


# Waste bylaw and control review 2026

Summary of feedback received during Auckland Council's public consultation from 20 January to 22 February 2026



# Waste bylaw and control review 2026



## Te take mō te pūrongo

### Purpose of the report

This report summarises feedback received during the consultation period of 20 January to 22 February 2026 on the waste bylaw.

It does not provide advice or recommendations based on the feedback received.

## Whakarāpopototanga matua

### Executive summary

**TOTAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED: 63**

### Overview of the consultation

Council makes waste rules about waste storage, kerbside and private property collection services, use of public waste bins, licencing of waste collectors and collection of waste data from waste collectors and waste facilities. These rules help to minimise public nuisance, health and safety risks and waste to landfill caused by improper storage and disposal of waste in Auckland.

We recently checked how our Waste Bylaw and Controls are working and identified improvements. Most proposed changes will have limited noticeable impact on people's day-to-day waste activities while other changes only impact waste collectors and facilities.

In this review, we propose changes to improve the Waste Bylaw by:

- updating rules for waste collectors that require a licence from council
- expanding the waste facilities that require a licence from council
- expanding options for how people can dispose of waste
- adding rules to ensure waste is appropriately stored and contained onsite, and rules about waste collection from private properties
- removing rules that are unnecessary, unused or duplicated elsewhere
- better explain rules in the 2023 Collections Control
- simplify council's regulatory approach by transferring relevant rules from the Waste Bylaw to other bylaws.

Other key aspects of the current Bylaw and Control are proposed to be retained, including that people must continue to dispose of their waste according to the Bylaw and Control and that waste collectors and facilities must still obtain a licence from council to operate in Auckland.

The proposal does not include specific rules for construction and demolition waste. Council has decided to undertake further investigation before deciding whether or not to propose new rules.

### **Who we heard from**

A detailed breakdown of people who gave their demographic information when submitting feedback is provided in **Attachment One**. While only a little over half of submitters gave demographic information, some key points to note include:

- 69 per cent of submitters were of European ethnicity, while 15 per cent identified as Asian, and eight per cent identified as Māori
- The majority of submitters (82 per cent) were fairly evenly spread between the ages of 35 and 74 years old.

### **Local board breakdowns**

A breakdown of results by local board area is provided in **Attachment Two**.

## Urupare

### Feedback

The following breakdown of feedback received summarises ‘top line’ responses from individuals and organisations.

It does not include common themes from comments made in submissions. More detail on common themes will be provided later for bylaw deliberations.

### Section 1 – Proposed changes impacting those needing a waste collection license

Under the proposal, **waste collectors** must still obtain a licence (approval) from council. Improvements are proposed to both the types of collectors that require a licence and to licence information requirements, assessment criteria and conditions.

#### We are proposing to improve requirements for waste collectors.


This includes to:

- revise and clarify the definition of waste collectors that require a licence (approval) from council.  
This includes:
  - removing the current 20 tonne annual exemption
  - adding exemptions for businesses who deal with waste as an incidental function of their primary activity (for example landscapers taking a customer’s garden waste to a composting facility)
- allow licence conditions to be updated to include any relevant waste collector requirements currently contained in the 2013 Containers Control
- simplify licensing information requirements, assessment criteria and conditions.

Refer clauses 11, 13-20, 24(2) and the interpretation section (clause 5) of the proposed bylaw attached to the Statement of Proposal for details.

#### What do you think of this proposed change?

Single select question | 19 responses (30% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	5	1
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	5
Do not support the proposal	1	4
I don't know	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>

## Section 2 - Proposed changes impacting those needing a waste facilities license

Under the proposal, **waste facilities** must still obtain a licence (approval) from council. Improvements are proposed to both the types of facilities that require a licence and to licence information requirements, assessment criteria and conditions.

We are proposing to improve requirements for waste facilities.


This includes to:

- expand the definition of waste facilities that require a licence from council to include facilities such as cleanfills, scrap metal dealers, e-waste facilities, and food and garden waste facilities
- limit the focus of a licence (approval) to providing waste-related data to council.

Refer to clause 11, 13-20 and the interpretation section (clause 5) of the proposed bylaw attached to the Statement of Proposal for details.

### What do you think of the following proposed changes?

Single select question | 23 responses (37% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	5	0
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	0	5
Do not support the proposal	4	9
I don't know	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>

### Section 3 - Proposed changes impacting the general public

Under the proposal, the **general public** must still dispose of their waste appropriately, for example by using a kerbside or private property collection service, taking waste to a disposal facility, transfer station or drop-off facility, by composting, burial or burning.

We're aiming to improve the bylaw by:

- proposing new rules to address gaps
- removing rules that are unnecessary, unused or covered by other laws
- transferring some rules to other more appropriate bylaws.

### Question 3A - Ways to dispose of waste correctly


We want to expand the bylaw and controls to cover a wider range of disposal options, including:

- donation collection bins
- charity shops
- supermarket soft plastics drop-offs
- hardware store battery bins

Refer clause 6 of the proposed bylaw attached to the Statement of Proposal for details.

### What do you think of the proposed new rules to the bylaw?

Single select question | 42 responses (67% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	27	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	2
Do not support the proposal	2	1
I don't know	3	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>7</b>


### Question 3B – Secure on-site waste storage

We want to add a rule to require people to store their waste securely to prevent it from escaping. For example, through wind or rain.

Refer clause 7(c) of the proposed bylaw attached to the Statement of Proposal for details.

#### What do you think of the proposed new rules to the bylaw?

Single select question | 42 responses (67% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	19	2
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	6	3
Do not support the proposal	6	1
I don't know	4	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>7</b>


### Question 3C – Onsite waste collection

We want to expand the rules to ensure waste that is collected from private properties is appropriately separated prior to collection.

Refer clause 9 of the proposed bylaw attached to the Statement of Proposal for details.

#### What do you think of the proposed new rules to the bylaw?

Single select question | 42 responses (67% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	19	2
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	7	2
Do not support the proposal	6	2
I don't know	3	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>7</b>

## Question 4 – What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?


The recent bylaw review found that some existing rules are unnecessary, unused, covered by other laws or should be moved to other, more appropriate, bylaws. We propose to remove these rules.

### Question 4A – Composting, burial and burning of waste

Relying on existing rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan.

## What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Single select question | 41 responses (65% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	18	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	0
Do not support the proposal	4	1
I don't know	10	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>6</b>

### Question 4B – Waste issues for multi-unit developments

We propose to remove these rules from the bylaw and instead, rely on the existing rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan or other Waste Bylaw rules about storage and collection of waste.

#### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Single select question | 41 responses (65% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	12	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	5	0
Do not support the proposal	3	0
I don't know	15	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>6</b>

### Question 4C – Unaddressed mail

We propose to remove these rules from the bylaw and instead, rely on the Litter Act 1979.

#### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Single select question | 40 responses (63% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	17	5
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	0
Do not support the proposal	3	0
I don't know	10	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>7</b>

### Question 4D – How to use donation collection bins

We propose to remove these rules from the bylaw and instead, rely on the Litter Act 1979.

### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Single select question | 40 responses (63% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	16	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	0
Do not support the proposal	1	1
I don't know	12	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6</b>

## Question 5 – What do you think of the proposals to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?


The recent bylaw review found some existing rules are unnecessary, unused, covered by other laws or should be moved to other, more appropriate, bylaws. We propose to transfer these rules to other bylaws.

### Question 5A – Donation collection bins on council land

We propose transferring the approval to operate on council-controlled land to the Public Trading, Events and Filming Bylaw 2022. We propose revoking other elements of rule.

### What do you think of the proposal to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Single select question | 39 responses (62% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	20	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	0
Do not support the proposal	1	1
I don't know	9	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>

### Question 5B – Waste plans for trading, event and filming activities

We propose transferring to the Public Trading, Events and Filming Bylaw 2022.

#### What do you think of the proposal to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Single select question | 36 responses (55% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	19	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	3	0
Do not support the proposal	1	1
I don't know	8	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>6</b>

### Question 5C – Shopping trolley owners to retrieve abandoned shopping trolleys and people not allowed to abandon shopping trolleys

We propose transferring to the Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013 and revoking other elements of rule.

#### What do you think of the proposal to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Single select question | 41 responses (65% of all submitters)




Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	25	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	4	0
Do not support the proposal	2	1
I don't know	4	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>6</b>

### Question 5D – Placing flyers on vehicles in public places

We propose transferring to the Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013.

#### What do you think of the proposal to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Single select question | 40 responses (63% of all submitters)



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Fully support the proposal (without any changes)	23	3
Partially support the proposal (with changes)	2	0
Do not support the proposal	3	1
I don't know	6	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6</b>

## Section 4 – Other feedback on the bylaw

The previous questions focus on changes that are more likely to have a noticeable impact on people's day-to-day waste activities, waste collectors and facilities.

There are other changes that will have a less noticeable impact. For example, proposed improvements to better explain rules about approved containers, waste deposited in different containers, types of prohibited, recyclable and food scrap waste, discarding waste in public waste bins, and adding rules about waste collection from private properties.

These improvements can be viewed by reading the Statement of Proposal and accompanying information (e.g. Options Report).

### **Do you have any other comments on the waste bylaw and controls?**

Open text question | 34 responses (54% of all submitters)

Of the 34 submitters that provided comments, the most common themes were:


- support for the intent of improving waste outcomes
- concerns about complexity, over-regulation, or lack of clarity, including calls to simplify rules, reduce over-compliance or provide clearer explanations
- concerns about public waste infrastructure and litter, including the lack of public bins and the need for more proactive litter management
- support enforcement in principle but emphasise the need for clearer and enforceable rules
- the need for better education and more accessible information for the public.

# ATTACHMENT ONE: Who we heard from


The tables below indicate the demographic profile of those that answered the demographic questions.

AGE	Male	Female	Other	Total	%
< 15	0	0	0	0	0%
15 - 24	0	0	0	0	0%
25 - 34	1	3	0	4	11%
35 - 44	5	2	0	8	21%
45 - 54	2	6	1	9	24%
55 - 64	2	4	0	6	16%
65 - 74	5	3	0	8	21%
75 +	3	0	0	3	8%
<b>Total submitters providing data</b>				<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Note: three submitters did not provide details



ETHNICITY	#	%
<b>European</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>69%</b>
Pākehā/NZ European	24	60%
Other European	3	8%
<b>Māori</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>Pasifika</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Asian</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15%</b>
Chinese	2	5%
Indian	2	5%
Other Asian	2	5%
<b>Middle Eastern/Latin American/African</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Other</b> (incl. Kiwi/New Zealander)	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>Total submitters providing data</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>NA*</b>



\* Note: submitters were able to select multiple ethnicities

## Overall local board breakdowns

We received feedback from 43 individuals and 20 organisations. These are combined in the table below, indicating the local board they reside in.

RESIDENT LOCAL BOARD	Number of responses	Percentage of total responses
Albert-Eden	3	5%
Aotea / Great Barrier	0	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	2	3%
Franklin Local Board	5	8%
Henderson-Massey	1	2%
Hibiscus and Bays	4	6%
Howick	6	10%
Kaipātiki	4	6%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	2	3%
Manurewa	2	3%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	7	11%
Ōrākei	3	5%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	2	3%
Papakura	1	2%
Puketāpapa	0	0%
Rodney	3	5%
Upper Harbour	3	5%
Waiheke	0	0%
Waitākere Ranges	3	5%
Waitematā	3	5%
Whau	4	6%
Other (Not supplied, outside Auckland or regional organisation)	5	8%

# ATTACHMENT TWO: Individual responses by Local Board area

## Question 1 – We are proposing to improve requirements for waste collectors.

### What do you think of this proposed change?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1	1	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	2	1	1	0	0
Henderson-Massey	0	0	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	0	0	0	0	0
Howick	1	0	1	0	0
Kaipātiki	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	1	1	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	0	0	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	0	1	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Harbour	1	0	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	2	1	1	0	0
Waitematā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0

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

## Question 2 – We are proposing to improve requirements for waste facilities.

### What do you think of this proposed change?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	1	1	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	0	0	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	1	0	0	1	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	0	0	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	0	1	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	0	1	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	2	0	0	2	0
Upper Harbour	1	0	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	1	1	0	0	0
Waitemātā	0	0	0	0	0
Whau	0	0	0	0	0

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

### Question 3A – Ways to dispose of waste correctly

#### What do you think of the proposed new rules to the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	3	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	4	3	0	0	1
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	2	1	1	0	0
Howick	5	5	0	0	0
Kaipātiki	4	3	0	0	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	2	0	1	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	2	1	0	0
Waitemātā	1	1	0	0	0
Whau	2	2	0	0	0

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

## Question 3B – Secure on-site waste storage

### What do you think of the proposed new rules to the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	1	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	3	2	1	0	0
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	3	1	2	0	0
Howick	5	2	0	2	1
Kaipātiki	4	4	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	1	0	2	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	0	1	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	0	0	1	2
Waitematā	1	1	0	0	0
Whau	2	1	1	0	0

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

## Question 3C – Onsite waste collection

### What do you think of the proposed new rules to the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	3	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	1	0	0	0
Franklin	3	1	1	1	0
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	3	1	2	0	0
Howick	5	2	1	1	1
Kaipātiki	4	3	0	1	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	2	0	0	1
Ōrākei	1	1	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	0	1	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	0	1	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	1	0	2	0
Waitematā	1	0	1	0	0
Whau	2	1	1	0	0

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

## Question 4A – Composting, burial and burning of waste

### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	3	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	1	0	1
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	3	2	1	0	0
Howick	5	1	0	1	3
Kaipātiki	4	3	0	1	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	2	0	1	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	1	0	0	2
Waitematā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	1	0	0	1

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

## Question 4B – Waste issues for multi-unit developments

### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	0	0	1
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	0	0	2
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	3	1	1	0	1
Howick	5	2	1	0	2
Kaipātiki	4	2	0	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	0	0	1	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	1	0	0	2
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	0	1	1	1
Waitemātā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	0	1	0	1

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

## Question 4C – Unaddressed mail

### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	0	0	1
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	1	0	1
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	1	1	0	0	0
Howick	5	3	0	0	2
Kaipātiki	4	2	0	1	1
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	2	1	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	1	0	1	1
Waitemātā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	1	0	0	1

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

## Question 4D – How to use donation collection bins

### What do you think of the proposal to remove these rules from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	0	0	1
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	1	0	1
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	1	1	0	0	0
Howick	5	2	1	0	2
Kaipātiki	4	2	0	0	2
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	2	2	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	1	0	0	2
Waitematā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	1	0	0	1

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

## Question 5A – Donation collection bins on council land

### What do you think of the proposals to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	0	0	1
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	0	0	2
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	2	2	0	0	0
Howick	5	3	1	0	1
Kaipātiki	4	3	1	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	2	2	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	1	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	1	0	0	2
Waitematā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	1	1	0	0

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

## Question 5B – Waste plans for trading, event and filming activities

### What do you think of the proposals to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	0	0	1
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	0	2	0	1
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	2	2	0	0	0
Howick	5	3	0	0	2
Kaipātiki	4	4	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	0	0	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	2	2	0	0	0
Ōrākei	1	0	1	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	2	1	0	0	1
Waitemātā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	2	0	0	0

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

## Question 5C – Shopping trolley owners to retrieve abandoned shopping trolleys and people not allowed to abandon shopping trolleys

### What do you think of the proposals to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	3	0	0	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	2	1	0	0
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	3	2	1	0	0
Howick	5	4	0	0	1
Kaipātiki	4	4	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	2	0	1	0
Ōrākei	1	1	0	0	0
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	1	1	0	0	0
Papakura	0	0	0	0	0
Puketāpapa	0	0	0	0	0
Rodney	1	0	0	0	1
Upper Harbour	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	2	1	0	0
Waitematā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	1	1	0	0

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

## Question 5D – Placing flyers on vehicles in public places

### What do you think of the proposals to transfer rules or control from the bylaw?

Local Board	Total responses	Fully support (without changes)	Partially support (with changes)	Do not support	I don't know
Albert-Eden	3	2	0	1	0
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0	0	0	0
Devonport-Takapuna	1	0	0	0	1
Franklin	3	1	1	0	1
Henderson-Massey	1	1	0	0	0
Hibiscus and Bays	2	2	0	0	0
Howick	5	4	0	0	1
Kaipātiki	4	4	0	0	0
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	0	0	0	0	0
Manurewa	1	1	0	0	0
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	3	2	0	1	0
Ōrākei	1	1	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	2	1	0	1	0
Waiheke	0	0	0	0	0
Waitākere Ranges	3	1	1	0	1
Waitemātā	1	0	0	0	1
Whau	2	2	0	0	0

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