere. Promote the walking tracks and enhance street lighting. Further develop Kowhai park and fix the constant rubbish dumping issue in the carparks. Offer riding tracks locally.

Opening Waitakere tracks should be a prime objective. Opening the Waitakere tracks is and issue for all Aucklanders, not just the Waitakere local board.
I’m all for Te Henga quarry getting turned into a usable park open space. Perhaps even spend some money to help repair Bethells road in the valley by the beach area. It’s literally disintegrating the more the public, tourist visitors and residents drive on it. I do not understand why a reserve is being made into a park. Keeping green spaces instead of building on them. When more and more houses are being built in such a way there are no yards or places to play green spaces are important. Please provide more places and more flexible rules for the exercise of dogs and horses. Everything is getting so limited and when I was younger I was fortunate to be able to ride on the beach and take my dog with me. Now both are so restricted!

Why aren’t the people who used the quarry returning it to park state? Shouldn’t that have been part of their contract/deal?

There seems to be way too much focus on fixing up parks and buildings etc. I get that they need to look after everyone but I am basically not affected by any of the things they say they are doing.

With the world record amount of skin cancer in NZ it would be great to see more effort put into combating this. From sun shades at playgrounds, to free hats for school kids or free suncream at beaches, the options are relatively cheap but potentially life saving.

A fair cost to rate payers… we are not allowed to go for walks in our local bush. That our parks are kept being upgraded and that road sides (as we are semi— rural) are kept to a standard whereby the children can walk to the local school. Nice to have park areas but not nice to have overflowing rubbish bins on Sunday mornings and streets covered in rubbish and litter.

What about swimming pools. the rules are different for Waitakere than they are for the rest of Auckland, we have more restrictions that other places, why is this.

Maintenance of existing walkways and cycleways. Some of these are improperly maintained making them unsafe for users in particular the elderly, disabled persons, mobility scooter users, runners and cyclists/scooter users. Improving safety on existing walkways and cycleways (firstly with maintenance above) by removing unnecessary obstructions such as bollards where they don’t serve a useful purpose, making bollards high visibility, improved signage especially at intersections to encourage cyclists to slow down. Some quick hits on improved cycleways/footpaths can be achieved by targeting linking paths and upgrading existing footpaths and looking at cycleways around schools. For example Hoani Waititi School. Linking paths include Glen Eden to Oratia, Glen Eden to Henderson, Glen Eden to New Lynn.

These priorities all sound like they are good for the Waitakere area. We need to keep the unique qualities of this area and environment whilst also providing for recreational needs of the people who live in this area and visitors to the area.

Access to parks for walking and exercise along with the excellent network of cycle/walkways that Auckland Council is providing in various parts of the city. These also provide excellent recreational areas for Aucklanders to meet and enjoy the natural environment, and to socialise. For children they provide amazing spaces for leisure activities.

Public toilet dirty

Improving west wave swimming pool, please. Providing women swimming pool

Regional parks, sport and recreation

More funds to ensure the tracks closest to the residential neighbourhoods on Scenic Drive and Mountain road get opened in the next calendar year. Fairy Falls isn’t even on the schedule for track openings.
### Item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 487          | Opening the Waitakere tracks is and issue for all Aucklanders, not just the Waitakere local board. |
| 1039         | Opening up tracks again that should never have been closed due to the over—reaction on kauri dieback. Some of these tracks have no kauri within 300—ee or very few anywhere near the actual tracks. |
| 1121         | Need to include — Re-opening of closed Waitakere tracks |
| 1436         | That our parks are kept being upgraded, and that road sides (as we are semi—rural) are kept to a standard whereby the children can walk to the local school. Open drains are cleared out regularly as they become overgrown and the water becomes stagnant. |
| 2272         | Most important is parks and green areas as environmental protection is paramount in view of global climate change. More accent on clean water planting trees developing green areas as protection for our future |
| 2772         | Access restored to most if not all of the Waitakere Ranges. |
| 2960         | Kauri Dieback. The Waitakere Ranges is a treasure for all Aucklanders. Together we all need to do what ever we can to look after this environment. Council needs to campaign government to help with Kauri dieback disease before it is too late. |
| 3418         | Access to parks for walking and exercise along with the excellent network of cycle/walkways that Auckland Council is providing in various parts of the city. These also provide excellent recreational areas for Aucklanders to meet and enjoy the natural environment, and to socialise. For children they provide amazing spaces for leisure activities. Our libraries do a great job in delivering quality services for people of all ages to be able to enjoy a variety of reading material and also provide a venue for reading and study and a place for activities for young children and teenagers. |
Planning

We should be looking at what works in rapidly growing cities, and implementing similar tactics to future proof our city.

Clean up glen mall and offer better bars and cafes in the area. Fix the parking around local schools. Konini primary, titirangi primary and kaurilands primary.

activating Glen Eden Town Centre with events and planning for its regeneration——this requires buy in from the residents—an Enwright workshop is needed.

I'm particularly keen to see the Glen Eden regeneration.

I support more spending on climate action, resilience and community services, and on Glen Eden town centre.

Would like to see higher priority on Glen Eden township regeneration, talk of planning is good but keen to see some action on the ground.

There is no mention of supporting our rural communities to be able to live and work out west with decent infrastructure (roading, communications, reliable power supply, public transport to even the rural areas). Are you lobbying AT, ATEED, the power companies, the communication companies, etc to service our community better? People live here because they want to spend time here, and not have to travel to the city every day for employment. How are is the local board looking to support this and create industry around this? How will the local board work to get access back into the ranges for not just our community, but all Aucklanders and visitors?

The board plan needs to be re—prioritised to assist in generating (temporary) employment for those who have lost work due to coronavirus. Re—prioritisation needs to firstly emphasise employment and secondly target spending that will address climate change.
## Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 153  | Footpaths / public transport  
We have no sidewalks, the walking tracks in the ranges are closed and we have no public transport. |
| 276  | Public transport / electric vehicles  
The highest priority for people I know in the Titirangi/ French Bay/ Laingholm/ Huia area is better public transport. As it is we mainly have to get ourselves to Titirangi shops to be able to use public transport from there (ranging from 2—10km away from these other locations), so we still need to use a car just to do some/ most of our journey by public transport. But then there’s not enough parking in the village to support a bunch of commuters parking there to then take the bus, so what are our options? It is obvious that Auckland Transport is just concentrating on the biggest wins where public transport is concerned and resigned to the rest of us just continuing to use cars because we really don’t have other options. Especially late nights, early mornings, or Sundays. Never mind the fact that the buses that go between New Lynn and Titirangi are not aligned well to meet the trains, which adds another layer of hassle. We could do with the train—bus timetable alignment being fixed, more buses on Sundays (and also for Waitakere township), the 209 service hours to be extended [add services at 7.15am, 7.45am, 9.30am, 10am, and then resume the return service from 2.30pm instead of 3pm]. PLEASE extend the hours of clearway on New North Road between St Lukes Road and Blockhouse Bay Road to be 6.30—9.30am in the morning, and 3.30pm—7pm in the evening. This would majorly help with traffic flow. |
| 522  | Public transport  
Get Watercare to hire a better Traffic Management contractor so their inevitably slow works don’t have to cause quite so much traffic mayhem? |
| 522  | Roads and footpaths  
One direct bus route from Glen Eden Parrs Park to New Lynn through the West coast road directly instead of going around the whole Glen Eden area. |
| 561  | Public transport  
Make more bike paths. Stop spending money on roads for a change. |
| 661  | Walking and cycling  
Perhaps even spend some money to help repair Bethells Road in the valley by the beach area. It’s literally disintegrating the more the public, tourist visitors and residents drive on it |
| 799  | Roads and footpaths  
I think Bus Lane should be used in peak hours to avoid traffic. Sometimes there is no bus driving in bus lane, but the cars are blocked in one line. |
| 843  | Roads and footpaths |

Item 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th>Attachment A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1151</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths</td>
<td>upgrading roads (like the bottom of Atkinson Rd, near Captain Scott Rd), and footpaths,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
<td>We need to get better public transport options and cycleways etc. I think this should be a really top priority but it is not even mentioned which is really disappointing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>We need to get better public transport options and cycleways etc. I think this should be a really top priority but it is not even mentioned which is really disappointing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSPORT. Please make this better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Parking and enforcement</td>
<td>2) Auckland Transport seems totally out of control and is inaccessible for comment or criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
<td>Greenways and local links is one of the No 1 ways to reduce short car journeys and link people to public transport, and should be supported through the climate work, integrating lands planning, environmental outcomes and active transport outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
<td>Establishing a reliable and fast train service from Swanson into the CBD so people do not have to use their cars to commute to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
<td>More cycle lanes free from car traffic to enable safe cycling. Reduction of cars on the roads should be a top priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Reduction of cars on the roads should be a top priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Build a western train line that includes Te Atatu Peninsula. Peak time motorway congestion is unacceptable, and worsening. The commuter transport system between the peninsula to the city is broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>Road safety</td>
<td>we have no foot path, no lighting of road, our road outside our house is used as a race track for a lot of traffic. (Waitakere Ranges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths</td>
<td>and that road sides (as we are semi)—rural) are kept to a standard whereby the children can walk to the local school. (Waitakere Ranges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths</td>
<td>The road immediately into and throughout Piha is appalling — the car parks and beachfront sealed areas are full of potholes and broken barriers and no attention to it for years. The turnaround area at the end of Marine Parade South needs improving to stop people parking on and around the roundabout — creating havoc for motorists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Public transport in the West Region is underserviced — the train network and frequency is insufficient, park &amp; rides are insufficient, and bus services do not assist the semi—rural structure of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2663</td>
<td>Roads and footpaths</td>
<td>The roads around rural Waitakere are a disgrace. Budget to get them fixed and upgraded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2725 Walking and cycling
Would like to see higher priority on cycleways to connect with other existing or planned cycleways — eg from Glen Eden to New Lynn which is soon to be connected via Avondale to a much larger off-road cycle network.

### 2772 Public transport
Public transport extended to rural areas.

### 2825 Parking and enforcement
Cars parked and abundant should be auctioned and also a fine to the registered owners.

### 3196 Roads and footpaths
I would like to see curb and channeling all the way from Te Ahu Ahu Road to the Piha shop. The road is very busy and walk down the hill has become increasingly dangerous. People should be encouraged to walk and not use their cars, but I’m finding the walk too dangerous now.

### 3415 Walking and cycling
Maintenance of existing walkways and cycleways. Some of these are improperly maintained making them unsafe for users in particular the elderly, disabled persons, mobility scooter users, runners and cyclists/scooter users. Improving safety on existing walkways and cycleways (firstly with maintenance above) by removing unnecessary obstructions such as bollards where they don’t serve a useful purpose, making bollards high visability, improved signage especially at intersections to encourage cyclists to slow down. Some quick hits on improved cycleways/footpaths can be achieved by targeting linking paths and upgrading existing footpaths and looking at cycleways around schools. For example Hoani Waititi School. Linking paths include Glen Eden to Oratia, Glen Eden to Henderson, Glen Eden to New Lynn.

### 3548 Road safety
Safe roads that serve not only the local community, but visitors from Auckland and the nation;

### 3805 Roads and footpaths
Up to 20 times Pihas population can come to Piha on summer days. We have not caused the Piha road to fall apart, it is the 1000s of Aucklanders. Our car parks are a disgrace, as is the lack of road drainage and lack of footpaths.

**Water**

Why is there no stormwater drainage for the residents of upper Grassmere Road. Our lower driveway has been washed out as a result at 84 Grassmere Road. It seems the houses at the lower end get more priority than at the top.

Watercare’s absolutely ludicrously long "upgrade" of a water main pipeline on Golf road that should have been finished in October and they are still digging holes in the ground.

And I am 100% sure this so called upgrade was not needed in the first place as I have never lived in a NZ house with better water pressure then my house on Golf road A remarkable waste of tax money and time and petrol for everybody delayed 30 min every day...
| Item 10 | 
|---|---|
| 862 | it is only fair that we get something from the budget, like having the river cleared of noxious weeds and willows to reduce the risk of flooding |
| 1008 | Wastewater systems are the responsibility of the landowner and as such they should be responsible for their maintenance and service |
| 1196 | Also subsidise installation of water tanks, thanks. |
| 1436 | Open drains are cleared out regularly as they become overgrown and the water becomes stagnant. |
| 1560 | Please please please just focus on clean waterways — I live at Titirangi Beach and it absolutely stinks like a Bombay sewer where the stream meets the ocean. A clean Manukau harbour is vital—they cleaned up the Sydney harbour years ago & it is amazing now. Just put money back into water infrastructure and stormwater improvements! |
| 2166 | Piha, Glenesk Road flooding prevention. I live in this street. Prioritise maintaining the river and keeping it clear of debris and ensure the access to the sea is free flowing. |
| 2102 | Flooding and land stability. Learning about water testing and Water springs? |
| 2698 | WATER — Auckland Council and all Local Boards should prioritise Health of all waterways—streams, beaches etc to ensure no pollution occurs. RENEW the pipes NOW—spend rates on good wastewater and sewage pipes. There should be NO pollution from run—off or industrial processes. Employ as many people as required to do the monitoring protection and prosecution of those who pollute our rivers and coastal areas. |
| 2698 | Drinking Water to our homes should be free. Only charge for water used in excess to real needs. User pays more is for those who use a lot of water. Council must ensure Auckland does not sell water cheap to industries who use a lot. |
| 3695 | WRPS recognises that water quality is a concern for parts of the WRHA. Several streams, lagoons and beaches on the west coast and Manukau Harbour are being polluted by overflows from ageing sewerage and stormwater systems. This results in some lagoons, streams and beaches being unsafe for swimming, and some being permanently closed. For example the Piha lagoon has been closed for the past few summers by Auckland Council due to its health hazard. |
| 3805 | lack of road drainage |
Governance

Anything to do with climate change really perturb me. Much money is being spent on wrongly diagnosed reasons for what is happening with climate and I do not like to see ratepayer money being spent this way.

Aligns with sustainable and fair policies

Too much is going on governance. Not sure what more can be done for Glen Eden. Seems like a bit of a waste of funds but that’s just me.

Glen Eden town centre upgrade and Swanson park development have been a long time coming. Climate resilience is essential work Waitakere Bethells Quarry is at a stalemate and needs local board leadership to realise it potential

More needs to be allocated for environmental services rather than community services

Dont want. Money spent on climate change. Close liaison by this organisation with the WRLB allows us to not only understand the issues and priorities, but have an influence in formulating those priorities.

see attachment for comments

a Council that provides services in line with it’s own and national legislation. There needs to be a fairer allocation of services and resources across the region. At the moment the former Auckland area continues to get better services than the rest of Auckland. West Auckland is treated poorly eg when the North Shore got discounted bag tags but West Auckland has to pay the full price straight away

I am seriously concerned that: 1) Auckland Council is dysfunctional and actively disempowering the Councillors and Local Boards.

reigning in of “CCOs” The main aim of stakeholder participation is to encourage them to have a meaningful input into the decision, since when has Auckland/local board really helped to build capacity to inform, train and empower people to involve in the decision making process.

Incomplete distribution of information
## Attachment B

**Response themes for the Waitakere rural sewage service and targeted rate - annual budget proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support theme</th>
<th>Waitakere</th>
<th>Waitakere</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support - should be user pays</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - like the convenience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - concerned about environmental impacts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - allow users to opt out</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - support</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - no opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| End service - should be user pays                         | 6         | 9%        | 23%      |
| End service - prefer private service/cheaper              | 29        | 45%       | 11%      |
| End service - private would be cheaper                    | 1         | 2%        | 2%       |
| End service - concerned about environmental impacts       | 1         | 2%        | 1%       |
| End Service - other areas                                 | 3         | 5%        | 2%       |
| End service - do not support                              | 24        | 38%       | 61%      |
| **Total**                                                  | **64**    |           |          |

| Continue service with subsidy                             | 23        | 39%       | 64%      |
| Continue service with subsidy - find other revenue / savings| 4         | 7%        | 2%       |
| Continue service with subsidy - everyone should pay       | 17        | 29%       | 20%      |
| Continue service with subsidy - should be user pays       | 4         | 7%        | 6%       |
| Continue service with subsidy - concerned about environmental impacts | 11        | 19%       | 7%       |
| **Total**                                                  | **59**    |           |          |

**NOTE:** Some submitters gave more than one reason for their response. The above table reflects the number of submission points on each theme.