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Local board input into the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget
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Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To seek the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board’s (the local board’s) feedback on the proposed regional topics in the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget (the Emergency Budget).

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary


3. The 2020/2021 Annual Budget was first consulted on in February and March 2020 (Consultation part 1). Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position. This will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council has considered what those impacts are likely to be and have asked Aucklanders for their views on aspects of the proposed budget, now referred to as Emergency Budget 2020/2021, through a second round of consultation (Consultation part 2).

4. During the second round of consultation, Aucklanders were asked for their views on three key proposals:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent;
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19; and
   - suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers.

5. The council received feedback through telephone interviews, written forms, including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters.

6. This report summarises the public feedback received through Consultation part 2 on the proposed 2020/2021 Emergency Budget.

7. Local board views on these regional matters will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget.

8. Out of the 34,915 submissions received on the regional proposals in the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget, 1,668 submissions were from people living in the local board area.

9. The following table provides a summary of consultation feedback on the proposed general rates increase for 2020/2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed rates increase</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 percent increase</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 percent increase</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The following table provides a summary of consultation feedback the rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19 and the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers:
## Attachment A

### Item 11

11. Accompanying this report is an analysis of the submissions and consultation feedback. This is included as Attachment A.

### Ngā tūtohunga

**Recommendation/s**

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area.

b) provide feedback on the proposed 2020/2021 Emergency Budget.

### Horopaki

**Context**

12. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed 2020/2021 Annual Budget (Consultation part 1).

13. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted considerable pressure on the council’s financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. Given the new financial realities facing Auckland, work has been undertaken to adjust the proposed budget, now referred to as 2020/2021 Emergency Budget.

14. The council has undertaken further public consultation with Aucklanders for their views on Auckland Council’s proposed ‘Emergency Budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (Consultation part 2) which included 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. This was carried out from 29 May to 19 June 2020.

15. The Emergency Budget consultation asked Aucklanders for their view on three main proposals:

- general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent;
- rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19; and
- suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

16. This report includes analysis of the consultation feedback on the regional proposals in the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget from people or organisations based in the local board area.
Local board input on regional plans

17. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in their 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 proposed Emergency Budget.

18. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements, which are adopted every year as part of the Annual Budget, and input into regional plans.

Types of feedback

19. Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 34,915 submitters in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:
   - Written feedback – hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
   - Over the phone.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Overview

20. The proposed 2020/2021 Emergency Budget sets out priorities and how they will be paid for. The regional consultation on the proposed Emergency Budget focused on changes to rates and fees; the key proposals were:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent;
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19; and
   - suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

21. The submissions received from the 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.

22. Sometimes the council receives submissions that have come via a platform created by an external organisation – these are referred to by the council as pro forma submissions.

23. Council has received an unusually large number of pro forma submissions in this consultation process – a total of 429. These have primarily come from two organisations – the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance (392) and Generation Zero (28).

24. When people submit via the council’s official consultation platform (either the hardcopy feedback form or the digital form), they are directed to the council’s consultation document and supporting information which are the statutory basis for the consultation process. People who submit via pro forma submissions often will not have had this same information presented to them when they submit, although each pro forma submission is different in its approach.

25. For example, the submission form set up by the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance did not refer to the council’s consultation material and did not ask the same questions that were included on the council’s feedback form. Generation Zero’s submission form also did not ask the same questions as the council’s feedback form. However, Generation Zero did include links to the council’s consultation material in the information supporting their submission form.

26. As with all feedback, pro forma submissions must be given due consideration with an open mind, and it is up to elected members to determine the weight that is given to this feedback.
Local board feedback on Emergency Budget consultation topics

27. The local board is requested to provide feedback on the four regional topics, which will then be considered by the Emergency Committee.

28. Respondents views and feedback on the four regional topics is detailed in the Summary of public consultation feedback section of this report.

Summary of public consultation feedback

Overview of submission types and groups

29. 1,668 submissions were received from people who live in the area, or commented on the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget.

30. There are several key points and themes to highlight, which include:
   - providing feedback online was the most common method of completion a submission;
   - 67 percent of all respondents were aged 45 years and older;
   - 14 percent of all respondents were aged 34 year or younger;
   - 71 percent of all respondents were of Pakeha / NZ European ethnicity. This is approximately a ten percent increase when compared the recently completed Annual Budget public consultation;
   - the 12 percent response rate from people of Chinese ethnicity is an eight percent decrease when compared the recently completed Annual Budget public consultation; and
   - five percent of respondents identified themselves as Maori.

Feedback on Emergency Budget consultation topics

31. As previously outlined in this report, feedback was sought on three topics:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent;
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19; and
   - suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

32. Consultation also contained an open-ended request which gave respondents the opportunity to comment on anything else important or relevant to them.

33. The following table provides a summary of consultation feedback on the proposed general rates increase for 2020/2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed rates increase</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 percent increase</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 percent increase</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table provides a summary of consultation feedback the rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19 and the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation topic</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19</td>
<td>746 (67.1%)</td>
<td>267 (24%)</td>
<td>98 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1,111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted rate paid by accommodation providers</td>
<td>817 (73.5%)</td>
<td>171 (15.4%)</td>
<td>124 (11.2%)</td>
<td>1,112 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. There are several key points and themes to highlight, which include:
   - while the above figures highlight a preference for a 3.5 percent rates increase, further analysis of submissions indicate there is also support from respondent to not increase rates. This assumption is based on the following variables:
     - despite respondents selecting a 2.5 percent rates increase, the overwhelming theme from respondents’ comments was that they support no increase;
     - many respondents who selected I don’t know to a rate increase commented that they support no rates increase; and
     - many respondents who did not provide a response, but commented, mentioned there should be no rates increases.
   - While staff cannot provide a definitive figure, based the sheer volume and number of comments, staff consider that is support for a zero percent rates from respondents.
   - there was clear support for the rates postponement by ratepayers impacted by COVID-19 and suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers.

36. A range of other comments and feedback were received from the open-ended question. Key themes that arose from other comments include:
   - that people are continuing to experience financial hardship since the COVID-19 lockdown period, and empathy and compassion is required;
   - addressing climate change must remain a priority;
   - retaining or minimising service level changes to community houses, libraries, recreation centres and pools;
   - continue to deliver environmental programmes;
   - continuing to deliver the Lake Road Improvements project;
   - council needs to focus on core services (i.e. footpath maintenance, renewals, rubbish collection);
   - improving public transport;
   - investing in active transport modes;
   - addressing road safety;
   - addressing Auckland’s water supply; and
   - retaining council animal shelters.
Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi

Climate impact statement

37. The decisions recommended in this report are procedural in nature.

38. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget 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.

39. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget 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

40. The Emergency Budget is an Auckland Council Group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. 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

41. 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.

42. Local boards play an important role in the development of the Emergency Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Emergency Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

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

44. 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.

45. The analysis included submissions made by mana whenua and the wider Māori community who have interests in the rohe / local board area.

46. 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.

47. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget 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
48. Local board input will be considered by the Governing Body for the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 decision-making.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
49. Local boards are required to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Emergency Budget by 10 July 2020, to enable the Governing Body to make decisions on them when considering the Emergency Budget in 16 July.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
50. 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 on 16 July.
51. Local boards will approve their local board agreements between 20 to 24 July and corresponding work programmes in August.
52. The Governing Body will adopt the Emergency Budget on 30 July 2020.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Analysis of 2020/2021 Emergency Budget public consultation feedback

1. Introduction

This document provides the local board with an analysis of the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget public consultation feedback, which was undertaken between 29 May and 19 June 2020.

1,668 submissions were received from people who live in the area or commented on the 2020/2021 Emergency Budget.

2. Submission types and groups

Table one: Submission type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>Local responses</th>
<th>Percentage – local responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Ratepayers Alliance</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenZero</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre forma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partners</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table two: Submitter group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter group</th>
<th>Local responses</th>
<th>Percentage – local responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Demographic information of respondents

Table three: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Local responses</th>
<th>Percentage – local responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table four: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Local response</th>
<th>Percentage – local responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 years or younger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years or older</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table five: Gender by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Local response – male</th>
<th>Local response – female</th>
<th>Local response – gender diverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 years or younger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 years or older</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table six: Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Local responses</th>
<th>Percentage – local responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/NZ European</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander/Kiwi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Maori</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pasifika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Responses to 2020/2021 Emergency Budget questions

General rates increase for 2020/2021

Question one asked submitters: We are proposing an average general rates increase of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent for 2020/2021. We looked at but could not responsibly propose rates increases below 2.5 per cent because of the severe impacts that would have on council services, new infrastructure, our debt levels and employment and business activity in Auckland. The scale of the financial challenge that we face for next year with a revenue loss of over half a billion dollars due to COVID-19 means that spending on some council services will need to be reduced and many capital projects will be delayed even with the 3.5 per cent increase we had previously planned.

With a lower rate increase of 2.5 per cent, we would need to further reduce spending on council services and further delay investment in transport, parks and community and town centre projects. Which increase do you support?

The following table outlines the results and relevant comments for question one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of rates increase</th>
<th>Number and percentage</th>
<th>Relevant comments from submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.5 percent            | 531 (44.6%)           | Respondents who support a 3.5 percent increase noted it is:  
  • insignificant compared to the ramifications of delaying significant projects further  
  • sensible and will allow council to complete the necessary work during this financial year  
  • not much weekly but we have to keep pressing on with and ensuring services aren’t as severely decreased  
  • vital to be progressive and recover from COVID-19 as quickly as possible. |
| 2.5 percent            | 471 (39.6%)           | Respondents who support a 2.5 percent increase noted:  
  • they prefer no rates increase, or an increase of less than 2.5 percent  
  • the lesser amount is preferred  
  • rates increase should be kept to a minimum  
  • everyone is doing it tough now and council needs to do the same by reducing their services  
  • 2.5 percent is a good balance between a manageable increase for ratepayers and ensuring some services continue. |
| I don’t know            | 188 (15.8%)           | Respondents who selected I don’t know to a rates increase noted:  
  • there should be no rates increases  
  • rates increases should be less than 2.5 percent |
| Total                   | 1,190                 |                                  |

Further analysis of question one

While the above figures highlight a preference for a 3.5 percent rates increase, further analysis of submissions indicate there is also support from respondent to not increase rates. This assumption is based on the following variables:

• despite respondents selecting a 2.5 percent rates increase, the overwhelming theme from respondents’ comments was that they support no increase;
many respondents who selected I don’t know to a rate increase commented that they support no rates increase; and

many respondents who did not provide a response, but commented, mentioned there should be no rates increases.

While staff cannot provide a definitive figure, based the sheer volume and number of comments, staff consider that a zero percent rates increase was in fact respondents preferred option.

Respondents who support no rates increases considered it was unfair to place additional financial burden on ratepayers, as they are already experiencing financial hardship, facing salary reductions and redundancies following COVID-19. Many respondents also highlighted that savings should made from reducing council operational expenditure (i.e. staffing) and scaling back to core council services, rather than placing additional costs on ratepayers.

The following table outlines key themes which arose from question one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of rates increase</th>
<th>Key theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3.5 percent**        | • The importance to retain as many council services (i.e. keeping libraries and swimming pools) as possible.  
                         • Ensuring there is funding to continue addressing climate change and providing environmental programmes  
                         • Continuing to invest in infrastructure and projects to help recovery, and rebuild the economy  
                         • A small number of respondents supported rates increases being more than 3.5 percent.  |
| **2.5 percent**        | • Significant support for no rates increases, despite selecting this option.  
                         • The rates increase should be less than 2.5 percent.  
                         • That households are continuing to experience financial hardship post COVID-19.  
                         • Council’s operating expenditure (i.e. staffing) needs reducing.  
                         • The importance of continuing to deliver of council services, in particular core services (i.e. libraries).  
                         • Alternative funding mechanisms need to be considered, not just an annual rates increase.  |
| **I don’t know**       | • Significant support for no rates increases.  
                         • The rates increase should be less than 2.5 percent.  
                         • council’s operating expenditure (i.e. staffing) needs reducing.  
                         • The importance of continuing to deliver of council services, in particular core services (i.e. libraries).  
                         • That households are continuing to experience financial hardship post COVID-19.  |
| **No response, but made comments** | • Significant support for no rates increases  
                         • council’s operating expenditure (i.e. staffing) needs reducing  
                         • The importance of continuing to deliver of council services, in particular core services (i.e. libraries)  |

**Rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19**

Question two asked submitters: We are proposing to introduce a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme. This will allow ratepayers who are struggling financially as a result of COVID-19 to defer up to $20,000 of
their rates for the 2020/2021 year. At the end of the postponement period ratepayers would have to pay off the balance (including interest and administration fees). What do you think of our proposal?

The following table outlines the results and relevant comments for question two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>Number and percentage</th>
<th>Relevant comments and themes from submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Support         | 746 (67.1%)           | • Fair and reasonable approach which supports people who will struggle to pay their rates.  
                   |                       | • People should be supported as needed during this crisis. Council would seem heartless if there were no mechanisms for rate support, relief or postponement.  
                   |                       | • Many members of the community are struggling financially due to the Covid-19 lockdown, this will provide welcome relief to them without affecting council.  
                   |                       | • Support the idea of a rates postponement, but I don’t think we should be charging them interest and admin fees.  
                   |                       | • This is a kind thing to do when individuals and businesses are suffering extreme financial hardship. |
| Do not support  | 267 (24%)             | • Instead of offering a postponement, just don’t increase rates.  
                   |                       | • $20,000 is too high. It should support small businesses and personal rate payers (not commercial and investors) and be capped at $5,000.  
                   |                       | • Just another way for people to get into significant debt. Also, not clear as to interest cost and administration levy e.g. total cost of borrowing.  
                   |                       | • Deferral isn’t helpful for people - reduction is. Plus adding fees is very unfair, it will cost them more than just paying as usual. This is a way of discouraging them to take it up in the first place.  
                   |                       | • I’d support up to $10,000, but council isn’t a bank. |
| I don’t know     | 96 (8.8%)             | • Postponing isn’t going to help a lot of people and delays the inevitable.  
                   |                       | • It sounds a good idea, but worry about the debt build up for people, who may never get out of a debt spiral even with low interest rates.  
                   |                       | • Prefer that council reduced rates instead.  
                   |                       | • While this is a good idea a lot of banks are providing support. Is it the job of the council to give this support? |
| Total           | 1,111 (100%)          |                                           |

Accommodation provider targeted rate

Question three asked submitters: Restrictions on travel and mass gatherings due to COVID-19 have resulted in us reducing our spending on visitor attraction and major events. We are proposing to suspend the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) which helps fund these activities until 31 March 2021. The APTR will only be charged for the last three months of the next financial year (2020/2021) as we increase our spending in this area. This proposal will assist the accommodation sector who are struggling financially. What do you think of our proposal?

The following table outlines the results and relevant comments for question three:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>Number and percentage</th>
<th>Relevant comments and themes from submitters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Support         | 817 (73.5%)           | • Seems fair and reasonable given there is limited tourism due to COVID.  
• Makes sense; accommodation providers have been hit hard and any unnecessary charges to these businesses should be removed.  
• Accommodation providers are not getting business, so it seems unfair to charge for something that is not happening.  
• This sector has been one of the hardest hit by the pandemic, so the proposal is fair.  
• The targeted rate should be removed altogether. |
| Do not support  | 171 (15.4%)           | • I support this proposal for hotels, hostels and motels but not properties conducting Airbnb or similar activities. Often these are properties that have been brought up by investors, utilized as short-term accommodation and reduce the number of available homes for Aucklanders. This is an investment, not a business and is not the same activity. If needs be, they can rent these properties long term instead. This is not the same situation for hotels.  
• Unclear if this is still relevant as domestic tourism has since started.  
• Council cannot afford to offer this concession.  
• Suspending rate will not increase demand for accommodation and any demand will still be from domestic visitors spending on attractions that are open. |
| I don’t know     | 124 (11.2%)           | • Most respondents were not sure about the targeted rate and chose to not comment. |
| Total            | 1,112 (100%)          | |

**Other issues, matters and feedback raised by respondents**

This section provides a summary of other issues, matters and feedback raised by respondents. Given the wide-variety of feedback, it has been categorised into council activity areas, maintaining council services, responding to COVID-19 and transport issues.

It is important to note some high-level comments and observations which arose from analysing the feedback. These include:

- the value of council activities (i.e. libraries, parks, arts and culture) is equally supported and questioned in terms of importance. While many respondents noted their support for certain activities, just as many questioned their importance during a period where there are significant financial constraints;
- based on point above, there often wasn’t a clear and definitive preference from respondents. Rather, it can be assumed there are mixed and divergent views on the respective topic;
- clear preferences based on respondent feedback is detailed, when applicable;
- recent and topical issues and events (i.e. water supply issues and the release of senior management salaries) had a clear impact on respondent’s views about finding council operational savings. It can be assumed that these have a direct link with respondents’ reluctance to accept a rates increase; and
- there is an overarching theme that people are continuing to experience financial hardship since the COVID-19 lockdown period.
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While there was wide-ranging feedback, several key themes did emerge from this question. The following table prioritises the key themes and issues routinely noted by submitters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High priority** | There was significant support from respondents to either continue undertaking, improve or focus on these activities or projects. | • Addressing climate change.  
• Delivering environmental programmes.  
• Delivering the Lake Road Improvements project.  
• Council focussing on core services (i.e. footpath maintenance, renewals, rubbish collection).  
• Improving public transport.  
• Addressing road safety.  
• Addressing Auckland’s water supply.  
• Retaining council animal shelters. |
| **Medium priority** | There was some support from respondents to either continue undertaking, improve or focus on these activities or projects. | • Charging for Auckland Transport Park and Ride facilities.  
• Addressing traffic congestion. |
| **Low priority** | There was little support from respondents to either continue undertaking, improve or focus on these activities or projects. | • 2021 America’ Cup event.  
• Delivering events. |

**General comments raised by respondents**

The purpose of beginning with general comments is to highlight several important themes raised by respondents, that don’t naturally fit into an activity area. These include:

- part of us all getting to the ‘new normal’ is supporting our city back to ‘normality’ while making it appropriate for the future. Focus people’s wellbeing and creating a sustainable future;
- as we rebuild from COVID-19 we could decide what kind of world we want to create and build a more liveable future for us and the earth. Now is the time to invest in services that support our community, people and environment. This means not cutting or deferring the public and environmental services that you have worked so hard to create;
- now is the time for bold, innovative ideas, not budget cuts and austerity for our local community. We need vision and investment that sees our city become a world-leading place that demonstrates how we can rise above COVID-19 by continuing to improve the quality of life of our people and continuing to address climate change
- a lot of what Auckland Council is proposing is old world, pre COVID-19 thinking. The world has changed, and we need to embrace new ways of thinking. I would like to see Auckland Council propose a bold vision to transform our city in a way we can all get behind. One which supports and invests in healthy communities, thriving nature, and a local economy that works for everyone. We should see this situation as an opportunity to create positive change, not push for a budget of austerity that will cut services and hit struggling families, businesses & our environment just when they need our support
- we can do better than what Auckland Council has proposed. Now is the time to be innovative and bold;
- spending should be targeted at benefits for poorer people including public transport, safer walking and cycling options, focus on ways in which people can access healthier foods, on support for people who are short of food and other essentials. We are all connected. Please focus on people who need public
support the most. We should start building the sustainable and interconnected future we want and the planet needs. Electric buses, bus lanes, preferential traffic lights for public transport. Water that is safe to drink and swim in. Access to public amenities for those who cannot afford it;
- we shall help each other and stay strong together during this pandemic crisis; and
- please keep improving Auckland. We are making such a good progress.

**Affordability and Support**

As outlined previously, affordability and support has been a key theme throughout respondents’ feedback, for the question on rates increases. Other comments made by respondents to affordability and support include:
- many situations will require more empathy than others and should be dealt with accordingly;
- focus on supporting people in need and getting back to doing the basics;
- having a council that supports its people to get through this rather than loading them with more debt and increased costs is what is important to me;
- it is appropriate that council has sort to show some consideration and compassion towards the many ratepayers affected by the current crisis, and
- apply a strong equity lens to urgently improve healthy and affordable transport choices – for working people, for those on stretched budgets, for Maori and Pasifika, and for children.

**Local projects and issues**

Several key local projects were highlighted by respondents. These include:
- continue the Lake Road improvements project;
- council needs to urgently address Lake Road. Council has approved further intensification on the peninsula which has resulted in a 45-minute trip from Devonport to Takapuna. This inconveniences thousands of residents on the peninsula;
- really annoyed at the cancellation of the Lake Road upgrade while the council pushes further development along the peninsula. It is a project that will enhance development and progress on the Shore;
- please do not defer Lake Road project again- council has allowed multiple housing projects to proceed and has a responsibility to ensure that we can get in and out of our community. If you can’t afford the road improvement, then put the housing projects on hold until you can;
- I do not support the deferral of the Lake Road and Hurstmere Road upgrades;
- I do not want to see the multimodal projects (cycling, pedestrian improvements) deferred. Especially Lake Road;
- the Lake road upgrade that we have been waiting 10 years for, was approved & construction due to start in Mid to late 2021. If this is delayed, then any rate increases for people directly affected should also be delayed. Projects must be prioritised, and this road is one of the most congested in the city, with nothing done since I lived here. We cannot pay increased rates, fuel surcharges etc and have a road that we can get out of our houses at peak times and all times in the weekend;
- You need to go ahead with the Lake Rd Devonport upgrade - specially to make the bike lane safe by separating it from the road. There are a lot of cyclists on this road already that aren’t safe - and a lot more people would cycle if there was a barrier between the cycle lane & the road;
• Lake Road needs to be upgraded and the proposal to defer this is ridiculous. It is one of the worst and most congested roads in NZ and on top of this significant is being allowed in the surrounding area. Forget the bike lanes and make the road useable to all the people who live in and around Lake Road;

• It is encouraging that projects like Lake Road are proposed to be deferred. I have seen nothing about that project that suggests that it will reduce emissions;

• All non-essential works should be halted. This should especially include Lake Road, where $43 million is proposed without a genuine solution to the problem. The whole project should go back to the drawing board because as it stands it is not fit for purpose. I say this as a frequent driver, casual cyclist and even bus catcher. Further suggestions on Lake Road could be supplied;

• concerned that the council has cut doing the urgent upgrading of the sewage system in the Milford shopping area / Shakespeare Road

• keep supporting the upgrade of Hurstmore Rd as it is crucial to the businesses alongside and the enjoyment of Takapuna Beach; and

• to press ahead with the construction of a Takapuna Town Square is an absolute ludicrous waste of the "public purse" before there are signed sales or contracts with future developers or resource consents given to develop the remaining site.

Community Services and Facilities

There was a clear theme that there should be no service level cuts or funding reductions towards community services and facilities. Comments from respondents include:

• centres are well used and have a very important link to the community;

• community support networks, organisations will require support during this time;

• community facilities and events. Favour funding smaller community events funded by the local boards rather than larger city-wide events which can be expensive. Community events will help bring people together building on the community support we saw during the lockdown. Smaller community-based events allow for greater participation in the running of the event and with more people likely to have time on their hands this ability to participate will help people cope and feel part of their community;

• all support for the social housing programme, particularly that for seniors, must be retained;

• support of facilities for local communities is more important now than ever. Please remember this. The mahi done by volunteers, who keep our community facilities alive must have council backing. Withdrawal of funding will not only see Aucklanders floundering as services to local community’s wither, but would be a kick in the teeth to every single person who has dedicated themselves to bettering and nurturing their local communities;

• keep arts, culture, libraries, swimming pools and the like fully funded - these community facilities provide enjoyment for everyone including people struggling financially even more important they have “free” events like music in parks;

• protecting the most vulnerable people in society who rely on government services. Such as support for the disabled, social services, child protection, drug rehabilitation, housing the homeless. All the types of services that would usually be cut; and

• local community run facilities/hubs are now even more vital than ever to ensure that people have ready access to low cost venue hire a for event/celebration or to run classes that are financially accessible to our local community. This is particularly important post Covid-19, when many people have lost income or their job and will therefore be more reliant on staying connected within their community. Existing Community Houses/Centres/Halls should therefore be a high priority for funding, to ensure that they can survive post Covid-19 (noting that majority are a Charity and heavily reliant on Local Board funding/Grants).
Arts, Culture and Events

There were mixed and divergent views on funding towards arts, culture and events. Most respondents requested that funding levels for arts and culture should be retained, however a small number considered this activity a ‘nice to have’. Many respondents also acknowledged that there may need to be fewer events than in previous year. Comments from respondents include:

- no more Movies in the Park as these just competes with local cinemas which are struggling;
- despite these difficult times, it’s still important to look after our cultural and built heritage;
- arts, culture and community activities are important for a cohesive society, especially with Auckland’s diverse population. They also have an economic value, especially in times when there will be less travel. It is important to me that these things are NOT considered of lower importance and NOT deprioritised, as often happens with arts;
- council should maintain funding of established community led historic restoration projects; and
- the need to continue with the arts and sports as recreation is an intrigue part of our society, not only for sense of community but also for people’s mental health; and

Libraries

There was a clear theme that there should be no service level cuts or funding reductions towards libraries. Comments from respondents include:

- libraries are an incredibly important part of their communities and would hate to see their funding cut;
- reducing the number of books bought for libraries for example, will have a huge impact. It’s one of the free things that the community needs, as well as the library itself and its services. If you cut back the services will never be restored. Inorganic rubbish will get fly-tipped parks and reserves will get scruffy and rubbish bins will overflow. The services are at a minimum now. Community services are more important than the grand things;
- that funding of cultural institutions and libraries is retained. These are vital to our city and our sense of identity. These are vital for processing current events and for moving forward;
- keeping libraries open in our communities across Auckland is essential. Their mission to acknowledge and support all people, offering resources, services, spaces, learning opportunities and social contact cannot be underestimated particularly in times of need and hardship;
- all spending on our wonderful public libraries retained. Devonport Library is a major institution in our suburb. It should be fully supported in the pre-COVID-19 manner; and
- Auckland libraries must continue to provide its services to the people of Auckland. They have been to be a great resource to people before and during the lockdown. I would hope they would get the support needed to continue to do so.

Parks, Sport and Recreation

There was a clear theme that there should be no service level cuts or funding reductions towards parks, sport and recreation. Comments from respondents include:

- no changes to leisure facilities;
- sport and recreation activities provided by council will support Aucklanders recovery from COVID-19;
- protect sport and recreation budget lines - it is an important way to reconnect Aucklanders and delivers significant physical, mental health, social, economic and educational benefits;
- sport and recreation play a huge role in rebuilding the wellbeing and social infrastructure across the region. Council facilities that support and provide for community sport and recreation are critical to maintain support for. The work done by the sport and rec team throughout COVID-19 appears to have been extensive, working hard to manage provision under challenging circumstances. Lots of this team’s work is operational and/or has a direct impact on the ability of the community to deliver sport and recreation opportunities (or of individuals to get out there by themselves and make the most of our Auckland environment);
- please keep supporting parks and reserves for Aucklanders;
- no cuts to community sporting venues. At times it’s a struggle to have enough venues for the interest in social sports it would be a real shame and loss of community well-being if this was to have funding cuts; and
- support funding for spaces for recreation, play and making community connections - the public spaces, parks, playgrounds- and the community development initiatives.

Environment, Climate Change and Sustainability

There was a clear theme that there should be no funding reductions towards environmental programmes and measures to address climate change. Comments from respondents include:
- funding cuts cannot compromise our ability to future-proof the city of Auckland. Climate-change, sustainable practices, and high-quality water and natural resources must be our top priorities moving forward, and therefore receive significant financial backing. COVID-19 should therefore be the springboard for shifting our priorities towards the long-term viability of this city. New Zealand has shown the capability to be a world leader in its response to COVID-19, we now need to show the foresight to be a world leader in prioritising climate change mitigation;
- environmental issues must not be forgotten in the mix of considerations. The pressure on the port and the harbour have been highlighted by the reduction in pollution in general;
- can we just keep up with our pest eradication, tree planting and climate change programmes. To get behind on these necessary programmes is about destroying what is fundamental to our survival;
- disappointed to see council reducing funding on expenditure which would reduce the city pollution. The lockdown period when few vehicles were on the road showed us all how much better our city could be. Removing diesel buses and investing in an electric charging infrastructure would help the city move towards a much cleaner environment;
- climate change measures shouldn’t be cut either, this time is an opportunity to make changes rather than just going back to the old ‘normal’;
- we cannot afford to stop programmes that build resilience to and help to fight climate change. Climate Change itself is not on hold or being deferred, so it is important to continue all programmes that support climate action and will help us face the challenge of Climate Change. Climate Change is currently at the bottom of the list of key consideration priorities in Auckland Council’s proposed emergency budget;
- greater action and spending pest control and conservation, including on Kauri Dieback, and climate action;
- work on water supply and wastewater needs to be prioritised; and
- the need to address water quality.
Economic Development and Town Centres

While there were only a small number of comments relating to economic development and town centres, it can be assumed this is because respondents indirectly raised this part of ‘getting back up and running’ following COVID-19. Comments from respondents include:

- continuing to spend money in the local economy to promote business and economic development;
- look at assisting business getting back, profit making, and those who are employed spending; and
- the town centres are fine, they don’t need upgrading. Spend the money on other more important things like cheaper public transport. Some people will probably disagree, but the town centres have been the same for a long time and they work, so there’s no need to change them just to make them look newer.

Public Transport

There were mixed and divergent views on funding towards public transport. While most respondents supported public transport, specific projects such as the City Rail Link and AT Local were highlighted as projects that should be cancelled. Comments from respondents include:

- any cutback in public transport would be counterproductive as would increasing fares. This is a time to encourage people into public transport so that cutting rather than raising fares is the best scenario;
- the council should not cut or defer funding to the following: Public transport services: Investment in electric vehicles & EV infrastructure, Electric buses and related infrastructure;
- focus on programs that do get funding on those that shift transport to PT and micro mobility. Every project must consider its climate impact with a heavy weight. Safe streets should also be prioritised for all users but most especially pedestrian and micro mobility users. Cycleways, pedestrian streets (shared spaces) and school routes should be the focus. We saw that people love to get out of their cars but do not feel safe with the current structure;
- instead of reducing Public Transport funding, charge for all street parking including suburban residential streets to encourage the use of public transport and reduce the traffic congestion on all streets; and
- there are far too many buses on high frequency routes are running around empty at all hours of the day.

Active Transport Modes

Many respondents highlighted that investing in active modes of transport (i.e. walking and cycling) should continue to be prioritised. Comments from respondents include:

- there was a resurgence in cycling and walking during the lockdown. Without anywhere to rush to it made sense BUT it also highlighted the extreme dominance of cars that restrict other transport options. We are now back to the old ways of people and bikes battling footpath space because the roads were not designed for the number of cars on the road, including (and very significantly) parked cars from the higher density housing and increase of no. of vehicles per household;
- some key projects, especially those that improve our environmental impact (public transport, cycling, etc. Should be continued as much as possible;
- do not under any circumstance cut cycling and road safety initiatives. I’m fed up with AT dragging their feet with providing safe cycling networks. The lack of safe cycling infrastructure means I have to drive more than I would like which is hugely expensive and in these times where money is tight I want the Council to invest in affordable solutions like cycling infrastructure not stupid mega road widening upgrades that try to fit the same amount of car traffic in plus bus lanes and cycle lanes. Take space from cars and give it to PT and cycling, it doesn’t have to be expensive and it should be the number one priority Auckland Transport is focusing on;
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- spending on public transport and cycling and walking infrastructure. These are vital to the health of our city, our population and to combatting climate change;
- in COVID-19 lockdown we saw how many people love to cycle when our streets are not too busy and dangerous for cyclists. Please consider this and move forward taking a positive learning from this... more people will cycle more if you make our streets more cycle friendly. With this more people cycling means less traffic and less pollution; and
- projects that reduce our carbon emissions need to get underway as soon as possible (e.g. safe cycle lanes) so I can bike to work safely, enhanced public transport (especially rail). Any decisions should be made with a view to consider both equity and the urgency of the climate crisis we face.

It should be noted that not all respondents shared a supportive view of active transport modes. Other comments include:
- stop all these bike lanes and T2 and T3 lanes, stop these silly little roading projects like you did in my suburb Devonport the other year;
- slash Auckland Transports budgets for cycle lanes; and
- stop cycle way construction. I’m sure people can cross the road instead of building two cycle bridges on Northcote road.

Transport – safety, footpaths and other issues

While a range of transport-related views were highlighted, a common theme that emerged was the need to ensure people’s safety and making improvements to footpaths. Comments from respondents include:
- the proposed pausing or cancelling of safety improvements is simply irresponsible. Our roads are dangerous, and people die or are injured because of that. Pausing work to save money sends the wrong message and is ultimately a false economy;
- road safety. The proposed cuts in footpath maintenance and road safety improvements would impact pedestrians and cyclists most and may result in more deaths and serious injuries. The COVID-19 lockdown experience highlighted how important walking is for physical and mental health and how universal the need to walk is. As above cuts would have most impact on the most deprived communities. I believe any road safety improvements, particularly pedestrian crossing installations or upgrades that have been promised to communities in the next financial year. In many cases communities have waited a long time for these improvements, and death or serious injuries may have already occurred at these points. One initiative which save lives and make communities more suitable for walking and cycling, and cost little would be to implement 30km/h speed limits in town centres and around schools as soon as possible;
- road safety and community placemaking. Our neighbourhoods were our refuge during lock down. We need to invest in neighbourhood resilience, green infrastructure, road safety (been waiting for 6 years for the zebra crossing on Bayswater Ave next to the park and it’s been put on hold);
- safety improvements to roads and footpaths; and
- do not cut or defer funding away from safety improvements on our roads and footpaths, this goes against Auckland Transport’s vision zero policy whereby no other measures should be put ahead of human life.

Investing in infrastructure and projects to help recovery and rebuild the economy

Many respondents highlighted that investing in infrastructure is an appropriate mechanism to rebuild the economy and get Auckland back on track after COVID-19. Comments from respondents include:
• council should put its money into finishing the projects it has on its books, but then rethink its focus for the future;
• not investing in infrastructure now when so much of it is in disrepair or on the brink of collapse would be a grave mistake and will only harm Aucklanders further down the track who will be burdened with much more debt than Aucklanders currently. This will also result in additional harm to the environment;
• try to keep on with capital projects to stimulate growth and prevent a recession;
• it is essential that Auckland pushes forward with investment to become a zero-carbon city. We cannot afford to delay transition away from fossil fuel-based transport, nor can we afford to delay improving our waterways and the health of the Hauraki Gulf;
• critical investment into infrastructure needs to continue as this has long term benefits for all Aucklanders. Steps such as increasing public transit costs (park and ride etc.) should be avoided where possible because they disproportionately impact those from poorer socio-economic backgrounds;
• support a long-term view to keep council plans on track. Auckland can’t afford to defer big capital works that improve our water quality, environmental protection and low carbon living (cycleways, pedestrian priorities), our quality of life and that of the planet depends on them; and
• now it is more important than ever to get public infrastructure projects going as a lot of private companies are dependent on it. A lot other will have less income this year, so to restart economy public investments is the key to do it. Please make the right move in right direction.

2021 America’s Cup event

Some respondents noted concerns with continuing to host the 2021 America’s Cup in Auckland. Their comments include:
• not keen on the continued funding of the Americas Cup as we are in a different socioeconomic age now. The Americas Cup is in the same bracket as tourism and pre-COVID was relevant—not anymore!
• any funding for the America’s Cup in this budget is outrageous. The economy is on its knees and cuts are being proposed to essential public services. We are heading into a once-in-a-lifetime downturn and you want to fund extremely rich people messing about in boats! I hope you get thousands of votes against this proposal.
• a massive reduction in the money allocated towards the Americas Cup would be preferable to any cuts in public transport/cycling/walking infrastructure. Cutting out some middle management roles in some areas, and reduced spending on one-off events and programmes like the Heritage Festival could also allow continued spending on on-the-ground action on planned infrastructure projects;
• investing in international events such as America’s Cup as this promotes Auckland and NZ on an international platform. Do not think cutting back the cleaning on the waterfront areas is a good idea, need these places to be inviting and encourage people to visit and spend
• lower the level of funding for 36th America’s Cup;
• continuing with the America’s Cup contest seems offensive considering the sufferings of so many Aucklanders who have no interest and nothing to gain; and
• there is a tremendous amount of money being spent to prepare Auckland for the America’s Cup. As this is now not certain to happen, what is being cut from these programmes that can be diverted to things that are more important right now?

Asset recycling and sale of major assets / holdings

There were mixed and divergent views on asset recycling and the sale major assets / holdings. Many respondents support the sale of non-service or surplus assets as they are not serving any function to council. Respondents who object to asset recycling noted that parks, open spaces and pocket parks
should not to be sold. It can be assumed that historical opposition to the sale of non-service or surplus assets has created a notion that parks, and open spaces may also be sold, therefore creating confusion. Comments from respondents include:

- sell non-core Council land to facilitate redevelopment of town centres;
- asset recycling and selling non-essential assets especially poor performers;
- support the divestment of surplus land asset which serve no function to council;
- get rid of council owned assets laying idol;
- 100% agree with the need to reduce our asset base and I agree with the assets listed for my LB area. This is a prudent approach which shouldn’t impact anyone too much, so I fully support this;
- don’t support the selling of public land;
- please don’t sell any parks or green spaces. They are a part of what makes this such a beautiful city and once they are gone, it will be very difficult to replace them;
- strongly object to the Council’s proposal to sell various properties including parks and reserves because they are mostly assets to the community;
- concerned about the proposal to sell a range of Council properties to raise funds. I believe that, in the current environment, these will not realise their full value, and the amount gained from the sales will not have a significant impact on Council funds. I’m happy for sites like 2 The Strand to be sold eventually, when the sale can achieve their commercial value; and

- assets especially parks should not be sold as a short-term solution to a short-term crisis. Local boards should have the final say on any asset sale apart from vehicles and similarly low value assets

**Council controlled organisations (CCOs)**

The small number of respondents who highlighted CCOs questioned the role and function of Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED), and suggested a review of CCOs should be undertaken.

**Watercare and water supply issues**

Many respondents highlighted their frustration with the current water supply issues and noted concern with Watercare’s operational expenditure (i.e. salaries). Other comments include:

- it is important to have a good water supply for the city;
- water is a necessity of life;
- introduce subsidies to support water capture via household roof for grey water needs; and
- council needs to take a greater role, and control of Watercare.

**Closing Council Animal Shelters**

There was a clear theme that there should be no closures of council animal shelter. Comments from respondents include:

- please don’t close any of the animal shelters, they are busy now and will be with people losing their jobs and animals suffering. Most of us are animal lovers so this is very important;
- please don’t close any animal shelters;
• animal shelters should be provided funds to assist with the potential increase of abandoned pets due to loss of income. Independent shelters that support the council facilities should also be provided with funds to assist in the rehabilitation and successful adoption of these pets;

• the animal shelters are needed. We have an obligation to care for our animals and closing shelters would mean that more animals are likely to be euthanised either as a direct or indirect result of there being less space available to accommodate them. Don’t close the shelters; and

• don’t shut down the animal shelters, this will put hundreds of animals at risk and may lead to animal control issues.

**Maintaining council services and efficiency improvements**

One of the major themes that arose from public consultation feedback was the types of services and activities council should focus or prioritise. It can be assumed the large amounts of feedback is attributed to the service levels council can provide through the proposed 2.5 or 3.5 rates increase. Respondents provided wide-ranging and divergent views in the types of services council should or shouldn’t undertake. Some of the consistent views and comments from respondents include:

• if budgets are constrained, that council needs to review the various services and activities it undertakes from a value-add and critical services perspective. Respondents routinely noted that core services included maintenance, renewals, storm water and wastewater infrastructure, rubbish collection and addressing climate change;

• being more fit-for-purpose and responsive to when issues arise, or require attention;

• ensuring that existing assets are well-maintained and renewed in a timely manner

• focus on providing services which directly benefit the community, this includes minimal service changes to libraries, recreation centres and community houses;

• better budgeting, planning and project delivery; and

• consider efficiency improvements in procurement and contracting out services.

As noted previously, the divergent views on the value of council services and activities are equally supported and questioned in terms of importance. For example, many respondents in this section considered economic development critical towards Auckland’s recovery, while others considered it (and ATEED) secondary, or a Central Government responsibility.

**Council organisational structure, size and operational expenditure**

Another major theme from consultation feedback was the council’s organisational structure and operational expenditure (i.e. staff and salaries). It can be assumed the strong views and comments from respondents can be directed linked to recent media articles about senior council staff salaries. Similar to the previous section, respondents provided wide-ranging comments on council’s organisational structure and operational expenditure. Some of the consistent views and comments from respondents include:

• the current financial challenge should be a reset opportunity to reconsider what council’s staffing numbers and its size. Priority should be given to delivering focus services first, then expand into other activity areas;

• concerns with the number of staff employed and contracted by council;

• concerns with council staff salaries, at all levels;

• that salary reductions should be imposed to all staff earning over a certain amount; and

• staff numbers employed at council should be reduced and more closely aligned to similar council’s (i.e. Brisbane City Council).
It should be noted there were a few comments which made different suggestions to council’s organisational structure and operational expenditure. These include:

- this is not the time to impose wide-ranging redundancies at council;
- redeployment towards core council service areas could be a better option than redundancies; and
- spend money wisely is paramount during uncertain times. Sweeping changes to cut staffing numbers may cost council more in redundancy / pay-out packages.