National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management

Summary of feedback received during Auckland Council's public consultation from 3 November to 4 December 2023

Analysis by Auckland Insights | Democracy and Engagement

National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

This report summarises feedback received during the public consultation period of 3 November to 4 December 2023 on setting our direction for improving freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland.

This report aims to capture key themes regarding the views and preferences of those that submitted feedback, rather than detail every point of feedback received. This report does not include any advice or recommendations for decision making.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

TOTAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED: 3,899

In 2022, we (Auckland Council) asked the public for feedback to help us develop a vision and values to better manage our freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau through the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM). In the 2023 public consultation, we aimed to make sure the public think we are still moving in the right direction with our planning.

NPS-FM is a government policy to guide how freshwater should be managed across New Zealand, in our rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands, aquifers (groundwater) and springs. It also includes how freshwater affects coastal waters and considers the impacts of climate change. When this new national direction was implemented, it required us to amend the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) by 31 December 2024, and develop action plans to achieve the outcomes we had identified. In December 2023, the new government signalled its intent to amend the NPS-FM and moved the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) deadline for the plan change to December 2027, to allow councils time to implement the policy inclusive of any future amendments to the NPS-FM.

This 2023 consultation was focused on the actions required to implement the NPS-FM. While the decisions made here will have an impact on the delivery of water services, including drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, this consultation does not directly consider the wider Water Services Reform process. Similarly, this NPS-FM engagement is quite separate from the central and local government response to severe storm events.

We received feedback via our online feedback form (1,386), hard copy feedback forms (2,361), email (21) and other sources (131).

In this report, we present feedback from individuals (3,873) and organisations (36) separately given differences in who they represent.

The feedback form for this consultation asked 22 questions, spread across six sections:

A. Long-term vision
B. Values and environmental outcomes
C. Waterbodies where special management is required
D. Achieving the vision and environmental outcomes for freshwater
E. Habitat protection and improvement
F. Water quantity
G. Other feedback.

All questions were optional. The questions responded to the most were:

- Question one, regarding the region-wide vision statement (around 3,400 responses)
- Question eight, regarding criteria/values for identifying outstanding waterbodies (around 2,200 responses)
- Question nine, regarding our approach to use Safeswim sites as primary contact sites (around 1,900 responses).

We noted a spike in submissions received (around 1,100 submissions over a three-day period), which coincided with an external campaign by 'Hobson's Pledge' – a copy of their online campaign can be found in Attachment three. Responses received around this time focussed primarily on questions one and eight.

Most other closed option questions received around 1,500-1,600 responses, and open comment most questions received around 200-500 responses. The final "other comments" open question received around 900 responses.

In general, there was widespread support for all proposals, with the majority receiving at least 70 per cent support.

The one exception was question eight, regarding our proposed approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values. This proposal received 50 per cent support, while 38 per cent did not support it. Common themes in the responses included:

- Those that supported the proposal, and provided comments, most commonly thought mana whenua should be involved because we should acknowledge Māori cultural values, or they agreed with the approach to address water quality issues.
- Those that did not support the proposal most commonly thought the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values, and/or were opposed to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities in general.

Common themes in the responses to each question are covered in more detail within the body of the report. However, below are some general themes found across all questions.

Those that were supportive of our proposals most commonly addressed:

- Concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources
- The importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations
- A desire to have improved plans and management of waterways
- The importance of prioritising healthy waterways to support water consumption for people.

Those that were not supportive of our proposals most commonly addressed:

- Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values, and/or were opposed to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities in general
- Certain aspects of the plan were unnecessary and/or were a waste of time and/or money.

Who we heard from

A detailed breakdown of submitters who provided demographic information when providing feedback is available in **Attachment One**. Some key points to note include:

- Older submitters were over-represented, with most feedback (60 percent) coming from submitters 55 years or older
- Only 16 per cent of feedback received was from submitters younger than 25 years
- We noted a highly diverse representation across ethnic groups in the feedback we received
    - 36 per cent identified as Asian, 33 per cent as Pasifika, and 30 per cent as European
    - Māori were relatively under-represented, with only five per cent of submitters identifying as Māori.

Contents

Purpose of the report **2**

Executive summary **2**

Context **8**

Feedback **8**

A. Long-term vision **9**

1.0 What do you think about the direction we are proposing in the region-wide vision statement? 9

2.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Hauraki FMU? 11

3.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Kaipara FMU? 13

4.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Manukau FMU? 14

B. Values and environmental outcomes **16**

5.0 Do you think we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan? 16

6.0 Do you think we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan? 18

7.0 Do you have any feedback on the proposed environmental outcomes? 20

C. Waterbodies where special management is required **21**

8.0 What do you think about our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values? 21

9.0 Tell us what you think about our approach to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments? 23

D. Achieving the vision and environmental outcomes for freshwater **25**

10.0 What do you think about the summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes? 25

11.0 How satisfied are you with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's river, streams and lakes? 27

12.0 Do you think we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change? 29

13.0 Do you think we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change? 31

14.0 What do you think about our proposal to at least maintain the state of waterbodies where they are already good and set ambitious targets to improve the health of waterbodies where they are poor? 33

15.0 How should we strike the balance between maintaining food security and improving water quality in the Pukekohe Specified Vegetable Growing Area? 35

16.0 Tell us what you think about the draft management options being considered? 35

17.0 Are there other management options outside of those listed that you think we should consider? 37

E. Habitat protection and improvement.....38

18.0 What do you think of our proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation? 38

19.0 Do you think we should retain our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams where they are higher than national requirements? 40

F. Water Quantity 42

20.0 How do you suggest the council fairly reduces water allocations to existing consent holders where that is considered necessary? 42

21.0 How do you think we should prioritise allocation where or when water is scarce? 43

G. Other feedback..... 44

22.0 Do you have any other feedback on improving freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland? 44

Attachments 45

ATTACHMENT ONE: Who we heard from 46

ATTACHMENT TWO: Local Board breakdowns 48

1.0 What do you think about the direction we are proposing in the region-wide vision statement? 48

2.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Hauraki FMU?..... 50

3.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Kaipara FMU?..... 52

4.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Manukau FMU?..... 54

5.0 Do you think we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan? 56

6.0 Do you think we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan?..... 58

7.0 Do you have any feedback on the proposed environmental outcomes? 59

8.0 What do you think about our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values? 60

9.0 Tell us what you think about our approach to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments?..... 62

10.0 What do you think about the summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes? 64

11.0 How satisfied are you with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's river, streams and lakes?..... 66

12.0 Do you think we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change? 68

13.0 Do you think we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change? 70

14.0 What do you think about our proposal to at least maintain the state of waterbodies where they are already good and set ambitious targets to improve the health of waterbodies where they are poor? 72

15.0 How should we strike the balance between maintaining food security and improving water quality in the Pukekohe Specified Vegetable Growing Area?..... 73

16.0 Tell us what you think about the draft management options being considered?..... 74
17.0 Are there other management options outside of those listed that you think we should consider?..... 75
18.0 What do you think of our proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation? 76
19.0 Do you think we should retain our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams where they are higher than national requirements? 78
20.0 How do you suggest the council fairly reduces water allocations to existing consent holders where that is considered necessary? 79
21.0 How do you think we should prioritise allocation where or when water is scarce? 79
22.0 Do you have any other feedback on improving freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland? 80
ATTACHMENT THREE: 'Hobson's Pledge campaign' 81

Horopaki

Context

In 2022, we (Auckland Council) asked the public for feedback to help us develop a vision and values to better manage our freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau through the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM). In the 2023 public consultation, we aimed to make sure the public think we are still moving in the right direction with our planning.

NPS-FM is a government policy to guide how freshwater should be managed across New Zealand, in our rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands, aquifers (groundwater) and springs. It also includes how freshwater affects coastal waters and considers the impacts of climate change. When this new national direction was implemented, it required us to amend the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) by 31 December 2024, and develop action plans to achieve the outcomes we had identified. In December 2023, the new government signalled its intent to amend the NPS-FM and moved the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) deadline for the plan change to December 2027, to allow councils time to implement the policy inclusive of any future amendments to the NPS-FM.

This 2023 consultation was focused on the actions required to implement the NPS-FM. While the decisions made here will have an impact on the delivery of water services, including drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, this consultation does not directly consider the wider Water Services Reform process. Similarly, this NPS-FM engagement is quite separate from the central and local government response to severe storm events.

Urupare

Feedback

The following breakdown of feedback received summarises ‘top line’ responses, followed by common themes identified.

In this report, we present feedback from individuals and organisations separately given differences in who they represent. Feedback received from an organisation is counted as a single piece of feedback, as with individuals, though we note they often represent the views of larger specialist and/or interest groups. They may also represent private businesses.

The feedback form for this consultation asked people 22 questions, spread across six sections:


A. Long-term vision
B. Values and environmental outcomes
C. Waterbodies where special management is required
D. Achieving the vision and environmental outcomes for freshwater
E. Habitat protection and improvement
F. Water quantity
G. Other feedback.

This summary of feedback follows the same order. Each question is stated as it was presented on our online and hard copy feedback forms before providing results and common themes.

A. Long-term vision

1.0 What do you think about the direction we are proposing in the region-wide vision statement?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=3540)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Strongly support	2,047	8
Mostly support	529	9
Mostly do not support	91	1
Strongly do not support	743	0
I don’t know	112	0
TOTAL	**3,522**	**18**

Individuals

Of the 2,576 individuals (73 per cent) that **support** (strongly or mostly support) the region-wide vision statement, 974 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Address water quality

People agree with the vision, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources with a focus on environmental stewardship, community involvement, and long-term planning.

(533 comments)

55%

General support

People generally support the region-wide vision statement without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(250 comments)

26%

	**Too focused on the Māori perspective** While people supported the vision, they had some concern that the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language, potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture. (84 comments)	**9%**

Of the 834 individuals (24 per cent) that **do not support** the region-wide vision statement, 752 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

	**Too focused on the Māori perspective** Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally. (710 comments)	**94%**
	**Address water quality** Most people agree the vision addresses their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources, but had other concerns. Others thought the vision did not meet their standards for water quality. (135 comments)	**18%**

Note – a significant number of submissions received that do not support the region-wide vision statement, and expressed the view that the plan is too focussed on the Māori perspective, coincided with an external campaign by 'Hobson's Pledge' – a copy of their online campaign can be found in Attachment three.

Of the 112 individuals (3 per cent) that provided **another response**, 25 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (9 comments)
- Address water quality (6 comments)
- General support (5 comments).

Organisations


Of the 17 organisations (94 per cent) that **support** the region-wide vision statement, 16 organisations provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Be more ambitious (5 comments)
- Address water quality (3 comments)
- Too focused on the Māori perspective (3 comments).

One organisation (6 per cent) **does not support** the region-wide vision statement.

2.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Hauraki FMU?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,556)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,221	8
Disagree	159	1
Other	81	5
I don't know	81	0
TOTAL	**1,542**	**14**

Individuals

Of the 1,221 individuals (79 per cent) that **agree** with the proposed vision statement for the Hauraki FMU, 223 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

General support

People generally support the vision statement without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(96 comments)

43%

Address water quality

People agree with the vision, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources with a focus on environmental stewardship, community involvement, and long-term planning.

(56 comments)

25%

Sustainable future planning

Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(33 comments)

15%

Of the 159 individuals (10 per cent) that **disagree** with the proposed vision statement for the Hauraki FMU, 117 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

	**Too focused on the Māori perspective** Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally. (97 comments)	**83%**
	**Address water quality** Most people agree the vision addresses their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources, but had other concerns. Others thought the vision did not meet their standards for water quality. (17 comments)	**15%**

Of the 162 individuals (10 per cent) that provided **another response**, 49 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (15 comments)
- Address water quality (7 comments).

Organisations


Of the eight organisations (57 per cent) that **agree** with the proposed vision statement, six organisations provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

One organisation (seven per cent) **disagrees** with the proposed vision statement.

Five organisations (36 per cent) provided **another response**, and all five provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

3.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Kaipara FMU?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,413)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,086	3
Disagree	108	0
Other	43	2
I don't know	170	1
TOTAL	**1,407**	**6**

Individuals

Of the 1,086 individuals (79 per cent) that **agree** with the proposed vision statement for the Kaipara FMU, 167 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

General support

People generally support the vision statement without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(64 comments)

38%

Address water quality

People agree with the vision, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources with a focus on environmental stewardship, community involvement, and long-term planning.

(46 comments)

28%

Communication, education and engagement

Increased community involvement and communication from Council.

(23 comments)

14%

Sustainable future planning

Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(18 comments)

11%

Of the 108 individuals (eight per cent) that **disagree** with the proposed vision statement for the Kaipara FMU, 77 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(68 comments)

88%

Address water quality

Most people agree the vision addresses their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources, but had other concerns. Others thought the vision did not meet their standards for water quality.

(9 comments)

12%

Of the 213 individuals (15 per cent) that provided **another response**, 38 individuals provided comments. The most common theme was:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (13 comments).


Organisations

Of the three organisations (50 per cent) that **agree** with the proposed vision statement, two organisations provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

Three organisations (50 per cent) provided **another response**, but none provided comments.

4.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Manukau FMU?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,504)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,172	5
Disagree	132	0
Other	42	1
I don't know	151	1
TOTAL	**1,497**	**7**

Individuals

Of the 1,172 individuals (78 per cent) that **agree** with the proposed vision statement for the Manukau FMU, 218 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



General support

People generally support the vision statement without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(148 comments)

68%



Address water quality

People agree with the vision, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources with a focus on environmental stewardship, community involvement, and long-term planning.

(32 comments)

15%



Sustainable future planning

Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(20 comments)

9%

Of the 132 individuals (9 per cent) that **disagree** with the proposed vision statement, 92 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(78 comments)

85%



Address water quality

Most people agree the vision addresses their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources, but had other concerns. Others thought the vision did not meet their standards for water quality.

(9 comments)

10%

Of the 193 individuals (13 per cent) that provided **another response**, 45 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (16 comments)
- Address water quality (5 comments).

Organisations


Of the five organisations (71 per cent) that **agree** with the proposed vision statement, four organisations provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

Of the two organisations (29 per cent) that provided **another response**, one organisation provided a comment.

B. Values and environmental outcomes

5.0 Do you think we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,747)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Yes	1,365	15
No	161	1
Other	47	1
I don't know	157	0
TOTAL	**1,730**	**17**

Individuals

Of the 1,365 individuals (79 per cent) that **agree** we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, 285 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



General support
People generally support including 'resilience' as a value without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(116 comments)

41%



Sustainable future planning
Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(93 comments)

33%



Address water quality
People agree with the value, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources with a focus on environmental stewardship, community involvement, and long-term planning.

(36 comments)

13%

Of the 161 individuals (nine per cent) that **disagree** we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, 94 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Not necessary
Many comments felt the existing values were sufficient and/or that 'resilience' could be included under the 'human contact' value. Others were concerned the inclusion of 'resilience' may lead to overreach by council.

(44 comments)

47%



Too focused on the Māori perspective
Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(20 comments)

21%

Of the 204 individuals (12 per cent) that provided **another response**, 54 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (17 comments)
- 'Resilience' needs further definition (11 comments).

Organisations

Of the 15 organisations (88 per cent) that **agree** we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, 12 organisations provided comments. The most common theme was:


- That including 'resilience' would encourage sustainable future planning (8 comments).

One organisation (six per cent) **disagrees** with adding 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan and provided a comment.

One organisation (six per cent) gave **another response** and provided a comment.

6.0 Do you think we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,749)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Yes	1,412	12
No	170	4
Other	30	2
I don't know	119	0
TOTAL	**1,731**	**18**

Individuals

Of the 1,412 individuals (82 per cent) that **agree** we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, 283 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

General support

People generally support including 'amenity' as a value without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(121 comments)

43%

	**Ensure accessibility** People emphasize the need for equal access to swimmable water sources for all Aucklanders. They see access to water bodies as a right for everyone, and amenity values are seen as crucial for providing spaces for rest, recreation, and learning. Some also raise cultural, economic and lifestyle benefits. (74 comments)	**26%**
	**Address water quality** People agree with the value, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water resources with a focus on environmental stewardship, community involvement, and long-term planning. (41 comments)	**14%**

Of the 170 individuals (10 per cent) that **disagree** we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, 87 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

	**Not necessary** Many comments felt the existing values were sufficient and/or that 'amenity' could be included under the 'human contact' value. Many were also concerned that emphasising amenity values may infringe on private property rights. (53 comments)	**61%**
	**Too focused on the Māori perspective** Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally. (8 comments)	**9%**

Of the 149 individuals (nine per cent) that provided **another response**, 41 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (9 comments)
- Not necessary (8 comments).

Organisations

Of the 12 organisations (67 per cent) that **agree** we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, ten organisations provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Ensure accessibility (4 comments)
- Address water quality (3 comments).

Four organisations (22 per cent) **disagree** we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan, and provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

Of the two organisations (11 per cent) that provided **another response**, one provided a comment.

7.0 Do you have any feedback on the proposed environmental outcomes?

People were asked to provide comments in an open question (n=347)

Individuals

331 individuals provided comments on the proposed environmental outcomes. The most common themes were:

	**General support** People generally support the proposed environmental outcomes without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do. (122 comments)	**37%**
	**Too focused on the Māori perspective** Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally. (43 comments)	**13%**
	**Address water quality** Comments addressed concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and ecologically sound water management practices. (32 comments)	**10%**

Organisations


16 organisations provided comments on the proposed environmental outcomes. The most common themes were:

- Generally support (4 comments)
- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments).

C. Waterbodies where special management is required

8.0 What do you think about our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=2,297)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,184	7
Disagree	844	1
Other	102	8
I don’t know	149	2
TOTAL	**2,279**	**18**

Individuals

Of the 1,184 individuals (52 per cent) that **agree** that our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values, 210 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Mana whenua should be involved

Comments highlighted the importance of recognising, respecting, and incorporating Māori cultural values in the identification and protection of outstanding waterbodies, emphasizing a holistic and collaborative approach.

(70 comments)

33%

General support

People generally support our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(61 comments)

29%

Address water quality

People agree with the approach, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, including cultural values, addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and ecologically sound water management practices.

(34 comments)

16%

Of the 844 individuals (37 per cent) that **disagree** that our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values, 687 individuals provided comments. The most common themes was:

Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(642 comments)

93%

Note – a significant number of submissions received that do not support the region-wide vision statement, and expressed the view that the plan is too focussed on the Māori perspective, coincided with an external campaign by 'Hobson's Pledge' – a copy of their online campaign can be found in Attachment three.

Of the 251 individuals (11 per cent) that provided **another response**, 88 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (42 comments)
- Mana whenua should be involved (15 comments)
- Address water quality (6 comments).

Organisations

Of the seven organisations (39 per cent) that **agree** that our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values, five organisations provided comments. The most common themes was:

- Address water quality (3 comments).


One organisation (six per cent) **disagrees** that our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, and provided a comment.

Of the ten organisations (56 per cent) that provided **another response**, nine provided comments. The most common themes was:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments).

9.0 Tell us what you think about our approach to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,998)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,644	9
Disagree	139	0
Other	69	6
I don't know	130	1
TOTAL	**1,982**	**16**

Individuals

Of the 1,644 individuals (83 per cent) that **agree** to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments, 371 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Address water quality

People agree with the approach, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, including addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and ecologically sound water management practices.

(136 comments)

37%

General support

People generally support to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and to introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments, without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(79 comments)

21%



Health and safety

Comments generally agreed with the approach in the interests of protecting public health and safety, including reducing pollution and addressing contamination.

(75 comments)

20%

Of the 139 individuals (seven per cent) that **disagree** to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments, 87 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(43 comments)

49%



Waste of time and/or money

Concerns included that we are already doing enough and/or wanting to avoid additional costs in the currently difficult economic environment.

(10 comments)

11%

Of the 199 individuals (ten per cent) that provided **another response**, 52 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (17 comments)
- Address water quality (12 comments).

Organisations


Of the nine organisations (56 per cent) that **agree** to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments, five organisations provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

Sseven organisations (44 per cent) provided **another response**, and six provided a comment. There were no significant themes within these comments.

D. Achieving the vision and environmental outcomes for freshwater

10.0 What do you think about the summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,561)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,304	8
Disagree	61	1
Other	37	8
I don’t know	142	0
TOTAL	**1,544**	**17**

Individuals

Of the 1,304 individuals (84 per cent) that **agree** with our summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes, 192 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

General support

People generally agree with our summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes, without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(105 comments)

55%

Address water quality

People agree with the approach, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, including addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and ecologically sound water management practices.

(43 comments)

22%

Of the 61 individuals (four per cent) that **disagree** with our summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes, 36 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(7 comments)

19%



Need better baselines

Comments suggested 2017 might not be the right or best year to set the baseline at. Suggestions included using a more realistic or ambitious baseline.

(7 comments)

19%

Of the 179 individuals (11 per cent) that provided **another response**, 59 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- I don't know or need more information (25 comments)
- Too focused on the Māori perspective (7 comments)
- Address water quality (4 comments)
- Be more ambitious (3 comments)
- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments).

Organisations

Of the eight organisations (47 per cent) that **agree** with our summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes, five organisations provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.


One organisation (six per cent) **disagrees** with our summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes and provided a comment.

Eight organisations (47 per cent) provided **another response** and all provided a comment. The most common themes were:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (4 comments)
- Address water quality (3 comments).

11.0 How satisfied are you with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's river, streams and lakes?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,590)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Very satisfied	492	0
Fairly satisfied	634	0
Fairly dissatisfied	212	4
Very dissatisfied	125	10
I don't know	110	3
TOTAL	**1,573**	**17**

Individuals

Of the 1,126 individuals (72 per cent) that are **satisfied** (very or fairly satisfied) with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's rivers, streams and lakes, 183 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Address water quality

People were satisfied with the health of our rivers, streams and lakes, but felt there are improvements that could still be made. Their concerns addressed human impacts, environmental degradation and a need for ecologically sound water management practices.

(71 comments)

39%

General support

People were generally satisfied with the health of our rivers, streams and lakes, without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(32 comments)

17%



Be more ambitious

People were satisifed with the health of our rivers, streams and lakes, but thought we could still do more to make them healthier.

(32 comments)

17%



Better planning or management

Comments would like to have improved plans and management of waterways, emphasising a need for specialised solutions rather than a blanket approach.

(23 comments)

13%

Of the 337 individuals (21 per cent) that are **not satisfied** (very or fairly dissatisfied) with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's river, streams and lakes, 171 individuals provided comments. The most common themes was:



Address water quality

Comments addressed concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, including addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and a need for ecologically sound water management practices. Many of these comments also expressed urgency and immediate action.

(110 comments)

64%

Of the 110 individuals (seven per cent) that provided **another response**, 42 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Address water quality (15 comments)
- Too focused on the Māori perspective (5 comments).

Organisations


Of the 14 organisations (82 per cent) that are **not satisfied** with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's river, streams and lakes, 13 and provided a comment. The common themes was:

- Address water quality (10 comments).

Of the three organisations (18 per cent) that provided **another response**, two provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

12.0 Do you think we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,568)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Yes	1,279	15
No	72	0
Other	32	1
I don't know	169	0
TOTAL	**1,552**	**16**

Individuals

Of the 1,279 individuals (82 per cent) that **agree** that we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change, 261 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

General support
People generally support the proposal without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(77 comments)

30%

Aquatic life protection
Comments emphasised that managing zinc and copper is important in maintaining biodiversity and aquatic plant growth, the preservation of aquatic life, and protecting freshwater ecosystems.

(52 comments)

20%

Health and safety
Comments generally agreed with the approach in the interests of protecting public health, particularly addressing water consumption for humans, and animals.

(38 comments)

15%

Of the 72 individuals (five per cent) that **disagree** that we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change, 32 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

	**Waste of time and/or money** Concerns included that we are already doing enough and/or wanting to avoid additional costs in the currently difficult economic environment. (6 comments)	19%
	**Generally do not support** People generally do not support the proposal without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do. (5 comments)	16%

Of the 201 individuals (13 per cent) that provided **another response**, 28 individuals provided comments. The most common theme was:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (7 comments).

Organisations


Of the 15 organisations (94 per cent) that **agree** that we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change, 13 provided a comment. The common themes were:

- General support (4 comments)
- Aquatic life protection (3 comments)
- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments).

One organisation (18 per cent) provided **another response** and comment.

13.0 Do you think we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,596)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Yes	1,294	13
No	119	2
Other	41	2
I don't know	125	0
TOTAL	**1,579**	**17**

Individuals

Of the 1,294 individuals (82 per cent) that **agree** we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change, 269 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

General support

People generally support the proposal without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(81 comments)

30%

Aquatic life protection

Comments emphasised that temperature regulation is important in maintaining biodiversity and aquatic plant growth, the preservation of aquatic life, and protecting freshwater ecosystems.

(75 comments)

28%

Of the 119 individuals (eight per cent) that **disagree** we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change, 60 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

	**Climate change is inevitable** Comments are skeptical about the value of controlling water temperature as climate change is inevitable and that the focus should be on more controllable factors. (22 comments)	**37%**
	**Waste of time and/or money** Concerns included that we are already doing enough and/or wanting to avoid additional costs in the currently difficult economic environment. (8 comments)	**13%**

Of the 166 individuals (11 per cent) that provided **another response**, 40 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (8 comments)
- I don't know or need more information (8 comments)
- Climate change is inevitable (3 comments)
- Plant trees to reduce water temperatures (3 comments).

Organisations

Of the 13 organisations (76 per cent) that **agree** we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change, and nine provided a comment. The common theme was:


- Plant trees to reduce water temperatures (3 comments).

Two organisations (12 per cent) **disagree** that we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change, and provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

Two organisations (12 per cent) provided **another response** and comments. Both provided specific suggestions for refinement.

14.0 What do you think about our proposal to at least maintain the state of waterbodies where they are already good and set ambitious targets to improve the health of waterbodies where they are poor?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,582)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Strongly support	1,058	10
Mostly support	372	3
Mostly do not support	27	3
Strongly do not support	46	0
I don't know	62	1
TOTAL	**1,565**	**17**

Individuals

Of the 1,430 individuals (91 per cent) that **support** the proposal and targets, 253 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Address water quality

Comments support our proposal and ambitious targets, addressing concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, including addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and ecologically sound water management practices.

(86 comments)

34%

General support

People generally support the proposal and targets without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(77 comments)

30%

Sustainable future planning
Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(29 comments)

11%

Of the 73 individuals (five per cent) that **do not support** the proposal and targets, 46 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

Too focused on the Māori perspective
Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(23 comments)

50%

Of the 62 individuals (four per cent) that provided **another response**, ten individuals provided comments. The most common theme was:

- Too focused on the Māori perspective (3 comments).

Organisations

Of the 13 organisations (76 per cent) that **support** the proposal and targets, and nine provided a comment. The common themes were:

- Support for ambitious targets and advocating high standards (3 comments)
- General support (2 comments)
- Address water quality (2 comments)
- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (2 comments).

Of the three organisations (18 per cent) that **do not support** the proposal and targets, and all three provided comments. The common theme was:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments).

One organisation (12 per cent) provided **another response** and provided a comment.

15.0 How should we strike the balance between maintaining food security and improving water quality in the Pukekohe Specified Vegetable Growing Area?

People were asked to provide comments in an open question (n=514)

Individuals

Of the 503 individuals that provided comments, the most common themes were:

	Advocacy for sustainable agriculture Comments are advocating for stainable farming practices with a focus on water conservation, reuse, and alternative growing methods, highlighting education, collaboration, and robust monitoring as integral to a successful strategy for addressing water quality concerns (105 comments)	21%
	Take a balanced approach Comments raised the importance striking a balance between food security and water quality while considering economic factors and growth control. (88 comments)	17%


Organisations

Of the 11 organisations that provided comments, the most common themes were:

- Specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments)
- Advocacy for sustainable agriculture (3 comments)
- Communication, education, and engagement (2 comments).

16.0 Tell us what you think about the draft management options being considered?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,547)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,303	11
Disagree	78	2
Other	36	5
I don't know	111	1
TOTAL	**1,528**	**19**

Individuals

Of the 1,303 individuals (85 per cent) that **support** the draft management options being considered, 186 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



General support

People generally support the draft management options without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(89 comments)

48%



Better planning or management

Comments would like to have improved plans and management of waterways, emphasising a need for specialised solutions rather than a blanket approach.

(29 comments)

16%



Address water quality

People support the options being considered, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, including addressing pollution concerns, and advocating for sustainable and ecologically sound water management practices.

(27 comments)

15%

Of the 78 individuals (five per cent) that **do not support** the draft management options being considered, 46 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(8 comments)

17%



Waste of time and/or money

Concerns included that we are already doing enough and/or wanting to avoid additional costs in the currently difficult economic environment.

(7 comments)

15%

Of the 147 individuals (nine per cent) that provided **another response**, 31 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- General support (4 comments)
- Address water quality (4 comments)
- Too focused on the Māori perspective (4 comments)
- I don't know or need more information (4 comments).

Organisations

Of the 11 organisations (58 per cent) that **support** the consideration of the draft management options, and nine provided a comment. The common theme was:

- Better planning or management (4 comments).

Two organisations (11 per cent) **do not support** the consideration of the draft management options, and both provided comments. There were no significant themes within these comments.

Of the six organisation (32 per cent) that provided **another response**, five provided comments. The most common theme was:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments).

17.0 Are there other management options outside of those listed that you think we should consider?

People were asked to provide comments in an open question (n=212)

Individuals

Of the 198 individuals that provided comments, the most common themes were:



Sustainable future planning

Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(24 comments)

12%

	Better planning or management Comments would like to have improved plans and management of waterways, emphasising a need for specialised solutions rather than a blanket approach. (24 comments)	12%
	Communication, education and engagement Increased community involvement and communication from Council. (23 comments)	12%
	Too focused on the Māori perspective Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally. (21 comments)	11%

Organisations


Of the 14 organisations that provided comments, the most common themes were:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (11 comments)
- Sustainable future planning (3 comments).

E. Habitat protection and improvement

18.0 What do you think of our proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,475)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Agree	1,217	13
Disagree	88	0
Other	34	2
I don't know	120	1
TOTAL	**1,459**	**16**

Individuals

Of the 1,217 individuals (83 per cent) that **support** the proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation, 207 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Address water quality

People support the proposal, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies for fish and other aquatic life, advocating for holistic strategies like daylighting streams, wide buffers, and responsible development rules.

(45 comments)

22%



General support

People generally support the proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(39 comments)

19%



Sustainable fishing practices

Comments highlight the need for sustainable fishing practices to protect native fish species and their habitats.

(34 comments)

16%

Of the 88 individuals (six per cent) that **do not support** the proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation, 45 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(17 comments)

38%

Of the 154 individuals (ten per cent) that provided **another response**, 54 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- I don't know or need more information (20 comments)
- Mana whenua should be involved (9 comments)
- Too focused on the Māori perspective (8 comments).

Organisations


Of the 13 organisations (81 per cent) that **support** the proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation, eight provided a comment. The most common theme was:

- General support (3 comments).

Of the three organisations (19 per cent) that provided **another response**, two provided comments. Both made specific suggestions for refinement.

19.0 Do you think we should retain our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams where they are higher than national requirements?

People were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,475)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Yes	1,231	13
No	98	1
Other	14	1
I don't know	114	0
TOTAL	**1,457**	**15**

Individuals

Of the 1,231 individuals (84 per cent) that **support** retaining our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams, 192 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



General support

People generally support our approach to retain our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(96 comments)

50%



Address water quality

People support retaining our existing regional standards, addressing their concerns for the health, quality, and sustainability of water bodies, highlighting the important role wetlands and streams play in maintaining water quality, supporting fauna, and preserving ecological balance.

(37 comments)

19%



Be more ambitious

Comments empahsised the urgent need for stronger protection measures, advocating for stricter rules beyond current standards in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

(21 comments)

11%

Of the 88 individuals (six per cent) that **do not support** retaining our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams, 36 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:



General do not support

People generally do not support our approach to retain our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams without providing any clear reason or explanation as to why they do.

(8 comments)

22%



Too focused on the Māori perspective

Concerns the plan focuses too heavily on Māori values and language - potentially neglecting other perspectives and hindering understanding for those unfamiliar with Māori culture, and/or opposition to co-governance arrangements with Māori entities - based on a belief that all cultures should be engaged with and considered equally.

(6 comments)

17%

Of the 154 individuals (ten per cent) that provided **another response**, 25 individuals provided comments. The most common themes were:

- I don't know or need more information (8 comments)
- Too focused on the Māori perspective (6 comments).

Organisations

Of the 13 organisations (87 per cent) that **support** retaining our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams, and 11 provided a comment. The most common themes were:

- General support (3 comments)
- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (3 comments)
- Address water quality (2 comments)
- Communication, education, and engagement (2 comments).

One organisation (seven per cent) that **does not support** retaining our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams provided a comment.

One organisation (seven per cent) provided **another response** and also provided a comment.

F. Water Quantity

20.0 How do you suggest the council fairly reduces water allocations to existing consent holders where that is considered necessary?

People were asked to provide comments in an open question (n=511)

Individuals

Of the 1,231 individuals that provided comments, the most common themes were:



Efficiency Management

Comments highlight the importance of a comprehensive and adaptive approach to water management, incorporating measures such as metering, restrictions, quota-based allocation, adjustment based on usage levels, and incentives.

(131 comments)

26%



Address water scarcity

Comments encouraged responsible and transparent water resource management, emphasising collaboration, prioritisation based on output and population quotas, and the need for continuous monitoring to address concerns about water scarcity.

(83 comments)

17%



Sustainable future planning

Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations.

(76 comments)

15%

Organisations

Of the 10 organisations that provided comments, the most common themes were:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (5 comments)
- Sustainable future planning (3 comments).

21.0 How do you think we should prioritise allocation where or when water is scarce?

People were asked to provide comments in an open question (n=492)

Individuals

Of the 480 individuals that provided comments, the most common themes were:

	**Prioritise human consumption** Comments had an emphasis of prioritising human health, hydration and consumption. (191 comments)	40%
	**Efficiency management** Comments highlight the importance of a comprehensive and adaptive approach to water management, incorporating measures such as metering, restrictions, quota-based allocation, adjustment based on usage levels, and incentives. (71 comments)	15%
	**Prioritise farming/food production** Comments had an emphasis on the role of water in sustaining agriculture and ensuring food security. (61 comments)	13%
	**Sustainable future planning** Comments raised the importance of sustainable practices, climate change mitigation, and protecting our waterways for future generations. (58 comments)	12%

Organisations

Of the 12 organisations that provided comments, the most common themes were:

- Provided specific suggestions for refinement (4 comments)
- Communication, education, and engagement (3 comments).

G. Other feedback

22.0 Do you have any other feedback on improving freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland?

People were asked to provide comments in an open question (n=899)

Most comments reiterated points raised in previous questions, most notably:

- The proposal is too focused on the on the Māori perspective (467 comments)
- We need to address water quality (113 comments).

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
1	Who we heard from	45
2	Local Board breakdowns by question	47
3	Hobson’s Pledge campaign	80

ATTACHMENT ONE: Who we heard from

Feedback was received via:

- Our online feedback form (1,386)
- Our hard copy feedback form (2,361)
- Email (21)
- Other sources (131)

The information below shows demographic information as provided by submitters. Not all submitters responded to each question, so totals for each table do not match the total number of submissions.


RESPONSES


GENDER	#	%
Male	1,841	52%
Female	1,666	47%
Another gender	21	1%
Total	**3,528**	**100%**

AGE	Male	Female	Another gender	Total	%
< 15	89	92	1	182	5%
15 – 24	144	151	0	302	9%
25 – 34	167	174	3	347	10%
35 – 44	192	219	5	420	12%
45 – 54	195	191	2	392	11%
55 – 64	330	343	6	688	20%
65 – 74	420	350	1	787	22%
75 +	263	123	3	392	11%
Total submitters providing data				**3510**	**100%**

ETHNICITY	#	%
European	**1,029**	**30%**
Pākehā/NZ European	897	26%
Other European	132	4%
Māori	**166**	**5%**
Pacific	**1,127**	**33%**
Samoan	856	25%
Cook Islands Māori	42	1%
Tongan	25	1%
Other Pasifika	204	6%
Asian	**1,242**	**36%**
Chinese	1,036	30%
Southeast Asian	158	5%
Korean	35	1%
Indian	5	0%
Other Asian	8	0%
Middle Eastern/Latin American/ African	**43**	**1%**
Other (incl. Kiwi/New Zealander)	**154**	**4%**
Total submitters providing data	**3460**	**NA***

COMPARISON TO CENSUS





* Note : will add to more than 100 per cent as submitters could identify with more than one ethnicity

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

RESIDENT LOCAL BOARD	Individuals	Organisations
Albert-Eden	147	1
Devonport-Takapuna	8	0
Franklin Local Board	146	3
Great Barrier	91	2
Henderson-Massey	375	1
Hibiscus and Bays	228	1
Howick	229	1
Kaipātiki	119	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	304	1
Manurewa	145	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	133	0
Ōrākei	103	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	190	0
Papakura	61	0
Puketāpapa	52	0
Rodney	135	4
Upper Harbour	224	1
Waiheke	23	3
Waitākere Ranges	105	0
Waitematā	76	1
Whau	320	0
Other (Not supplied, outside Auckland or regional organisation)	518	12

ATTACHMENT TWO: Local Board breakdowns

1.0 What do you think about the direction we are proposing in the region-wide vision statement?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Strongly support	Mostly support	Mostly do not support	Strongly do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	126	42%	15%	6%	31%	6%
Aotea/Great Barrier	5	20%	0%	0%	80%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	128	35%	30%	4%	28%	2%
Franklin	73	11%	15%	12%	59%	3%
Henderson-Massey	359	77%	11%	1%	6%	6%
Hibiscus and Bays	195	46%	15%	3%	33%	3%
Howick	207	37%	26%	4%	29%	5%
Kaipātiki	108	42%	30%	3%	17%	9%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	302	97%	1%	1%	2%	0%
Manurewa	142	91%	2%	1%	5%	1%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	120	44%	15%	4%	33%	4%
Ōrākei	83	25%	16%	7%	51%	1%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	187	94%	3%	0%	2%	1%
Papakura	54	56%	15%	2%	26%	2%
Puketāpapa	50	56%	22%	2%	16%	4%
Rodney	114	17%	16%	6%	60%	2%
Upper Harbour	213	50%	36%	0%	10%	3%
Waiheke	15	20%	27%	13%	40%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	93	70%	12%	1%	16%	1%
Waitematā	66	24%	24%	3%	48%	0%
Whau	313	90%	5%	0%	3%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Strongly support	Mostly support	Mostly do not support	Strongly do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	8	0	0	0	0	8
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	5	1	1	0	0	3
Franklin	3	1	0	0	0	2
Henderson-Massey	22	1	0	0	0	21
Hibiscus and Bays	6	0	0	0	0	6
Howick	11	0	1	0	0	10
Kaipātiki	12	1	1	0	0	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	2	1	0	0	0	1
Manurewa	2	1	0	0	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	5	0	0	0	0	5
Ōrākei	2	0	0	1	0	1
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	2	0	0	0	0	2
Papakura	1	0	0	0	0	1
Puketāpapa	2	0	0	0	0	2
Rodney	5	0	3	0	0	2
Upper Harbour	7	0	0	0	0	7
Waiheke	3	2	1	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	1	0	0	0	0	1
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	2	0	0	0	0	2
Regional organisation	1	0	1	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

2.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Hauraki FMU?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	67	57%	24%	9%	10%
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	89	73%	13%	9%	4%
Franklin	16	38%	50%	6%	6%
Henderson-Massey	152	92%	4%	0%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	129	82%	12%	4%	2%
Howick	107	80%	9%	5%	6%
Kaipātiki	90	74%	7%	13%	6%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	17	53%	6%	0%	41%
Manurewa	7	86%	0%	14%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	38	66%	24%	8%	3%
Ōrākei	35	63%	20%	11%	6%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	21	71%	10%	5%	14%
Papakura	14	64%	14%	21%	0%
Puketāpapa	17	71%	12%	6%	12%
Rodney	33	45%	27%	24%	3%
Upper Harbour	181	92%	2%	3%	3%
Waiheke	5	60%	20%	20%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	38	47%	8%	3%	16%
Waitematā	32	50%	34%	6%	9%
Whau	262	97%	1%	1%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	0	1	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	2	0	0	2	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	1	0	0	1	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

3.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Kaipara FMU?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	61	61%	21%	7%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	79	76%	8%	3%	14%
Franklin	11	45%	45%	9%	0%
Henderson-Massey	153	89%	6%	2%	3%
Hibiscus and Bays	111	83%	6%	1%	10%
Howick	103	72%	7%	4%	17%
Kaipātiki	70	63%	7%	7%	23%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	16	50%	6%	0%	44%
Manurewa	7	71%	0%	29%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	32	53%	13%	3%	31%
Ōrākei	27	63%	11%	11%	15%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	20	60%	5%	5%	30%
Papakura	14	50%	14%	21%	14%
Puketāpapa	14	79%	7%	7%	7%
Rodney	29	55%	28%	14%	3%
Upper Harbour	168	85%	1%	0%	14%
Waiheke	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	36	81%	3%	0%	17%
Waitematā	22	55%	32%	0%	14%
Whau	261	96%	2%	0%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	1	1	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	1	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	0	0	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	1	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	1	0	0	1	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

4.0 What do you think about our proposed vision statement for the Manukau FMU?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	61	61%	23%	5%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	79	77%	8%	3%	13%
Franklin	27	22%	33%	33%	11%
Henderson-Massey	180	96%	4%	1%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	111	82%	7%	0%	11%
Howick	115	70%	13%	3%	13%
Kaipātiki	71	66%	7%	4%	23%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	24	88%	8%	0%	4%
Manurewa	11	82%	0%	9%	9%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	35	69%	17%	3%	11%
Ōrākei	30	57%	17%	10%	17%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	27	67%	15%	0%	19%
Papakura	20	50%	20%	20%	10%
Puketāpapa	16	69%	19%	6%	6%
Rodney	21	38%	29%	14%	19%
Upper Harbour	165	83%	2%	0%	15%
Waiheke	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	52	92%	4%	2%	2%
Waitematā	22	50%	32%	5%	14%
Whau	263	97%	1%	0%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	1	1	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	1	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	1	1	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	0	0	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	1	1	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

5.0 Do you think we should add 'resilience' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	67	78%	9%	3%	10%
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	50%	0%	0%	50%
Devonport-Takapuna	93	71%	5%	10%	14%
Franklin	28	57%	32%	11%	0%
Henderson-Massey	170	54%	35%	1%	10%
Hibiscus and Bays	131	86%	6%	2%	6%
Howick	119	66%	12%	2%	21%
Kaipātiki	86	76%	8%	2%	14%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	25	88%	0%	4%	8%
Manurewa	10	90%	0%	10%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	41	68%	17%	2%	12%
Ōrākei	33	76%	6%	6%	12%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	26	77%	12%	0%	12%
Papakura	17	53%	29%	0%	18%
Puketāpapa	17	82%	0%	6%	12%
Rodney	42	76%	17%	7%	0%
Upper Harbour	183	85%	2%	2%	11%
Waiheke	7	86%	14%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	45	87%	4%	0%	9%
Waitematā	27	70%	15%	4%	11%
Whau	263	98%	0%	0%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	1	1	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	1	1	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	2	2	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	1	1	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	0	1	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	1	1	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	3	3	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	2	2	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

6.0 Do you think we should add 'amenity' as a value in the Auckland Unitary Plan?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	67	73%	6%	0%	21%
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	92	88%	7%	1%	4%
Franklin	28	46%	39%	4%	11%
Henderson-Massey	169	56%	35%	2%	8%
Hibiscus and Bays	132	86%	10%	1%	3%
Howick	118	78%	9%	2%	11%
Kaipātiki	91	85%	7%	2%	7%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	25	96%	0%	4%	0%
Manurewa	10	60%	10%	0%	30%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	40	83%	13%	3%	3%
Ōrākei	32	69%	13%	3%	16%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	25	84%	8%	0%	8%
Papakura	16	63%	25%	6%	6%
Puketāpapa	16	81%	6%	6%	6%
Rodney	37	73%	8%	8%	11%
Upper Harbour	183	92%	3%	1%	4%
Waiheke	7	71%	14%	0%	14%
Waitākere Ranges	46	85%	0%	2%	13%
Waitematā	27	63%	30%	4%	4%
Whau	264	98%	0%	0%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	1	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	1	0	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	1	1	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	0	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

7.0 Do you have any feedback on the proposed environmental outcomes?

As this was an open-ended question, there is no breakdown of results by local board.

8.0 What do you think about our approach to identify outstanding waterbodies, with criteria for Māori cultural values, ecological, landscape and recreational values?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	98	44%	47%	4%	5%
Aotea/Great Barrier	3	0%	67%	33%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	114	48%	42%	5%	4%
Franklin	63	6%	76%	8%	10%
Henderson-Massey	187	79%	12%	7%	2%
Hibiscus and Bays	153	48%	46%	3%	3%
Howick	161	45%	46%	2%	7%
Kaipātiki	87	33%	32%	6%	29%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	27	70%	19%	4%	7%
Manurewa	18	44%	44%	6%	6%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	74	39%	51%	7%	3%
Ōrākei	77	27%	64%	5%	4%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	29	69%	21%	0%	10%
Papakura	27	26%	70%	4%	0%
Puketāpapa	24	54%	33%	0%	13%
Rodney	102	17%	70%	13%	1%
Upper Harbour	186	68%	17%	4%	11%
Waiheke	8	13%	75%	13%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	51	65%	20%	4%	12%
Waitematā	56	27%	61%	9%	4%
Whau	272	93%	4%	1%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	1	0	1	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	0	1	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	0	1	1	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	2	0	2	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	1	1	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	2	0	1	1	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

9.0 Tell us what you think about our approach to use the Safeswim sites as our primary contact sites, and introduce stricter standards to manage contamination in these catchments?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	85	71%	13%	2%	14%
Aotea/Great Barrier	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	103	82%	8%	6%	5%
Franklin	53	58%	23%	11%	8%
Henderson-Massey	176	92%	1%	2%	5%
Hibiscus and Bays	130	84%	10%	2%	4%
Howick	139	82%	9%	1%	7%
Kaipātiki	78	81%	3%	10%	6%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	23	52%	4%	17%	26%
Manurewa	16	63%	13%	6%	19%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	55	73%	15%	7%	5%
Ōrākei	52	87%	8%	4%	2%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	27	78%	7%	0%	15%
Papakura	21	71%	10%	10%	10%
Puketāpapa	24	75%	4%	8%	13%
Rodney	59	75%	17%	5%	3%
Upper Harbour	176	91%	3%	1%	5%
Waiheke	5	80%	0%	0%	20%
Waitākere Ranges	45	80%	11%	0%	9%
Waitematā	45	62%	24%	2%	11%
Whau	268	97%	1%	0%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	0	1	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	1	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	1	0	1	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	2	0	2	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

10.0 What do you think about the summaries of the baseline health of our rivers/streams and lakes?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	62	79%	3%	2%	16%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	85	72%	7%	1%	20%
Franklin	22	59%	14%	14%	14%
Henderson-Massey	162	90%	2%	1%	8%
Hibiscus and Bays	127	83%	7%	2%	9%
Howick	117	79%	3%	1%	17%
Kaipātiki	80	86%	4%	3%	8%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	20	80%	10%	5%	5%
Manurewa	8	63%	13%	25%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	39	79%	8%	3%	10%
Ōrākei	33	94%	3%	0%	3%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	25	60%	8%	8%	24%
Papakura	16	69%	6%	0%	25%
Puketāpapa	18	72%	11%	11%	6%
Rodney	36	58%	11%	11%	19%
Upper Harbour	176	97%	1%	0%	2%
Waiheke	4	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	41	83%	2%	0%	15%
Waitematā	23	65%	13%	13%	9%
Whau	262	97%	1%	0%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	0	1	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	1	0	1	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	1	1	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	2	0	2	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	1	0	1	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

11.0 How satisfied are you with the health of Tamaki Makaurau's river, streams and lakes?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	I don't know
Albert-Eden	65	31%	34%	9%	15%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	90	31%	41%	13%	12%	2%
Franklin	22	14%	41%	27%	14%	5%
Henderson-Massey	162	23%	56%	2%	5%	13%
Hibiscus and Bays	133	19%	61%	10%	8%	3%
Howick	117	15%	47%	22%	5%	10%
Kaipātiki	81	14%	44%	32%	6%	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	20	10%	30%	15%	25%	20%
Manurewa	10	20%	20%	10%	40%	10%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	38	16%	39%	21%	13%	11%
Ōrākei	35	9%	31%	37%	17%	6%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	25	20%	40%	12%	16%	12%
Papakura	16	0%	44%	31%	6%	19%
Puketāpapa	18	0%	33%	44%	11%	11%
Rodney	36	3%	47%	25%	19%	6%
Upper Harbour	182	23%	62%	10%	4%	1%
Waiheke	4	0%	50%	25%	25%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	42	55%	10%	12%	14%	10%
Waitematā	25	12%	32%	16%	20%	20%
Whau	263	91%	3%	2%	2%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	I don't know
Albert-Eden	7	0	0	0	0	7
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	3	0	0	0	1	2
Franklin	1	0	0	0	0	1
Henderson-Massey	22	0	0	0	1	21
Hibiscus and Bays	4	0	0	0	0	4
Howick	13	0	0	1	0	12
Kaipātiki	5	0	0	0	2	3
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	5	0	0	0	1	4
Manurewa	2	0	0	1	0	1
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	4	0	0	0	0	4
Ōrākei	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	3	0	0	0	0	3
Papakura	3	0	0	0	0	3
Puketāpapa	2	0	0	0	0	2
Rodney	5	0	0	1	2	2
Upper Harbour	2	0	0	0	0	2
Waiheke	3	0	0	0	3	0
Waitākere Ranges	4	0	0	0	0	4
Waitematā	5	0	0	0	0	5
Whau	4	0	0	0	0	4
Regional organisation	1	0	0	1	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

12.0 Do you think we should include and manage copper and zinc as attributes for urban streams in this plan change?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	64	72%	8%	3%	17%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	90	83%	7%	3%	7%
Franklin	21	62%	5%	19%	14%
Henderson-Massey	162	90%	1%	2%	8%
Hibiscus and Bays	129	86%	8%	1%	5%
Howick	112	79%	4%	3%	13%
Kaipātiki	81	77%	2%	1%	20%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	20	70%	0%	20%	10%
Manurewa	9	78%	11%	0%	11%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	37	59%	19%	5%	16%
Ōrākei	35	91%	6%	0%	3%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	24	71%	8%	0%	21%
Papakura	15	87%	13%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	18	78%	0%	0%	22%
Rodney	36	75%	6%	8%	11%
Upper Harbour	181	82%	3%	0%	15%
Waiheke	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	41	80%	2%	2%	15%
Waitematā	23	65%	17%	4%	13%
Whau	261	98%	0%	0%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	0	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

13.0 Do you think we should include and manage temperature as an attribute in this plan change?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	64	70%	11%	2%	17%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	89	80%	9%	7%	4%
Franklin	21	29%	38%	10%	24%
Henderson-Massey	162	92%	2%	1%	5%
Hibiscus and Bays	131	80%	11%	2%	6%
Howick	117	84%	4%	4%	8%
Kaipātiki	87	84%	6%	7%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	20	60%	5%	10%	25%
Manurewa	8	88%	0%	13%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	39	72%	15%	5%	8%
Ōrākei	35	77%	20%	0%	3%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	24	75%	13%	0%	13%
Papakura	15	73%	20%	0%	7%
Puketāpapa	18	83%	0%	6%	11%
Rodney	36	69%	19%	6%	6%
Upper Harbour	186	83%	3%	1%	13%
Waiheke	4	75%	0%	0%	25%
Waitākere Ranges	44	86%	2%	0%	11%
Waitematā	25	72%	12%	8%	8%
Whau	261	98%	0%	0%	2%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	2	0	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	0	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

14.0 What do you think about our proposal to at least maintain the state of waterbodies where they are already good and set ambitious targets to improve the health of waterbodies where they are poor?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Strongly support	Mostly support	Mostly do not support	Strongly do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	64	55%	30%	2%	5%	9%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	87	70%	21%	7%	1%	1%
Franklin	22	27%	55%	5%	9%	5%
Henderson-Massey	163	69%	22%	1%	1%	7%
Hibiscus and Bays	129	74%	21%	1%	4%	1%
Howick	118	57%	35%	1%	2%	6%
Kaipātiki	86	67%	27%	0%	3%	2%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	20	65%	10%	0%	5%	20%
Manurewa	9	56%	22%	11%	11%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	38	37%	47%	3%	8%	5%
Ōrākei	35	69%	29%	0%	3%	0%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	25	52%	24%	0%	8%	16%
Papakura	15	53%	40%	7%	0%	0%
Puketāpapa	18	28%	61%	6%	0%	6%
Rodney	36	44%	33%	11%	6%	6%
Upper Harbour	183	73%	24%	0%	2%	1%
Waiheke	4	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	42	74%	7%	0%	2%	17%
Waitematā	25	40%	32%	4%	16%	8%
Whau	261	97%	2%	0%	0%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Strongly support	Mostly support	Mostly do not support	Strongly do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	6	0	0	0	0	6
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	2	0	1	0	0	1
Franklin	2	1	0	0	0	1
Henderson-Massey	12	1	0	0	0	11
Hibiscus and Bays	1	0	0	0	0	1
Howick	8	1	0	0	0	7
Kaipātiki	4	0	2	0	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	5	1	0	0	0	4
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ōrākei	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	4	0	0	0	0	4
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	1	0	0	0	0	1
Rodney	5	1	0	2	0	2
Upper Harbour	1	0	0	0	0	1
Waiheke	3	3	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	7	0	0	0	0	7
Waitematā	2	0	0	0	0	2
Whau	2	0	0	0	0	2
Regional organisation	1	1	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

15.0 How should we strike the balance between maintaining food security and improving water quality in the Pukekohe Specified Vegetable Growing Area?

As this was an open-ended question, there is no breakdown of results by local board.

16.0 Tell us what you think about the draft management options being considered?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	62	73%	6%	2%	19%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	88	84%	8%	2%	6%
Franklin	23	52%	22%	22%	4%
Henderson-Massey	158	91%	2%	2%	6%
Hibiscus and Bays	128	90%	5%	2%	3%
Howick	113	87%	3%	2%	9%
Kaipātiki	84	89%	4%	2%	5%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	17	59%	18%	0%	24%
Manurewa	8	88%	13%	0%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	38	71%	11%	11%	8%
Ōrākei	33	82%	6%	0%	12%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	24	71%	13%	0%	17%
Papakura	15	53%	20%	0%	27%
Puketāpapa	15	80%	7%	7%	7%
Rodney	33	58%	33%	6%	3%
Upper Harbour	178	96%	2%	1%	2%
Waiheke	4	75%	0%	0%	25%
Waitākere Ranges	38	84%	3%	0%	13%
Waitematā	24	63%	17%	0%	21%
Whau	259	98%	0%	0%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	1	0	1	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	1	0	1	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	3	1	1	1	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	1	0	1	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	0	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

17.0 Are there other management options outside of those listed that you think we should consider?

As this was an open-ended question, there is no breakdown of results by local board.

18.0 What do you think of our proposal to prioritise catchments across the region for fish passage remediation?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	65	74%	9%	2%	15%
Aotea/Great Barrier	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	88	72%	8%	2%	18%
Franklin	25	36%	20%	16%	28%
Henderson-Massey	165	84%	4%	6%	5%
Hibiscus and Bays	100	82%	11%	1%	6%
Howick	109	83%	5%	2%	10%
Kaipātiki	67	79%	3%	4%	13%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	19	68%	11%	5%	16%
Manurewa	9	78%	11%	0%	11%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	35	83%	11%	0%	6%
Ōrākei	33	76%	18%	3%	3%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	24	71%	13%	0%	17%
Papakura	14	64%	21%	0%	14%
Puketāpapa	16	81%	13%	0%	6%
Rodney	37	57%	14%	11%	19%
Upper Harbour	164	95%	2%	0%	2%
Waiheke	4	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	40	83%	3%	0%	15%
Waitematā	21	67%	24%	0%	10%
Whau	260	99%	0%	0%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Agree	Disagree	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	1	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	1	0	1	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	0	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

19.0 Do you think we should retain our existing regional standards for wetlands and streams where they are higher than national requirements?

Feedback from **individuals** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	64	75%	9%	0%	16%
Aotea/Great Barrier	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	88	88%	5%	1%	7%
Franklin	25	64%	24%	4%	8%
Henderson-Massey	161	93%	3%	0%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	98	85%	7%	1%	7%
Howick	112	83%	4%	1%	13%
Kaipātiki	69	87%	4%	1%	7%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	17	65%	0%	0%	35%
Manurewa	9	67%	11%	0%	22%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	35	74%	11%	0%	14%
Ōrākei	34	88%	12%	0%	0%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	23	70%	13%	0%	17%
Papakura	14	86%	7%	0%	7%
Puketāpapa	16	50%	25%	0%	25%
Rodney	37	59%	24%	3%	14%
Upper Harbour	165	91%	6%	1%	2%
Waiheke	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	39	82%	5%	0%	13%
Waitematā	22	77%	18%	0%	5%
Whau	260	98%	0%	0%	1%

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

Feedback from **organisations** by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Yes	No	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	0	0	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	0	0	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	0	0	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	0	0	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	1	1	0	0
Upper Harbour	0	0	0	0	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	0	0	0	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0
Regional organisation	0	0	0	0	0

Note - this table only includes feedback where the local board of residence is known.

20.0 How do you suggest the council fairly reduces water allocations to existing consent holders where that is considered necessary?

As this was an open-ended question, there is no breakdown of results by local board.


21.0 How do you think we should prioritise allocation where or when water is scarce?

As this was an open-ended question, there is no breakdown of results by local board.

22.0 Do you have any other feedback on improving freshwater in Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland?

As this was an open-ended question, there is no breakdown of results by local board.

ATTACHMENT THREE: ‘Hobson’s Pledge campaign’



HOBSON'S pledge

Email address STAY INFORMED

HOME ABOUT US CAMPAIGNS THE UPDATE CONTACT SIGN UP DONATE

No place for race in freshwater policies

While it is an exciting time in central government politics, I need to direct your attention to another local government matter.

Auckland Council is developing its freshwater management plans and has put some documents out for consultation with the public. As I am sure you can imagine, we have identified some issues...

- For a start, the Council states: **“Freshwater is precious and limited, a taonga of huge significance, and of particular importance to Māori.”**
- They also mention that in addition to the public consultation, **“There is a separate and ongoing programme of engagement with mana whenua in Auckland.”**

MAKE A SUBMISSION BY DECEMBER 4TH

The documents reveal a persistent presumption that Māori have a special relationship with water that is not shared by the rest of the community and that they have “stronger ambitions to improve our waterways”.

Water is the essence of ALL life, so everyone has an interest in healthy water. **All Aucklanders should be equal stakeholders in how freshwater is managed in their city.**

In the far-reaching consultation document, Auckland Council presents the idea that Māori are entitled to be involved to a much greater degree in the decision-making, monitoring and management, plus allocation, of Auckland’s freshwater.

They’re now asking for Aucklanders’ input to this new policy, **yet engagement with mana whenua has already been undertaken through a separate process.**

Hobson’s Pledge doesn’t claim to be an expert on the scientific or regional issues covered by the Council’s proposals, but we do recognise the potential for frightening consequences from giving exclusive, unaccountable rights over water to one sector of the community.

We say people must not be divided by ancestral lines. Policies and rules must apply to us all equally.

What can you do?

CLICK HERE TO MAKE A SUBMISSION

All questions are optional. You will first be asked to choose which sections you wish to give feedback on. Select as many as you like.

We suggest that if you want to submit on the racial aspects of the plan you should select **‘A. Long-term vision’** and **‘C. Waterbodies where special management is required’.**

You can also provide feedback in the box labelled **G. Other Feedback.**

CLICK HERE FOR MORE ADVICE FOR SUBMITTING

Please tell Auckland Council what you think by 4 December 2023.

posted November 27, 2023

Share

Sign in with:

Or sign up:

Email address STAY INFORMED

DONATE

Subscribe with RSS