CITY BUILDERS ASSOCIATION LIMITED

Rōpū Hanganga Tāone · Auckland civic think tank

PRE-CONSULTATION POSITION PAPER

Our Long-Term Vision

Updated position on Auckland Council's Long-term Plan 2027–2037

Rates and the rates cap · who pays · capital transparency · transport and the City Rail Link · growth and housing delivery · canopy, heat and parks · sport and community · waste · water · local boards · heritage · hazards · CCOs

VERSION 2 · OCTOBER 2026 · supersedes the submission of 6 August 2026

TO	Auckland Council Governing Body and Mayor
FROM	City Builders Association Limited (NZBN 9429053649225), an Auckland civic think tank incorporated on 6 May 2026 and funded solely by membership
CONTACT	Mark Pervan, Founder and Director · founder@citybuildersassociation.org · info@citybuildersassociation.org · 021 737 826
ADDRESS	330 Dominion Road, Mount Eden, Auckland 1024 (registered office: 204 St Andrews Road, Epsom)
DATE	October 2026

TĀMAKI MAKAURAU – AUCKLAND

Contents

1. Summary and priority asks ... 3
2. Purpose, status and context ... 5
3. Financial strategy under a rates cap ... 7
4. Who pays: the business share and rates distribution ... 10
5. Capital discipline and transparency ... 12
6. Transport ... 14
7. Growth, housing delivery and infrastructure ... 20
8. Urban canopy, heat, parks and open space ... 24
9. Sport and community services ... 25
10. Residual waste ... 29
11. Water and Watercare accountability ... 30
12. Local boards ... 31
13. Heritage, vacant buildings and adaptive reuse ... 32
14. Hazards and regional parks ... 33
15. CCOs, cultural institutions and economic development ... 33
16. Performance framework ... 34
17. Consultation design and evidence standards ... 36
18. Closing ... 36

Annex A: Matters for central government ... 38
Annex B: Index of asks by owner and timing ... 39
Annex C: Local board matters ... 39
Annex D: Matters for further work ... 40
References ... 41

1. Summary and priority asks

This paper updates City Builders Association Limited's submission of 6 August 2026 on Auckland Council's Long-term Plan 2027–2037 [1]. It is a **pre-consultation position paper**. No LTP 2027–2037 consultation is open yet. Council has said the plan will be discussed during 2027 [2]. The 2024 cycle suggests the Mayoral Proposal will come first, then formal consultation, with adoption before 1 July 2027 [3, 4]. We are offering this paper now so it can inform officer advice and the Mayoral Proposal. We will lodge a formal submission when the Consultation Document is released.

Several things have changed since August. City Rail Link opened on 13 September 2026 [5]. A Bill that would cap the average rates price is awaiting the new Parliament [6, 7]. New planning statutes received assent on 30 September 2026 [8]. The Governing Body has adopted the local board funding model for the next LTP [9, 10], and on 6 October 2026 a committee resolved that unanticipated development has no automatic entitlement to council services [11]. Other changes pre-date our August submission but were not reflected in it: Council has been the road controlling authority since 7 May 2026, with Auckland Transport now focused on public transport [12, 13, 14]. These changes call for a sharper set of asks. Each ask in this paper names who should act, what they should do and when, and how success should be measured.

1.1 Priority asks

These are the asks we consider most important for the draft LTP. The full set is in sections 3 to 17, and Annex B indexes every ask by owner and timing.

#	Priority ask	Who	When
R3.1	Plan openly against the rates cap: show the legal band and Council's own forecast separately	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R3.7	Charge users their full cost: review fees and charges against cost recovery and publish the ratios	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R4.1	Do not move rates onto business to keep the residential increase inside the band	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R4.2	Publish a rates distribution statement every year	Chief Financial Officer	Draft LTP
R5.1	Adopt a proactive publication code: contracts register, spending disclosure, decision logs and workshop materials	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R5.6	Publish a 30-year whole-of-life cost before deciding any capital project above $10m	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R6.1	Hold the new transport bodies to three published tests: reliability, decision speed and public trust	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R6.8	Make the rail network safe after dark: more visible Transport Officers at priority stations and on night services	Auckland Transport	Draft LTP
R6.12	Put the next rail dollars into nine-car platforms and reliability ahead of a $2.7bn crossings programme	Auckland Regional Transport Committee	Dated
R6.14	Protect the Avondale–Southdown designation before it lapses	Governing Body	Dated
R7.1	Set up Growth Infrastructure Delivery Units with ring-fenced funding for PC120 catchments	Chief Executive / officers	Draft LTP
R8.1	Adopt the canopy and heat framework with five measurable outcomes (O1–O5)	Policy, Planning and Development Committee	Draft LTP
R8.4	Apply a public-tree removal test and a year-10 canopy replacement rule	Parks; TID directorate	Year 1

#	Priority ask	Who	When
R9.1	Consult on a regional sport targeted rate to stabilise and ring-fence sport funding: flexible across programmes, clubs, access, opening hours and capital, and fully offset within the rates path	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R10.1	Publish a residual waste capacity plan for the gap after Redvale's current consent ends in December 2028	Governing Body	Draft LTP
R12.1	Make local board plans real service-level documents with costs, as the law requires	Local boards	Year 1

1.2 What has changed since our August submission

- **Rates cap:** we now ask Council to plan openly against the rates cap and to publish a rates distribution statement every year. We also ask it to commit not to move rates onto business to keep the residential increase inside the band (sections 3 and 4).
- **Transport:** the transport section is rebuilt around the new governance and the CRL now in service. It adds asks on rail capital priorities, corridor decisions, safety after dark and time-of-use charging (section 6).
- **Active transport:** we have revised our earlier call for a fixed 12% active transport funding floor. We now ask for evidence- and value-based prioritisation instead, consistent with our cost-discipline position (section 6.6).
- **New and expanded sections:** new sections on water (11), hazards and regional parks (14), and CCOs and cultural institutions (15); substantially expanded sections on canopy and heat (8), sport and community (9), and heritage and vacant buildings (13).
- **Sport funding:** a regional Amateur and Community Sport Targeted Rate is proposed to stabilise and ring-fence sport funding that is currently exposed to local budget shortfalls and savings targets. The fund would be flexible across programmes, club capability, access and affordability, opening hours and facility capital, allocated by need and evidence, and fully offset within the rates path from regional, not local, spending (section 9.1).
- **Funding discipline:** every ask that needs new money names the offset, reprioritisation or non-rates revenue that pays for it, inside Council's rates path (section 3).
- **Updated facts:** the paper reflects developments since August (the CRL opening, the Rates Capping Bill, the Planning Act and Natural Environment Act 2026, fairer funding for local boards and the 6 October 2026 resolution on unanticipated development) and earlier changes that version 1 did not reflect (the transport governance reforms in force from 7 May 2026, the Plan Change 120 decision of 23 July 2026, and the disestablishment of Eke Panuku on 1 July 2025 [15]). It no longer addresses asks to Eke Panuku.

1.3 How to read this paper

Each proposal follows the same template:

- **Remit and change:** whether the matter is for the Council LTP, a local board or central government, and what has changed since version 1.
- **Problem and evidence:** what the problem is, with sources. Figures come only from cited sources. CBA's own analysis is labelled as such.
- **What we ask:** numbered asks (R3.1, R3.2 and so on) in a Who | Action | When table. Timing is either tied to the statutory process or proposed by CBA. We have not estimated costs; where an ask seeks new or reprioritised funding, the table says "*[to be costed by officers]*" and names where the money should come from.
- **How success will be measured:** indicators, each with the body that holds the data and how often it should be reported. Targets are left for the LTP to set unless a source states one.

2. Purpose, status and context

2.1 About City Builders Association

City Builders Association Limited (Rōpū Hanganga Tāone) is an Auckland civic think tank. It was incorporated on 6 May 2026 (NZBN 9429053649225) and is **funded solely by membership**. We frame structured questions, gather professional input, publish explainers on thecitybuilder.com and make formal submissions. Our positions come from published evidence and our members' expertise. Mark Pervan is Founder and Director.

2.2 Status of this paper

This paper supersedes our submission of 6 August 2026 [1] and is offered as early input to the Long-term Plan 2027–2037. The table below sets out what is known about the process.

Stage	Status (as at October 2026)	Source
LTP 2027–2037 consultation	Not open. No dates published. Council says discussions will happen in 2027.	[2, 16]
Precedent (LTP 2024–2034)	Mayoral Proposal released 1 December 2023; consultation 28 February to 28 March 2024; final decisions 16 May 2024; adopted 27 June 2024.	[3]
Statutory deadline	The LTP must be adopted before the start of the first year it covers (1 July 2027), using the special consultative procedure.	[4]
Work already under way	Asset management plans updated for the LTP; Governing Body decisions on local board funding (29 September 2026).	[17, 18, 9]
Rates Capping Bill	First reading 1 September 2026; Finance and Expenditure Committee report due 28 February 2027. Parliament dissolved on 1 October 2026 for the 7 November 2026 election, so the Bill awaits the new Parliament.	[6, 7]

The sequence we expect, based on the 2024 precedent, is a Mayoral Proposal around December 2026, consultation around February–March 2027, deliberations and final decisions around May 2027, and adoption by 30 June 2027 [3]. These dates are our inference; Council has not published them. In this paper, "Draft LTP" means the draft plan and Consultation Document that Council will consult on.

2.3 Legal and process foundation

Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires a long-term plan covering at least ten years, adopted using the special consultative procedure in section 83 and containing the information in Part 1 of Schedule 10 [4]. Under section 93(6), the plan exists to describe Council's activities and community outcomes and to provide integrated decision-making, a long-term focus, a basis for accountability and an opportunity for public participation.

Three other provisions matter for this paper:

- **Funding analysis:** section 101(3) requires a benefit-based analysis of how each activity is funded. Section 100 requires a balanced budget unless Council resolves otherwise [4].
- **Local boards:** sections 14–23 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 allocate decisions between the Governing Body and local boards. Section 20 sets out what a local board plan must contain [12, 19].
- **Transport:** since the 2026 transport governance amendments came into force on 7 May 2026, Auckland Council is the road controlling authority [14]. Local boards exercise defined powers over local and collector roads [12, 20].

2.4 Developments since, or not reflected in, our August submission

The first five rows are developments since 6 August 2026. The remaining rows pre-date that submission but were not reflected in it.

Development	Date	Why it matters for the LTP	Source
City Rail Link opened	13 Sep 2026	The CRL's ownership and operating costs ($235m a year in 2026/27) are now permanent costs, and the question becomes how well it is operated.	[5, 21]
Rates Capping Bill introduced	24 Aug 2026; first reading 1 Sep 2026	A 2–4% target range (the 'band') on the average rates price. For this LTP, Council must have regard to it in 2027/28–2028/29 and comply from 2029/30.	[6, 22, 23]
Planning Act 2026 and Natural Environment Act 2026	Assent 30 Sep 2026	The RMA and Unitary Plan remain in force during a transition. This affects heritage, tree and growth rules.	[8]
Local board fairer funding	29 Sep 2026 (13–3, 1 abstention)	Local operating funding rebased on population (80%), deprivation (15%) and land area (5%).	[10, 9, 19]
Unanticipated development resolution	6 Oct 2026	Unanticipated development has no automatic entitlement to council services.	[11]
Transport governance reform (not reflected in v1)	In force from 7 May 2026	Council is the road controlling authority; roads and transport strategy sit with Council and a new Auckland Regional Transport Committee. AT now runs public transport.	[12, 13, 14]
Plan Change 120 (not reflected in v1)	Governing Body, 23 Jul 2026 (15–5, one absent)	Proposed changes to Plan Change 120 (Housing Intensification and Resilience; first notified 3 November 2025) approved for public notification, after the Government lowered the minimum to about 1.4 million plan-enabled homes (April 2026). Hearings run from August 2026 to April 2027; the Independent Hearings Panel reports in mid-2027, and Council is to make final decisions in June 2027.	[24, 9, 25]
CCO changes (not reflected in v1)	From 1 Jul 2025	Eke Panuku disestablished and its functions brought in-house. Tātaki Auckland Unlimited's economic development functions followed.	[15]
2026/27 rates (not reflected in v1)	Annual Plan adopted 2026	Average increases: 7.9% residential, 10.47% business, 8.36% farm/lifestyle.	[26]

2.5 Abbreviations and owners named in the asks

Term	Meaning
Governing Body	The Mayor and 20 councillors of Auckland Council
B&P / A&R / PPDC / VfM	Budget and Performance Committee; Audit and Risk Committee; Policy, Planning and Development Committee; Value for Money Committee
TID directorate	Council's Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate (road controlling functions since the 2026 reforms)
AT	Auckland Transport, now a council-controlled organisation focused on public transport
ARTC	Auckland Regional Transport Committee (joint Council–Crown), which prepares the 30-year transport plan and the RLTP
TAU	Tātaki Auckland Unlimited
RIMU	Council's Research and Evaluation Unit
CCO / SOI / LoE	Council-controlled organisation; statement of intent; letter of expectation
LTP / RLTP / CD / SCP	Long-term Plan; Regional Land Transport Plan; Consultation Document; special consultative procedure

Term	Meaning
IFF Act	Infrastructure Funding and Financing Act 2020
PC120	Plan Change 120 to the Auckland Unitary Plan

3. Financial strategy under a rates cap

The financial strategy determines everything else in the LTP. The question in 2027 is no longer only how much rates rise. It is also how Council plans inside a legal limit on the average rates price without hollowing out renewals, without raising its borrowing costs and without quietly moving costs between ratepayers.

> Funding discipline: every ask in this paper that needs new money is to be met inside Council's rates path, through named offsets, reprioritisation or non-rates revenue, and shown in the scenario tests in R3.3. The main sources we name are the surplus property review (R3.13), permanent savings (R3.15), re-ranking of the transport capital programme (R6.4), full-cost fees (R3.7) and development contribution discipline (R3.8). The offsets for the proposed sport targeted rate are set out in the funding statement in section 9.1. Local board budgets, core facility opening hours and protected local service levels are not offsets (R9.9, R12.3, R12.4). Where an ask names an offset, officers should cost both sides.

3.1 Plan openly against the rates cap

REMIT Council LTP (responding to central legislation)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New. Not covered in v1. Source: CBA-WATCH-86, -91 and -92.

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The Local Government (Rates Capping) Amendment Bill would cap a **rates price**: the council's total general rates, uniform annual general charges, targeted rates and penalties, divided by the number of rating units. The Bill sets an interim target range of 2–4% (in this paper, 'the band'), which applies until a new range set by Order in Council takes effect for Auckland, expected with the 2030 LTP (Schedule 1AA clauses 8–9; new section 26D) [22]. For this LTP, Council must have regard to the band in 2027/28 and 2028/29 and must comply from 2029/30 unless an exemption applies (Schedule 1AA clause 66) [22]. In future LTPs, years 1–3 are tested on a three-year average and later years must comply each year (new section 93(9C) of the Local Government Act 2002) [22, 6, 23]. Water services charges and fees and charges fall outside the rates price [23].

The LTP 2024–2034 forecast average rates increases at or below 3.5% from 2027/28. **That 3.5% is a forecast in Council's own plan, not a cap.** The cap is the band in the Bill, and the Bill is not yet law. Parliament was dissolved on 1 October 2026, so the Bill now awaits the new Parliament [7].

Council starts from a heavy fixed-cost base. The Annual Plan 2026/2027 provides for rates revenue of $3,339 million, operating expenditure of $7,354 million, capital investment of $3,639 million and planned net debt of $17,004 million (group), with a debt-to-revenue ratio of 212% (excluding Watercare). Owning and running the City Rail Link costs $235 million a year [21]. Council's credit ratings are S&P AA and Moody's Aa2; Moody's has changed its outlook on Council to negative from stable while affirming the Aa2 rating [21]. Any slip in the rating would raise interest costs, and interest sits inside the costs that rates must fund.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R3.1	Governing Body (on Budget and Performance Committee advice)	Set out the financial strategy with two separate lines: (a) the statutory rates-price band, if enacted, and (b) Council's own forecast rates path. The Consultation Document must not describe a forecast as a cap.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R3.2	Chief Financial Officer	Publish, for each LTP year, the rates-price calculation: numerator, excluded amounts, the projected number of rating units and the method used to project it. Show headroom to the top of the band.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); then each Annual Plan
R3.3	Chief Financial Officer	Publish scenario tests of the financial strategy at 2%, 3% and 4% average rates-price growth. For each, show which services, renewals and capital projects change and what that does to credit metrics, and the offsets that fund any new spending proposed in this paper.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R3.4	Governing Body	Adopt the principle that, other than a Type-1 exemption for exceptional circumstances such as an emergency (new sections 26F–26J) or a 2029/30 transitional exemption for financial hardship provided for in the Bill [22], any application to exceed the band will be made only for named growth infrastructure, with a published date for returning to the band, and that every such application will be published.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027) (principle); applies from 2029/30
R3.5	Governing Body	Keep the disclosures in R3.2 and R3.3 even if the Bill is amended, delayed or not passed.	At LTP adoption (by 30 June 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Annual change in the rates price compared with the band and with Council's own forecast path	Council Finance	Each Annual Plan and Annual Report
Rates-price calculation published, complete as described in R3.2	Chief Financial Officer	Annually
Credit ratings (S&P, Moody's) and debt-to-revenue ratio	Council Treasury	Annually; on any rating action
Number of exemption applications, each with its stated return-to-band date	Governing Body	As they arise

3.2 A funding mix that does not default to rates

REMIT Council LTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten and extended from v1 recommendation 1 (alternative funding analysis). Adds full-cost fees, development contribution discipline and Infrastructure Funding and Financing (IFF) Act levies (CBA-WATCH-86).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Version 1 asked for a quantified analysis of alternative funding [1]. A rates cap makes that analysis essential. Fees and charges, development contributions and IFF Act levies fall outside the rates price. Used properly, they let users and growth pay their share [23]. Used improperly, they become a disguised rate or a way of shifting costs. A regulatory fee cannot exceed the cost of the service. If development contributions are discounted and the gap is filled from rates, the band tightens for everyone else [23]. An IFF levy is legitimate for a named growth asset; Milldale is the working example. It is not a way to fund ordinary running costs [23].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R3.6	Chief Executive / officers	Include in the financial strategy a quantified alternative funding analysis covering development contributions, targeted rates, IFF Act levies, value capture and Crown co-funding for projects with national benefit. Rates should not be the default residual source.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R3.7	Governing Body	Review fees and charges against cost recovery under section 101(3). Publish the cost-recovery ratio for each regulatory fee group, and the reason wherever recovery is set below cost.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R3.8	Governing Body	Review the Development Contributions Policy alongside the LTP. Publish the value of any development contribution discounts or remissions that are funded from rates.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R3.9	Governing Body	Use IFF Act levies only for named growth assets with a project-specific financing vehicle, never for operating costs. Publish each proposed levy with the asset it funds.	During the LTP 2027–2037 period

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Cost-recovery ratio by regulatory fee group	Council Finance	Annually
Development contribution revenue compared with growth-related capital expenditure; rates-funded discounts	Council Finance	Annually
IFF levies in place, the asset each funds, and the amount	Council Finance	Annually

3.3 Fiscal discipline: depreciation, debt, City Rail Link costs and savings

REMIT Council LTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten from v1 recommendations 5, 6 and 15. Adds fiscal-discipline rules under the cap (CBA-WATCH-86) and the whole-of-life test for new facilities.

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

A cap creates incentives to make the budget look better than it is. Examples are not funding depreciation, labelling maintenance as capital, holding debt in council companies, and leases that behave like loans [23]. Each lowers rates now and raises costs later, and auditors and rating agencies treat them as credit weaknesses [23]. The Local Government Act requires a balanced budget unless Council formally resolves otherwise [4]. The CRL's ongoing cost ($235 million a year [21]) was the main driver of the 2026/27 increase. Version 1 asked Council to model it in full over ten years [1], and that remains outstanding.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R3.10	Governing Body	Fund depreciation in full in every year of the LTP. Any departure must be decided by resolution under section 100 and explained in the Consultation Document.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); annually
R3.11	Audit and Risk Committee	Report annually on any reclassification of operating spending as capital, and on debt and lease-type obligations held by council-controlled organisations, so that group debt is visible in one place.	Annually from 2027/28
R3.12	Governing Body	Adopt a rule that no new facility enters the LTP unless its whole-of-life cost (operating, depreciation, interest and renewals) is shown, funded and consistent with the rates path.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

#	Who	Action	When
R3.13	Chief Executive / officers	Publish a surplus property review listing buildings proposed for sale, transfer or repurposing, with the ongoing depreciation and renewal costs each would remove, and the sale proceeds and savings available to offset new spending.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R3.14	Chief Financial Officer	Publish a ten-year City Rail Link cost line (interest, depreciation, operating) and its contribution to each year's rates increase for residential and business ratepayers.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); annually
R3.15	Budget and Performance Committee	Report savings each quarter against target, separating permanent savings from one-off deferrals, with any service-level effect named.	Quarterly from 2027/28

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Depreciation funded as a percentage of depreciation expense	Council Finance	Annually
Group debt including CCO and lease-type obligations	Council Treasury	Annually
City Rail Link annual cost and its share of the rates increase	Council Finance	Annually
Savings: target, achieved, permanent compared with one-off	Budget and Performance Committee	Quarterly
New facilities entering the LTP with a published, funded whole-of-life cost (R3.12)	Council Finance	Each LTP and Annual Plan
Surplus properties disposed of or repurposed, proceeds realised and ongoing costs removed (R3.13)	Chief Executive	Annually

4. Who pays: the business share and rates distribution

REMIT Council LTP (Revenue and Financing Policy; funding impact statement). Related Bill amendments are in Annex A.

CHANGE SINCE V1 Extended and rewritten. v1 asked for a one-off analysis and a 'reduce or justify' decision (recommendations 2–4). v2 adds ongoing reporting and a commitment not to shift rates onto business while the cap applies (CBA-WATCH-90/91/92; AP-05).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Under Auckland Council's rating policy, businesses contribute 31% of the rates revenue raised from the general rates, the Water Quality Targeted Rate, the Natural Environment Targeted Rate and the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate [26, 27]. Before the LTP 2024–2034, a Long-term Differential Strategy had set a gradual reduction in the business share toward 25.8%. That strategy was discontinued and the share was held [28, 1].

Because the share is fixed and business property values have grown more slowly than residential values, business properties have received larger percentage increases. In 2025/26 the average-value residential property rose 5.8%, while the average business property rose 7.17% against a 5.9% forecast, because business values grew more slowly and the 31% share was maintained [29, 21]. In 2026/27 the average-value business property ($3.869 million) rose 10.47%, compared with 7.9% for the average residential property ($1.28 million) and 8.36% for farm and lifestyle properties [26].

The Rates Capping Bill limits the average rates price but says nothing about how the total is shared between categories of ratepayer. Moving rates from residential to business properties leaves the average unchanged, so a council could comply with the band while increasing the business burden [23, 30]. CBA raised this with the Minister of Local Government on 20 August 2026 [31]. The Minister's office replied on 15 October 2026 without addressing it [32]. On 18 October 2026 we asked the Finance and Expenditure

Committee to amend the Bill [7, 30]. **Council does not need to wait for Parliament.** It can adopt the same safeguards in its own LTP.

> On the differential ratio: we have not cited a business-to-residential rate-in-the-dollar multiplier. Our earlier publications gave different figures, and we have not yet confirmed one against an Auckland Council primary source. R4.6 asks Council to publish it.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R4.1	Governing Body (on Budget and Performance Committee advice)	Write into the Revenue and Financing Policy a commitment that, while the band applies, Council will not raise the business share of rates, whether through differentials or business-weighted targeted rates, to keep the residential increase inside the band. This matches CBA's submission on the Bill [7, 30]. The only exceptions are (a) an increase in the business share that results solely from a revaluation, or from new rating units or a genuine change in the actual use of a rating unit under category definitions that have not changed, and only where Council has not raised the rate in the dollar for any business category relative to the corresponding non-business category; and (b) a targeted rate for an activity undertaken at the request of, and primarily for the benefit of, the ratepayers who pay it (for example a business improvement district rate), after consulting them. The effect of revaluation on business increases is addressed by R4.4 and R4.7.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); in force from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R4.2	Chief Financial Officer	Publish a rates distribution statement in the LTP and in each Annual Plan, setting out: (a) business and non-business shares for the year and the three previous years; (b) each differential category's ratio to the base residential rate; (c) any proposed change and the reason; (d) whether the change relates to the rates band; (e) the average change for existing rating units by category; (f) remissions and postponements by category.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); then each Annual Plan
R4.3	Governing Body	Commission an independent economic analysis of the distributional and competitiveness effects of the 31% business share on industrial, retail, office and mixed-use properties, and publish it before LTP deliberations (v1 recommendation 2).	Before LTP deliberations (expected May 2027)
R4.4	Governing Body	Present explicit options for the business share in the Consultation Document (for example a staged reduction pathway with milestones, or holding the share with evidence of the services businesses receive) and consult on them through the special consultative procedure (v1 recommendations 3–4).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R4.5	Chief Executive / officers	Wherever an activity moves from rates to fees, development contributions or excluded water charges, state in the Consultation Document who will bear the cost, and justify the move under section 101(3) on its merits rather than its effect on the band.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); each Annual Plan
R4.6	Chief Financial Officer	Publish the current rate-in-the-dollar ratio of each business category to the base urban residential category.	With R4.2
R4.7	Governing Body	Review the Rates Remission and Postponement Policy so that business ratepayers facing sharp revaluation-driven increases can be offered a phased transition *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Business share of the rates covered by the 31% policy (baseline 31% [26]); target: no increase while the band applies	Council Finance	Annually (Annual Plan and LTP)

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Average percentage change for existing business compared with residential rating units (2026/27: 10.47% compared with 7.9% [26])	Council Finance	Annually
Gap between the average business and average residential increase, in percentage points, with the share of the gap explained by revaluation	Council Finance	Annually
Rates distribution statement published and complete for items (a)–(f)	Chief Financial Officer	Annually
Independent analysis (R4.3) published before deliberations	Governing Body	Each LTP

5. Capital discipline and transparency

Version 1 identified the systemic overuse of "commercial sensitivity" to withhold cost and risk information until intervention is no longer practical [1]. Since 2025, Council's structure has changed. Eke Panuku's functions were brought in-house from 1 July 2025, and road and transport delivery moved inside Council from 7 May 2026 [15, 13, 14]. More capital spending is now directly under the Governing Body, so a published transparency standard matters more.

5.1 Publish by default

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body resolution; CCO letters of expectation)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended. v1 recommendations 7, 8 and 10 kept, and owners and timing added. New: proactive publication code and CCO accountability measures (CBA-WATCH-080).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

LGOIMA starts from a principle of availability: information should be released unless there is good reason to withhold it [33]. In practice, withholding grounds such as commercial prejudice and free and frank advice are applied widely. Requests are slow and often end up with the Ombudsman, and workshops can settle decisions outside formal meeting rules [15]. Section 90 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 requires Council to adopt an accountability policy for its substantive council-controlled organisations, section 91 lets it add accountability requirements, and section 92 requires those CCOs to give effect to the LTP [12]. These tools have been used weakly [15].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R5.1	Governing Body	Adopt a proactive publication code by resolution: a public register of contracts, publication of spending above a threshold set by the Governing Body, decision logs, and publication of workshop materials once the decision is made.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027) (adopt with the LTP)
R5.2	Governing Body	Proactively release cost, risk, contingency and performance information for every capital project above $10 million, or funded mainly by rates or debt, at each business case and contract stage (v1 recommendation 7).	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R5.3	Chief Executive / officers	Publish a public-interest balancing statement, reviewable under LGOIMA, whenever commercial sensitivity is claimed for project information (v1 recommendation 8).	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R5.4	Governing Body	Direct a default-to-release approach in letters of expectation and statements of intent for Auckland Transport, Watercare, Tātaki Auckland Unlimited and other council-controlled organisations (v1 recommendation 10).	Next letters of expectation, before draft 2027/28 statements of intent are due (1 March 2027) [4]

#	Who	Action	When
R5.5	Governing Body	Strengthen the section 90 CCO Accountability Policy, require CCO boards to hold public meetings each quarter, and rely on section 92 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, under which substantive CCOs must give effect to the LTP, to set clear LTP expectations for each.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Share of capital projects above $10 million with published cost, risk and contingency information at each stage	Chief Executive	Quarterly
Withholding decisions citing commercial sensitivity, with balancing statements; Ombudsman complaints upheld	Chief Executive (LGOIMA team)	Annually
CCO public meetings held compared with required	Governing Body secretariat	Annually

5.2 Whole-of-life cost and independent scope review

REMIT Council LTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended. v1 recommendation 9 (independent cost assurance) now covers whole-of-life costing and scope review (CBA-WATCH-077).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Ratepayers carry both the inflation in day-to-day costs and the operating consequences of earlier capital decisions. When scope grows after the initial commitment, those consequences arrive while other services are being trimmed [34]. A decision to build is a decision to fund operating, depreciation and renewal costs for decades. Those costs should be visible before the vote.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R5.6	Governing Body	Require a 30-year whole-of-life cost (capital, operating, depreciation, interest and renewals) to be published before any decision on a capital proposal above $10 million.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); applies from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R5.7	Audit and Risk Committee	Commission independent scope and cost reviews for major projects, reporting to the Committee rather than the project team. Apply this to Avondale–Southdown work and any residual waste or energy-recovery proposal (v1 recommendation 9).	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Capital decisions above $10 million with a published whole-of-life cost	Chief Executive	Annually
Independent reviews commissioned and published	Audit and Risk Committee	Annually

5.3 Contract variations and cost variance

REMIT Council LTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended. v1 recommendation 11 (annual report on more than 10% variance) kept. New: accountability for variations (CBA-WATCH-01 [35]; CBA-WATCH-09, July 2026 [36]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Council's major works use standard construction contracts (NZS 3910 and 3916) under which variations can accumulate without a single point of accountability [35]. Community facility projects have repeatedly

finished later and costlier than first reported, with little public explanation of the decisions that drove the change [36]. Thorough site investigation and pre-lodgement work before commitment is basic Better Business Case practice [36].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R5.8	Chief Executive / officers	Name one accountable approver for cumulative contract variations on each major project, and publish a variation register (value and description) every quarter.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R5.9	Chief Executive / officers	Require site investigation and pre-lodgement consenting work before a project's budget is committed in the LTP or an Annual Plan.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R5.10	Governing Body	Receive an annual public report on every project where cost variance exceeds 10% of the approved budget, with causes and remediation (v1 recommendation 11).	Annually from 2027/28

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Projects with more than 10% cost variance, and the total variance	Chief Executive	Annually
Variation registers published on time	Chief Executive	Quarterly

6. Transport

Auckland's transport system now runs differently. The Local Government (Auckland Council) (Transport Governance) Amendment Act 2026 made Council the road controlling authority from 7 May 2026 and created the Auckland Regional Transport Committee. That committee is a joint Council–Crown body that prepares the 30-year transport plan and the Regional Land Transport Plan. About 1,350 staff are moving into a Council Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate. Auckland Transport now focuses on buses, trains and ferries. Local boards gained explicit powers over local and collector roads, speed limits, parking and crossings [12, 13, 14]. The City Rail Link opened on 13 September 2026 [5]. The next RLTP will feed the 2027–30 National Land Transport Programme, and the Government expects to consult on a draft Government Policy Statement on land transport in early 2027 [37]. The asks below are addressed to these new owners.

6.1 Governance transition and accountability

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body; Auckland Regional Transport Committee; Auckland Transport)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New. Reflects the 2026 reforms (CBA-WATCH-078 [13]; CBA-WATCH-26, September 2026 [14]). Incorporates v1 recommendations 14 and 16.

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The new structure is cleaner on paper, with elected members making strategy, a delivery agency running services, and central and local government planning together. Whether outcomes improve depends on whether the new owners are held to measurable results [13]. The method on the street has so far not changed. Arterial changes are still presented project by project, and local board objections are escalated without the total trade-off being published [14]. Version 1 asked for a published 10-year and indicative 30-year pipeline with cost ranges [1], and the new committee is now the place to produce it.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.1	Governing Body	Include three transport tests in the LTP performance framework: (1) reliability and journey time on the frequent network after the CRL; (2) decision speed for growth infrastructure; (3) public trust in transport decision-making. Apply them to the Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate and Auckland Transport.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R6.2	Governing Body	Assign a named committee and lead councillor to each arterial corridor, and publish them. Any decision to override a local board on a corridor must name the decision-maker and publish the reasons.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R6.3	Auckland Regional Transport Committee	Publish the 10-year and indicative 30-year investment pipeline with cost ranges, contingency, residual risk and funding assumptions, and align it with the LTP capital programme (v1 recommendation 14).	With the RLTP 2027–2037 (expected 2027) and the next 30-year plan
R6.4	Governing Body	Rank transport capital projects by measured network productivity, capacity, reliability and safety benefit per dollar, and publish the ranking, so that lower-ranked projects can be deferred to fund higher-value work, including the asks in this paper (v1 recommendation 16).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R6.5	Governing Body	Fund local boards' new transport decision rights with matching officer support and clear budgets for local and collector roads, by allocating existing TID directorate local-road budgets and staff to those decisions rather than adding new spending *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Frequent-network punctuality and average journey time on key corridors	Auckland Transport / TID directorate	Quarterly
Time from business case to funding decision for growth transport projects	TID directorate	Annually
Public trust in transport decision-making (Council-commissioned representative survey)	Council research (RIMU)	Annually

6.2 City Rail Link in operation: service pattern, capacity and safety

REMIT Council LTP (Auckland Transport for operations; NZ Police matters in Annex A)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten. v1 recommendations 5 and 15 (CRL cost) move to section 3.3. New: service pattern (CBA-WATCH-073), capacity (CBA-WATCH-84) and after-dark safety (CBA-WATCH-25, September 2026 [38]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The CRL opened on 13 September 2026. Auckland Transport patronage data reported by CBA show 528,007 rail boardings in opening week, against 325,203 the week before, back in the pre-COVID daily range [5]. The opening timetable runs six trains an hour at peak on the South City line, and almost every train is six cars long [5]. The first weeks combine a new city-centre catchment with curiosity, and they should not be annualised [5].

Under the opening service pattern, Eastern and Western Line trains do not stop at Newmarket, and Onehunga Branch trains do not serve the three city-centre stations [39]. CBA's position is that service patterns should follow the principle of capacity capture: using the CRL's capacity to capture demand, with the flexibility to change the pattern as demand is created, for example by giving more lines direct access to inner-city stations where demand emerges. Safety after dark will decide whether people come back.

The people on platforms most of the time can de-escalate and call Police, but they cannot stop an incident themselves. Policing is national under the Policing Act 2008, so a dedicated transit capability is a matter for NZ Police (Annex A) [38].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.6	Auckland Transport	Publish a post-opening service pattern review after at least six months of operation, then review the pattern against observed demand by line and station at least annually. Test options that give more lines direct access to inner-city stations where demand emerges.	After six months of operation (from mid-March 2027), then annually
R6.7	Auckland Transport	Publish rail patronage by line and station monthly, alongside its published annual patronage targets.	Monthly from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R6.8	Auckland Transport	Increase visible Transport Officer presence at priority stations and on night services, with a published escalation and response protocol with NZ Police, funded by reprioritisation within Auckland Transport's existing operating budget *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R6.9	Auckland Transport	Publish disorder and crime incidents per million journeys and response times in underground stations each quarter, and the results of a representative safety-perception survey every six months.	Quarterly and six-monthly from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R6.10	Auckland Transport	Adopt and publish station staffing, lighting and sightline standards for night-time operation.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Rail boardings compared with AT's published targets	Auckland Transport	Monthly
Service pattern reviewed against observed demand by line and station; changes made	Auckland Transport	Annually
Incidents per million journeys; median response time underground	Auckland Transport	Quarterly
Share of passengers who feel safe on trains and at stations after dark	Auckland Transport (representative survey)	Six-monthly

6.3 Rail capital priorities: capacity before crossings

REMIT Council LTP and RLTP (Auckland Regional Transport Committee; Auckland Transport; KiwiRail)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-84).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The Auckland Rail Programme Business Case, as summarised by CBA, puts whole-of-programme capital at $21.2 billion (P50), with a benefit–cost ratio of 1.0 without wider economic benefits and 1.2 with them. Within Auckland Transport's 30-year rail split, $2.7 billion is for level crossing removal [5]. KiwiRail's own timing for one crossing is about a minute of barrier-down time per train [5]. Takaanini, where freight, metro services and the crossing safety record coincide, is the exception [5]. Nine-car platform extensions, southern paths and reliability work offer capacity at lower cost [5].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.11	Auckland Regional Transport Committee	Before committing level crossing grade separation beyond Takaanini, require level crossing safety impact assessments re-run against the timetable actually operating after the CRL, and publish them.	Before the RLTP 2027–2037 is finalised (expected 2027)

#	Who	Action	When
R6.12	Auckland Regional Transport Committee	Prioritise nine-car platform extensions, southern network paths and reliability works ahead of grade separation where they deliver more capacity per dollar.	Next RLTP; LTP capital programme
R6.13	Governing Body	Make Council's LTP rail capital contribution conditional on at least six months of post-opening patronage data and published business-case updates.	At LTP adoption (by 30 June 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Rail capacity added (seats per peak hour) per dollar of capital	Auckland Transport / KiwiRail	Annually
Crossing safety incidents by site	KiwiRail / Auckland Transport	Annually

6.4 Avondale–Southdown corridor and the port

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body; Auckland Regional Transport Committee); Crown and KiwiRail for delivery	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Kept from v1 (recommendations 12–13) with owners and timing added. New: port position (CBA-WATCH-024, August 2026 [40]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The Avondale–Southdown corridor is a 13 km east–west rail link between the Western Line near Avondale and the Southern Line at Westfield. It has been designated for rail since the 1950s, and KiwiRail owns most of the land [1]. The designation (Auckland Unitary Plan designation 6303, held by KiwiRail) lapses on 31 August 2029 [41]. KiwiRail's current feasibility and scoping study has the primary objective of protecting it [42]. The corridor would take most north–south freight off the inner network, free paths for passenger services, improve resilience and allow new stations [1]. CBA's position is to keep and intensify the Waitematā port, release Captain Cook and Marsden wharves once operations consolidate, protect the corridor, and prepare decision-ready Upper North Island port capacity options [40].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.14	Governing Body	Name the Avondale–Southdown corridor as a strategic priority in the LTP, and support protection of the designation before it lapses.	Before the designation lapses (31 August 2029)
R6.15	Auckland Regional Transport Committee	Complete joint land-use and transport analysis for potential stations on the corridor and set out a staged funding pathway, including a Crown contribution that reflects national freight benefits.	RLTP 2027–2037 (expected 2027) and the next 30-year plan
R6.16	Governing Body (as shareholder)	Set out in the LTP and in shareholder expectations the long-term port position: keep and intensify port operations, release Captain Cook and Marsden wharves once operations consolidate, and support decision-ready Upper North Island capacity options.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Designation protection milestones met	Governing Body / KiwiRail	Six-monthly
Corridor business case stage reached	Auckland Regional Transport Committee	Annually

6.5 Corridor decisions: one account, function first

REMIT Council LTP (Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate; Transport and Infrastructure Delivery Committee [43])	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New. Corridor account (CBA-WATCH-26, September 2026 [14]), One Network Framework filters (CBA-WATCH-081 [44]), utility cost separation (CBA-WATCH-24, August 2026 [45]) and kerbside evidence (AP-03).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Arterial changes are presented one at a time. Minutes saved by bus priority on one page are not set against minutes lost to new signals, raised tables and metering on another, so no one publishes the total [14]. Unit costs for multimodal and cycling corridors have escalated, much of it from kerb relocation, wider standards and place-making additions, while cheaper options inside existing kerb lines were often diluted or rejected [44]. Utility relocation and services work can make up a large share of corridor cost and should be separated from transport capacity costs [45]. Kerbside removal decisions need occupancy evidence that covers peak, event and delivery days, plus displacement analysis [46].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.17	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Keep and publish one corridor account for each arterial: minutes saved by bus priority, minus minutes added at new signals, raised tables and meters, signed off by the councillor who owns the corridor.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R6.18	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Apply the One Network Framework and the Roads and Streets Framework as binding filters. Publish trade-off tables, people throughput before and after, and the results of ‘do less’ and parallel-route options. Explain publicly whenever a cheaper option is rejected.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R6.19	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Report utility and services costs separately from transport capacity costs in corridor business cases. Make ‘dig once’ coordination standard practice with Watercare and network utility operators.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R6.20	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Make no decision to remove kerbside space without occupancy surveys covering peak, event and delivery days, side-street counts, displacement analysis and mitigation in place from day one.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Corridor accounts published for arterial schemes	TID directorate	Per scheme; annual summary
Cost per kilometre of corridor schemes, with the utility share shown separately	TID directorate	Annually

6.6 Active transport: prioritise by evidence and value

REMIT Council LTP and RLTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Revised position (not in v1). CBA’s July 2026 proposal for a legislated 12% active transport funding floor (AP-02) is withdrawn and replaced by evidence- and value-based prioritisation, consistent with CBA’s later cost-discipline work (CBA-WATCH-081; CBA-WATCH-24, August 2026 [45]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

In July 2026 CBA proposed a fixed floor of 12% of the transport budget for active transport [47]. Our later work on corridor costs found that the binding problem is value for money, not the size of the budget. Unit costs have risen because of standards and scope, and cheaper options have been passed over [44, 45]. A

fixed percentage would protect spending whether or not it delivers. We now ask instead that walking and cycling investment compete on measured value, with protection for low-cost network completion.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.21	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Prioritise walking and cycling projects by cost per additional trip, safety benefit and network completion, and publish the ranking. Give priority to low-cost connections that complete existing networks.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R6.22	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Set design standards that let proven lower-cost options (road-space reallocation within existing kerbs, parallel routes) be used wherever they meet the safety need.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Cost per additional active trip for completed projects	TID directorate	Annually
Kilometres of connected network completed per dollar	TID directorate	Annually

6.7 Speed limits on urban streets

REMIT Council (road controlling authority) and local boards	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (AP-10).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Under the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2024, the permitted permanent limit for the ‘urban streets’ class is 50 km/h. Variable 30 km/h limits outside schools at travel times are separately authorised [20]. Local boards exercise Council’s powers under the Rule for local and collector roads, but they cannot set a limit the Rule does not allow [20]. On 22 September 2026, CBA asked Council for written legal advice on whether permanent limits below 50 km/h on urban streets would breach clause 4.5 [20].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.23	Chief Executive	Publish Council’s legal position on permanent limits below 50 km/h on ‘urban streets’, and the street classification method.	Now, before any local board consults on a permanent limit below 50 km/h
R6.24	Local boards	Spend nothing on consultation, signage or certification for any permanent limit that would breach clause 4.5 under Council’s own classification.	Immediately

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Speed-limit proposals with a published legal and classification check	Chief Executive	Annually

6.8 Time-of-use charging: conditions before charging

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body as Scheme Board member) with NZTA	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-082).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The Land Transport Management (Time of Use Charging) Amendment Act 2025 enables a scheme but does not require one. It creates a Scheme Board (Auckland Council, NZTA and an independent chair), requires public consultation and an impact assessment, and requires net revenue to be spent on land

transport in the scheme region [48]. Pricing scarce road capacity can be right in principle. Its legitimacy depends on alternatives being in place first, on reaching the real bottlenecks, and on transparent use of the revenue [48].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.25	Governing Body	Support a scheme only if defined public transport and alternative-route capacity is operating before charging begins.	Before any scheme decision
R6.26	Governing Body	Require an equity and diversion analysis, and annual publication of gross revenue, costs and net revenue spent, by project.	Before any scheme decision; annually thereafter
R6.27	Governing Body	Require a trial with published evaluation gates. Prefer a design that reaches the main bottlenecks, including the Harbour Bridge corridor, over a city-centre-only scheme, which would reach fewer of the bottlenecks.	Before any scheme decision

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Net charging revenue and where it is spent	Scheme Board	Annually
Peak travel time on charged corridors and diversion routes	Scheme Board / TID directorate	Quarterly during trial

6.9 Waitematā Harbour crossing

REMIT Central government (NZTA/Crown) with Council's contribution in the LTP; see also Annex A	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-079).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The harbour crossing has been studied repeatedly without a decision. CBA's review found that recurring studies have not produced scope discipline, cross-party commitment or early market pricing [49]. Council's role is limited to its contributions to studies and to integration with its own networks and land use.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R6.28	Governing Body	Publish every Council contribution to harbour crossing studies, with the decision each contribution is meant to inform. Make further contributions conditional on a fixed scope and an independent senior responsible owner.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Council spending on crossing studies, and decisions reached	Governing Body	Annually

7. Growth, housing delivery and infrastructure

CBA supports growth focused on high-capacity public transport nodes and metropolitan centres, with infrastructure funded to match [1]. Plan Change 120 concentrates capacity in walkable catchments around centres, rapid transit and City Rail Link stations, and tightens controls in hazard areas [24, 11]. The Government's minimum target was reduced in April 2026 to about 1.4 million plan-enabled homes [24]. On 23 July 2026 the Governing Body approved proposed changes to Plan Change 120 (Housing Intensification and Resilience), first notified in November 2025, for public notification, by 15 votes to 5

with one member absent [9, 50]. A second submission period ran from 27 August to 24 September 2026. The hearing process runs from August 2026 to April 2027. The Independent Hearings Panel is to submit its recommendations in mid-2027, and Council is to make final decisions in June 2027; the statutory process must be completed by mid-2027 [25, 50]. Zoning is a planning decision. Delivering the pipes, roads, stormwater and facilities is a capital delivery problem [24].

7.1 Match infrastructure delivery to enabled capacity

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body; Chief Executive; Watercare)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten from v1 recommendations 17 and 19. New: Growth Infrastructure Delivery Units (CBA-WATCH-10).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

A typical Council capital project takes six to ten years from conception to completion. It runs through asset management plans, LTP prioritisation, business cases, design, consents, procurement and construction, with no deadline once funding is allocated [24]. PC120 lets homes be consented faster than the infrastructure behind them can be built. The likely results are local capacity failures, falling service levels and growing resistance to intensification [24].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R7.1	Chief Executive / officers	Establish Growth Infrastructure Delivery Units with ring-fenced funding and staff dedicated to PC120 priority catchments and transport corridors, staffed by redeploying existing capital delivery teams and funded from growth capital already in the LTP, development contributions and any IFF levies (R3.8) *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); operating from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.2	Chief Executive / officers	Run infrastructure design and consenting alongside housing consenting. Use early contractor involvement and design-and-construct by default, and pre-approved standard designs for repeat assets.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.3	Governing Body	Tie LTP growth capital decisions to published infrastructure capacity assessments for each priority catchment, covering three waters (with Watercare), local transport and open space.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R7.4	Local boards	Take part in intensification design for their areas at concept stage, through a defined input step before options are fixed (v1 recommendation 19).	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Priority catchments with a published infrastructure capacity assessment	Chief Executive	Annually
Time from funding approval to completion for growth infrastructure	Chief Executive	Annually
Dwellings completed in PC120 priority catchments	Council research (RIMU)	Annually

7.2 Unanticipated development: make the 6 October resolution work

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body; Policy, Planning and Development Committee)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-88).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

On 6 October 2026 the Policy, Planning and Development Committee resolved that unanticipated development has no automatic entitlement to council infrastructure, services or future ratepayer support, and that Council should actively consider deprioritising those services [11]. Statutory duties mean Council

cannot simply switch core services off. What it can do is slow the timing of discretionary services, adjust service levels and warn buyers more clearly. Recent Government amendments allow targeted changes to development contribution policies after an approval, but they are narrow [11]. Without published decisions, the resolution works more as a signal than a brake [11].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R7.5	Policy, Planning and Development Committee	Publish each case-by-case assessment of an unanticipated development: affordability, costs, consequences, risks and the services deprioritised.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.6	Governing Body	Use the post-approval development contribution policy amendment power wherever it applies, and report its use.	As cases arise
R7.7	Chief Executive / officers	Add LIM notations and buyer information where approved development sits outside funded growth areas and service levels are not assured.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.8	Governing Body	State in the LTP which services will be deprioritised for out-of-sequence growth, so the policy is consulted on and predictable.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Unanticipated developments assessed and published	PPDC	Annually
Post-approval development contribution amendments made and recovered value	Council Finance	Annually

7.3 Building consents and inspections as a production system

REMIT Council LTP (Building Consent Authority / Regulatory Services)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-076).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The gap between plan-enabled capacity and actual building is not caused by zoning alone. It comes from planning friction, supply constraints, site access and congestion, and the rework caused by failed inspections [51]. Statutory processing timeframes are largely being met, but the total time a project takes is driven by incomplete applications, poor site readiness and repeat inspections [51].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R7.9	Chief Executive / officers	Publish first-time inspection pass rates by inspection type, with targets set in the LTP performance framework.	Monthly from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.10	Chief Executive / officers	Scale up remote inspection, national multiple-use approvals (MultiProof) and risk-based inspection for builders with good track records, funded from building consent fees under full cost recovery (R3.7) *[to be costed by officers]*.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.11	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Front-load construction access planning (corridor access and traffic management) for intensification areas within spatial and corridor planning.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
First-time inspection pass rate	Regulatory Services	Monthly
Median elapsed time from consent to code compliance certificate	Regulatory Services	Quarterly

7.4 Parking and kerbside management for intensification

REMIT Council (TID directorate; Auckland Transport); NPS-UD matters in Annex A	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten from v1 recommendation 20 (CBA-WATCH-028 [52]; CBA-WATCH-22 [53]; CBA-WATCH-11, July 2026 [54]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Version 1 asked for parking standards for mixed-use areas based on evidence [1]. Intensification without on-site parking shifts demand onto streets, and street management has not kept up [52, 54]. Public transport is designed mainly for single commuter trips and suits multi-stop family travel less well [53].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R7.12	Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	Introduce residential parking zones and pricing proactively in intensifying areas, using published occupancy thresholds, with local board approval for zones on local and collector roads.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.13	Chief Executive / officers	Require clear point-of-sale and LIM disclosure for new dwellings built without on-site parking.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R7.14	Auckland Transport	Test service and fare products for multi-stop and family trips in intensifying areas.	During the LTP period

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Kerbside occupancy in intensifying areas compared with thresholds	TID directorate	Annually

7.5 Spatial plan and national direction

REMIT Council (spatial plan) with central government	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended (CBA-WATCH-08, September 2026 [55]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

New national planning direction is being written under the 2026 statutes, and feedback on the sample National Policy Direction closed in October 2026 [55]. Council will prepare a spatial plan under the new system. CBA's position is that no growth area should be enabled without funded pipes, and that the Pukekohe food-growing area should be protected [55].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R7.15	Governing Body	Commit in the LTP that no new growth area will be enabled in the spatial plan without funded three-waters and transport infrastructure, and that highly productive land around Pukekohe will be protected.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Growth areas enabled with funded infrastructure compared with unfunded	Chief Executive	Annually

8. Urban canopy, heat, parks and open space

8.1 Urban canopy and heat resilience framework

REMIT Council LTP (Policy, Planning and Development Committee; Parks; Regulatory Services; RIMU; Healthy Waters; TID directorate)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Replaces v1 recommendation 18 with a full operating framework (AP-08).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Urban canopy in Auckland is about 18% against the Urban Ngahere Strategy's target of 30% by 2050 [56, 57]. Most urban canopy is on private land. On urban environment allotments, section 76(4A)–(4D) of the RMA lets a rule restrict tree removal only where the tree is individually scheduled, so most private removals are permitted [56]. Plan Change 113 (notable trees) was withdrawn. The new planning statutes signal a move away from listing urban trees individually [56]. Under current law, the 30% target cannot be delivered on private urban lots and should not be the only measure [56]. Council can still act on the land it owns, through the consents it controls, on the titles it can bind and through cooler surfaces where trees will not arrive in time [56].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R8.1	Policy, Planning and Development Committee	Adopt outcome statements O1–O5 as the urban forest operating measures, replacing 30% by 2050 as the only measure: no net loss of public canopy by local board (O1); funded planting in hot, low-canopy areas by 2032 (O2); full arboricultural assessment wherever there is a consent hook (O3); stabilise private canopy loss in the six highest-pressure boards (O4); publish canopy change data (O5).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); adopt alongside the LTP
R8.2	Chief Executive (RIMU)	Deliver the 2024 LiDAR canopy height change product by tenure, zone and local board.	Within 12 months after committee adoption of the framework (R8.1)
R8.3	Regulatory Services	Code and publish tree-related Certificates of Compliance and notable-tree decisions each quarter.	Quarterly after committee adoption of the framework (R8.1)
R8.4	Parks; TID directorate	Apply a public-tree removal test (safety, biosecurity, or infrastructure that cannot be redesigned) and a year-10 canopy replacement rule, funded within the same project budget, on the same corridor or in the same heat cell.	From the quarter after committee adoption of the framework (R8.1)
R8.5	Chief Executive / officers	Draft a standard consent notice and a Council-held covenant product for retained trees, and run a two-catchment private retention grant pilot, funded by reprioritisation within existing parks and urban forest budgets *[to be costed by officers]*.	Months 6–12 after committee adoption of the framework (R8.1)
R8.6	Chief Executive	Appoint one Senior Responsible Officer (third tier or above) across Parks, Plans and Places, Regulatory Services and transport, reporting quarterly to committee, from within existing senior staffing *[to be costed by officers]*.	Within 90 days after committee adoption of the framework (R8.1)
R8.7	Chief Executive / officers	Specify cool roofs and high-albedo surfaces on Council projects, and target large-grade planting at hot, low-canopy, high-deprivation streets first.	Months 6–12 after committee adoption of the framework (R8.1)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
O1: net change in public canopy (3 m and taller) by local board	RIMU / Parks	Three-yearly LiDAR cycle
O2: qualifying heat cells with a funded large-grade planting programme	Parks	Annually
Tree-related Certificates of Compliance issued; public removals approved; replacements established	Regulatory Services / Parks	Quarterly
Survival of large-grade trees to year 3	Parks	Annually
O3: share of consents with a tree hook that received a full arboricultural assessment	Regulatory Services	Annually
O4: net private canopy change in the six highest-pressure local boards	RIMU	Three-yearly LiDAR cycle
O5: canopy change data published by tenure, zone and local board	RIMU	Each LiDAR cycle

8.2 Parks and open space capacity in growth areas

REMIT Council LTP and local boards	CHANGE SINCE V1 Extended (CBA-WATCH-026, August 2026 [57]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Private backyards are shrinking as housing densifies, and public parks and sports fields are expected to absorb the difference without matching investment [57]. Manaaki Tāmaki Makaurau, Council's 2025 open space, sport and recreation strategy, treats capacity as low below 10 m² of qualifying open space per person, moderate at 10–20 m² and high above 20 m², assessed at full build-out. It directs acquisition and investment toward high- and medium-density areas with low or moderate capacity [57]. Most of the network is governed by the Reserves Act 1977, which requires classification and, for most reserves, management plans [57].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R8.8	Chief Executive / officers	Publish open space capacity assessments for every PC120 priority catchment, using the Manaaki Tāmaki Makaurau capacity bands.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R8.9	Governing Body	Where reserves are rationalised under the Reserves Act, reinvest the proceeds in the same low-capacity catchment.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R8.10	Local boards	Bring reserve management plans up to date for reserves in growth catchments, and prioritise sports field capacity upgrades (drainage, lighting, surfaces) in low-capacity catchments.	During the LTP period

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Catchments by capacity band (low, moderate, high), current and at build-out	Parks / RIMU	Annually
Sports field hours available in winter by catchment	Parks	Annually

9. Sport and community services

Version 1 asked that sport and active recreation be treated as essential community infrastructure, and not as the item cut first when budgets tighten [1]. Since then, CBA has published a specific funding instrument

and delivery models. This section sets them out, including a funding statement showing how the sport rate would be offset within the rates path.

9.1 A sport targeted rate to stabilise and ring-fence sport funding

REMIT Council LTP (needs LTP consultation); local boards for input on allocation	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended from v1 recommendation 22 (AP-06; CBA-WATCH-21). Reframed in v4: stabilise and ring-fence, flexible beyond facilities, offset regionally.

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Community sport rests on three unreliable pillars: Class 4 gaming machine grants, alcohol sponsorship, and membership fees and club income. All three are under pressure [58, 59]. The Online Casino Gambling Act 2026 sets aside a community share of the new duty, but it is small compared with the Class 4 pipeline it may erode [58]. Council's own regional sport funding has, by contrast, broadly held: the regional sport grants that the 2023/24 consultation proposed to remove were retained in the final Annual Budget 2023/2024 [60, 61, 62], and the LTP 2024–2034 added $35 million to the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund [63, 64].

The pressure has landed instead on sport and recreation delivered through local budgets, savings targets and charges:

- **Local board funding:** the Annual Budget 2023/2024 cut local board funding by $4 million, which Council said may affect local events, community grants and facility opening hours, and reduced some open-space maintenance service levels [61].
- **Pools and leisure:** the Governing Body kept the mixed delivery model for pools and leisure centres in August 2024 [65]. By August 2025 Council reported that the estimated savings from the revised model had not been realised [66].
- **Charges:** new access and usage charges for swim and diving clubs add about $0.2 million a year, and fee reviews across pools and leisure, venue hire and cemeteries raised about $2 million over three years [66].
- **2026/27 local proposals:** several local boards consulted on reducing sport and park activation, community grants and library hours [67]. A one-off Governing Body fix of about $6 million meant those budgets could be managed without significant service cuts for 2026/27, but the underlying gap remains [68, 69].

The problem is therefore less a cut to regional sport funding than exposure: much of the money that keeps people playing sits in local budgets and savings targets that move each year. And the problem is not always facilities funding. Clubs also need programmes, coaching and volunteer capability, affordable access, and facilities that are open when people can use them [58]. A ring-fenced fund should be able to respond to whichever of these is the binding constraint in each place.

A targeted rate under section 16 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 can be ring-fenced to a purpose consulted on through the LTP [70]. Northland Regional Council's Regional Sporting Facilities Rate is a working New Zealand precedent [58].

Funding statement. Because targeted rates count toward the capped rates price under the Rates Capping Bill [23], CBA proposes that the sport targeted rate be fully offset within Council's rates path rather than added on top of it. The offset should come from regional rather than local spending: first, by not backfilling the $7 million-a-year major events funding gap from general rates [64, 71]; then by bringing existing regional sport funding under the new rate with an equal reduction in general rates [72]; by delivering the facilities maintenance and pools and leisure savings that Council's own value-for-money reviews have identified but not yet realised [66]; and by selling surplus community property, excluding libraries and pools, with the proceeds used to repay debt [66]. Local board budgets and core facility opening hours are excluded from the offset, consistent with R9.9, R12.3 and R12.4. We ask the Chief Financial Officer to publish the costed reprioritisation alongside the rate (R9.2).

Scale and workings (CBA analysis). Council's rule of thumb is that every $25 million of ongoing savings avoids about a 1% average residential rates increase [73]. On that basis:

- **Major events:** the LTP 2024–2034 reduced major events funding by $7 million a year from 2025/26 [64, 71]. Not backfilling it is equivalent to about 0.3% of rates ($7m ÷ $25m × 1% = 0.28%).
- **Size of the rate:** each $10 million raised by a sport rate is equivalent to about 0.4% of rates ($10m ÷ $25m × 1%). We have not estimated the rate's yield; that is for officers (R9.2).
- **Existing regional sport funding:** the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund is $24.1 million in 2026/27 and $29.3 million in 2027/28 [72]. Only the part now funded from general rates offsets the rate; if a line is debt-funded, moving it onto a rate would raise the rates price. Council has not published the split, so it must be confirmed by the Chief Financial Officer.
- **Surplus property:** proceeds reduce rates only through lower interest. Council's asset recycling target is $30 million a year [66]; at the 2026/27 average interest rate of 4.65% [21], each $30 million repaid saves about $1.4 million a year ($30m × 4.65% = $1.395m).
- **Value-for-money savings:** these must be additional to the $106 million of savings Council already targets in 2026/27 [21]. Only savings beyond existing targets create new room. Maintenance savings should come from contract efficiency, not lower local maintenance standards (R12.3).

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R9.1	Governing Body	Direct officers to develop and consult on a regional Amateur and Community Sport Targeted Rate to stabilise and ring-fence sport and recreation funding. The ring-fenced fund should be able to support, according to need and evidence: (a) programmes and participation; (b) club capability, coaching and volunteer support; (c) access and affordability, including fee relief and equitable access; (d) facility opening hours and operating support above the core minimums in R9.9; and (e) facility capital, including multi-club hubs, indoor courts, artificial surfaces and lighting. The rate should be fully offset within the rates path as set out in the funding statement, and levied with no higher business differential than for other ratepayers, consistent with R4.1 *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R9.2	Chief Financial Officer	Publish with the Consultation Document the costed reprioritisation that offsets the rate: yield options; the effect on the rates price; incidence by category of ratepayer; and, for each offset in the funding statement, the amount, the share currently funded from general rates (including the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and regional sport grants), and confirmation that it is additional to existing savings targets.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R9.3	Governing Body	If the rate is adopted, allocate the fund by need and evidence through an independent panel with published criteria (participation gaps, equity of access, affordability, club capability, capacity shortfall and co-funding leveraged), with formal local board input on priorities for their areas. Publish every allocation annually by purpose and local board, and report the outcomes achieved.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28) if adopted

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Allocations by purpose (programmes, club capability, access and affordability, opening hours and operations, capital) and by local board	Council Finance	Annually
Outcomes reported for each allocation against its stated purpose, including participation (women, girls and juniors) and utilisation at funded sites	Parks, Sport and Recreation	Annually

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Offsets delivered compared with the published costed reprioritisation; net effect of the rate on the rates price (target: nil)	Council Finance	Annually
Local boards providing input on allocation priorities	Local Board Services	Annually
Co-funding leveraged per rate dollar	Parks, Sport and Recreation	Annually

9.2 Multi-club hubs as community infrastructure

REMIT Council LTP and local boards	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended from v1 recommendation 21 (CBA-WATCH-21).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Multi-club hubs (sometimes called ‘Sportsvilles’) let clubs keep their identity while sharing facilities, administration and commercial income under a properly structured entity. They are a proven way to make clubs more viable [58]. Funding that is contestable and annual cannot support them.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R9.4	Governing Body	Recognise multi-club hubs as community infrastructure in the LTP, alongside libraries and pools, with multi-year funding agreements linked to outcomes. Fund them by converting existing annual contestable sport grants and Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund allocations into multi-year agreements and, if adopted, from the sport targeted rate (R9.1) *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R9.5	Local boards	Identify hub opportunities in local board plans and agreements, with the default service level and any local funding named.	Next local board agreements

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Multi-club hubs established or in development	Parks, Sport and Recreation	Annually

9.3 Community occupancy, partnerships and co-funding

REMIT Council LTP and local boards	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-075 [74]; CBA-WATCH-09, July 2026 [36]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The Community Occupancy Guidelines restrict subsidised leases to not-for-profit entities whose funds go to community purposes. Combined with a culture that is suspicious of any commercial activity, this keeps network gaps open. Groups instead turn to school land, where leases under the Education and Training Act 2020 are simpler [74]. Co-funding through independent trusts, with private capital committed early, changes the incentives in delivery. The Mt Roskill schools artificial turf, part-funded through Council’s Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and delivered by a community trust, is a current example [36].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R9.6	Governing Body	Revise the Community Occupancy Guidelines so that organisations reinvesting surplus in their community purpose can occupy Council land, and use the Facility Partnerships Policy to close network gaps.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

#	Who	Action	When
R9.7	Chief Executive / officers	Set standard co-funding terms for Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund grants: binding private capital commitments, milestone payments, clawback, whole-of-life renewal (for example turf replacement) funded upfront, and enforceable access-equity rules.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R9.8	Chief Executive / officers	Agree a standard approach with the Ministry of Education for community use of school land and facilities.	During the LTP period

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Co-funded facilities delivered on time and on budget	Parks, Sport and Recreation	Annually
Community leases granted under revised guidelines	Community Facilities	Annually

9.4 Protect core facilities and opening hours

REMIT Council LTP and local boards	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten from v1 recommendations 23–24 (CBA-WATCH-077, -86).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Once transport contracts and interest are treated as fixed, community spending becomes the flexible part of a capped budget. Grants, events and facility hours tend to be cut first [23]. Council should make that choice openly, protecting the facilities people use and publishing whether they are used.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R9.9	Governing Body	Set minimum opening hours and service levels for core community facilities (libraries, pools, halls, sports fields) in the LTP, and require any reduction to be consulted on. Fund them within existing community facility budgets, protected from the reprioritisation that funds the sport targeted rate *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R9.10	Chief Executive / officers	Publish utilisation for each Council community facility and bookable space.	Annually from LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R9.11	Chief Executive / officers	Require asset management plans for sport and recreation facilities to cover realistic renewals, growth capacity and climate resilience (v1 recommendation 23).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Opening hours of core facilities compared with LTP minimums	Community Facilities	Annually
Utilisation by facility	Community Facilities	Annually

10. Residual waste

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body; Council waste services)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Kept from v1 (recommendations 25–30), with owners, timing and measures added. Landfill dates re-verified in October 2026 against WM New Zealand sources.

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Redvale Landfill receives around half of Auckland's residual waste and is currently consented to receive waste only until 31 December 2028 [75, 76]. Its planned replacement, the Auckland Regional Landfill at Wayby Valley near Wellsford, was consented in 2021, but legal appeals mean it is now unlikely to be operational until the mid-2030s [76]. WM New Zealand is seeking a fast-track extension of Redvale to no later than 31 December 2036, with landfilling to stop sooner if the new landfill opens earlier [75]. Council's 2023 assessment of waste-to-energy technologies concluded that large-scale incineration of mixed residual waste is not recommended for Tāmaki Makaurau [1]. Food scraps go to anaerobic digestion, which produces biogas and fertiliser [1]. The gap between the end of Redvale's current consent and a replacement landfill must be addressed in the LTP period without locking Auckland into lower-order treatment or volume guarantees.

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R10.1	Governing Body	Include a residual waste capacity plan for December 2028 to the mid-2030s, with options, costs and risks *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R10.2	Governing Body	Prioritise and fund organics diversion and anaerobic digestion capacity as the preferred recovery route for food and green waste, funded within the existing waste management targeted rate, Council's waste levy funding and user charges, by reprioritising from residual disposal rather than adding to the rates path *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R10.3	Governing Body	Make no capital or contractual commitment to thermal treatment of mixed residual waste until a full public lifecycle, cost, emissions, ash and waste-hierarchy assessment has been published and consulted on.	Before any commitment
R10.4	Governing Body	Enter no put-or-pay or feedstock-guarantee contracts for residual waste.	Throughout the LTP period
R10.5	Chief Executive / officers	Apply the proactive release and independent assurance standards in section 5 to all residual waste and energy-recovery business cases.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Diversion rate and residual tonnes to landfill per person	Council waste services	Annually
Progress milestones on the post-2028 capacity plan	Council waste services	Six-monthly

11. Water and Watercare accountability

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body as shareholder; Watercare)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New. v1 did not cover water. Based on AP-01, 'Three Waters reform – local accountability safeguards' (17 July 2026), CBA's submission to Council [77].

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Watercare has been financially separated from the rest of the Council group but is still consolidated in the group accounts [21]. Water charges sit outside the proposed rates price, including any stormwater costs moved out of general rates into a separate charge [23]. This makes the method of allocating costs to water services a matter of public interest. CBA has supported local accountability safeguards in water reform, including continued public ownership, published long-run cost forecasts and "a community veto on any future privatisation pathway" [77].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R11.1	Governing Body	Restate in the LTP that Watercare will remain in public ownership, and commit that any change to its ownership – including a full or partial sale, a transfer, a share issue, or a change of control or shareholding – will be subject to public consultation before any decision is made.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R11.2	Watercare	Publish ten-year and long-run forecasts of water charges for a typical household and business.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027); annually
R11.3	Chief Financial Officer	Publish the method and amounts used to allocate stormwater and other water-services costs between rates and water charges.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Forecast compared with actual water charges for a typical household	Watercare	Annually
Stormwater costs funded by rates compared with charges	Council Finance	Annually

12. Local boards

REMIT Council LTP and local boards	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten from v1 recommendations 31–34 to respond to the 29 September 2026 fairer funding decision. New: service-level plans (CBA-WATCH-83 [19]), carry-forward (CBA-WATCH-05 [78]) and protected minimum service levels (CBA-WATCH-077 [34]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

On 29 September 2026 the Governing Body adopted the Local Board Funding model for the LTP 2027–2037 by 13 votes to 3, with one abstention [10, 9]. The unconfirmed minutes record that the resolution retains the fairer funding core settings and grows local board funding with population [10]. Local operating funding is being rebased on population (80%), deprivation (15%) and land area (5%), so some boards will have more room and some less [19]. Section 20 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 requires each local board plan to state default service levels, explain each variation and its cost, and present an indicative budget that either fits the allocation or names the local revenue that will pay for the excess [12, 19]. The 2026 local board plans largely follow one corporate template and do not do this [19].

The Local Board Funding Policy has no general provision for carrying forward unspent operating funding. This encourages spending before the end of the financial year and works against multi-year projects [78]. When the rates path and savings targets cannot absorb every pressure, local service levels become the residual adjustment [34]. Under the Bill, a new local targeted rate counts toward the rates price [23].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R12.1	Local boards	Set out default service levels, every variation with its cost, and the local revenue source for any spending above the allocation in local board plans and agreements, as section 20 requires.	Next local board agreements (2027/28)
R12.2	Governing Body	Amend the Local Board Funding Policy to allow carry-forward of operating and capital funds for approved multi-year work, for a limited time and with Governing Body approval, with each board reporting budget against actual every quarter.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

#	Who	Action	When
R12.3	Governing Body	Set protected minimum local service levels in the LTP. A genuine cost pressure should trigger an explicit, published choice about reallocation within the rates path, from lower-priority regional spending, not automatic trimming at local level *[to be costed by officers]*.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R12.4	Governing Body	Make no use of local board budgets to absorb regional cost overruns or savings shortfalls, and consult on any material change to local board funding or decision rights (v1 recommendations 33–34). This includes the reprioritisation that funds the sport targeted rate (R9.1).	Throughout the LTP period
R12.5	Chief Financial Officer	Publish the year-by-year transition for each board under the fairer funding model.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Local board plans that meet each s 20 content requirement	Local Board Services	Each plan cycle (three-yearly); agreements annually
Carry-forwards approved and delivered	Council Finance	Annually
Local service levels compared with LTP minimums by board	Local Board Services	Annually

13. Heritage, vacant buildings and adaptive reuse

REMIT Council LTP (Regulatory Services; Plans and Places)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Extended from v1 recommendation 35 (adaptive reuse). New: vacant and derelict heritage (CBA-WATCH-87, -19).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The former Carrington Hospital main building (Building One) is both a Category 1 Historic Place and a Category A scheduled place under the Unitary Plan. Under the Unitary Plan it has the strongest protection against demolition. Even so, it has stood vacant and deteriorating, with a fire in July 2026 [8]. The legal tools are strong against deliberate destruction but weak against neglect. They include consent conditions, the Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw, RMA enforcement, Building Act powers and voluntary Heritage New Zealand covenants [8]. The transition to the new planning statutes narrows the window for using them [8]. Derelict private houses raise similar issues at a smaller scale [79]. Version 1 also asked for proportionate change-of-use processes for low-impact adaptive reuse [1].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R13.1	Regulatory Services	Adopt a policy for vacant Category A places that uses consent conditions, the Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw and RMA enforcement to require weatherproofing, a certified conservation management plan and adaptive-reuse milestones.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R13.2	Chief Executive / officers	For Carrington Building One, seek weatherproofing, a certified conservation management plan and a heritage covenant through every available consent and enforcement hook during the RMA transition.	Now, while RMA consent and enforcement tools remain available during the transition
R13.3	Regulatory Services	Use the Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw consistently for derelict and vacant buildings, and report its use.	From LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

#	Who	Action	When
R13.4	Chief Executive / officers	Introduce proportionate, faster processes for low-impact changes of use that bring employment or community benefit (v1 recommendation 35).	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Vacant Category A places with a conservation management plan and weatherproofing in place	Regulatory Services	Annually
Bylaw notices issued and resolved	Regulatory Services	Annually
Median processing time for low-impact change of use	Regulatory Services	Annually

14. Hazards and regional parks

REMIT Waitākere Ranges Local Board (Piha Domain); Council LTP (Regional Parks)	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-27, September 2026 [80]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Piha Domain campground, a leased camp on a local recreation reserve, was closed after updated flood mapping placed it in a high-risk area. Council has not given a reopening date, and an engineers' report has set out three options: reconfigure, relocate or withdraw over time [80]. Council has about 40 campgrounds and overnight parking areas in its regional parks. It has not published a screen of those sites against flood and landslide hazard maps [80]. Landslide susceptibility maps published in 2025 also feed Plan Change 120 [80].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R14.1	Chief Executive (Regional Parks)	Publish a hazard screen of all regional park campgrounds and overnight sites against Flood Viewer and landslide susceptibility mapping, with any proposed changes.	LTP Year 1 (2027/28)
R14.2	Waitākere Ranges Local Board; Governing Body (regional parks)	Make decisions on camping at hazard-exposed reserves, including Piha Domain, through public Reserves Act processes, and cost reconfiguration or higher-ground options before withdrawal.	Now, and before any decision to relocate or withdraw camping at Piha Domain

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Overnight sites screened and decisions published	Regional Parks	Annually
Campsite nights available	Regional Parks	Annually

15. CCOs, cultural institutions and economic development

15.1 MOTAT and cultural autonomy

REMIT Council (Value for Money Committee; Tātaki Auckland Unlimited). Repeal of the MOTAT Act 2000 is for Parliament.	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (AP-07; AP-ADV02; CBA-WATCH-08, July 2026 [81]).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Council is considering a stronger operating model for MOTAT with Tātaki Auckland Unlimited. Under the MOTAT Act 2000, Council appoints six of ten board members and funds the museum by levy, $20.4 million in 2026/27 according to the committee report [82]. On 10 September 2026, CBA told the Value for Money Committee it supports the work in principle, subject to conditions protecting MOTAT's statutory, memorial and curatorial character [82, 83, 81].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R15.1	Value for Money Committee	Before any Bill is promoted, ring-fence MOTAT's brand, collection title and care standards, programming, volunteer model and the MOTAT Society's role in a binding instrument.	Before any final decision
R15.2	Tātaki Auckland Unlimited	Set KPIs that match the MOTAT Act's objectives (collection stewardship, education, memorial and heritage functions) as well as visitation and revenue, and publish a 10-year operating and capital schedule.	Before any final decision
R15.3	Governing Body	Ensure any operational delegation from the MOTAT Board to TAU before the Act is changed is time-limited and published, and consult Society members, volunteers, mana whenua and the affected local boards before the final decision.	Before any final decision

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Conditions met before the final decision	Value for Money Committee	At decision

15.2 Economic development held to measurable outcomes

REMIT Council LTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** New (CBA-WATCH-074).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

Economic development functions formerly delivered by Tātaki Auckland Unlimited have been brought in-house [15]. CBA has argued that event-led economic development is a weak substitute for lowering business costs, building skills and retaining talent [84].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R15.4	Governing Body	Set economic development outcome measures in the LTP (business costs imposed by Council, consent and regulatory times for business, skills and talent retention) and report against them, rather than event-attributed GDP alone.	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Council-imposed business cost indicators and regulatory timeframes for business	Chief Executive	Annually

16. Performance framework

REMIT Council LTP	**CHANGE SINCE V1** Rewritten from v1 recommendations 36–39. Consolidates the measures in this paper. New: Auditor-General role (CBA-WATCH-080).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

An LTP without rigorous, publicly reported measures is a statement of aspiration, not a plan [1]. The Local Government Act requires statements of service provision and performance measures that let the public assess levels of service [4]. The table below brings together the headline indicators proposed in this paper. Targets are for Council to set in the LTP.

Area	Headline indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Finance	Rates price compared with the band and Council's forecast; depreciation funded; new spending matched to named offsets	Council Finance	Annually
Who pays	Business share; average change by category for existing rating units	Council Finance	Annually
Capital	Projects with more than 10% variance; whole-of-life costs published	Chief Executive	Annually
Transparency	Capital projects above $10m with published cost and risk information	Chief Executive	Quarterly
Transport	Frequent-network reliability; journey times; public trust	AT / TID directorate	Quarterly
Rail safety	Incidents per million journeys (quarterly); perceived safety after dark (six-monthly)	Auckland Transport	Quarterly / six-monthly
Growth	Catchments with published infrastructure capacity assessments; dwellings completed	Chief Executive / RIMU	Annually
Building	First-time inspection pass rate	Regulatory Services	Monthly
Canopy	Net public canopy change by board (O1); heat-cell planting (O2)	RIMU / Parks	Three-yearly / annually
Sport	Participation and utilisation at funded sites; co-funding leveraged	Parks, Sport and Recreation	Annually
Waste	Diversion rate; residual tonnes per person	Council waste services	Annually
Local boards	Plans meeting s 20 requirements (each plan cycle); service levels compared with minimums (annually)	Local Board Services	Each plan cycle / annually

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R16.1	Governing Body	Adopt a limited set of outcome and output measures for each group of activities, with baselines, targets and reporting frequency (v1 recommendation 36).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R16.2	Governing Body	Receive annual public reporting against those measures, with variances explained (v1 recommendation 37).	Annually from 2027/28
R16.3	Governing Body	Align CCO statements of intent with the LTP performance framework, with stated consequences for underperformance (v1 recommendation 39).	2027/28 statements of intent (drafts due by 1 March 2027) [4]
R16.4	Governing Body	Invite the Auditor-General to carry out a performance audit of service delivery in Auckland during the LTP period.	During the LTP period

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Measures reported on time with variance explanations	Chief Executive	Annually

17. Consultation design and evidence standards

REMIT Council LTP (Governing Body; Chief Executive)	CHANGE SINCE V1 Rewritten from v1 recommendations 40–43. New: evidence standards (CBA-WATCH-89).

PROBLEM AND EVIDENCE

The special consultative procedure is a legal minimum, not a quality standard [19]. Officers must summarise all feedback, and decision-makers must consider the views of those affected [4]. There is, however, no requirement to assess whether the evidence offered is fit for purpose. Convenience samples, self-selected online polls and leading questions can enter summary reports and influence advice [85]. Council's own research already reports sampling method, sample size, response rate and weighting [85].

WHAT WE ASK

#	Who	Action	When
R17.1	Governing Body	Design the Consultation Document to make the key trade-offs explicit: the rates path against service levels, options for the business share, growth against liveability investment, regional against local priorities, and residual waste options (v1 recommendation 40).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R17.2	Chief Executive / officers	Publish supporting information on cost ranges, contingency and residual risk for each major capital proposal (v1 recommendation 41).	Draft LTP (expected early 2027)
R17.3	Chief Executive / officers	Apply minimum evidence standards in advice. Any survey cited must state its population, sampling method, sample size, response rate, fieldwork dates and weighting. Non-representative material must be labelled as such and given limited weight.	Officer advice on the draft LTP and at deliberations
R17.4	Chief Executive / officers	Analyse detailed submissions on their merits, not only as pro-forma counts. Schedule enough time for elected members to deliberate (v1 recommendations 42–43).	LTP deliberations (after consultation, before adoption by 30 June 2027)

HOW SUCCESS WILL BE MEASURED

Indicator	Data owner	Frequency
Officer reports citing surveys that meet the disclosure standard	Chief Executive	Annually

18. Closing

These asks are designed to work together. Planning openly against the cap, protecting the business share, funding depreciation and setting a whole-of-life rule provide the discipline within which the investment asks in transport, growth, canopy and sport can be considered. Each of those asks names its offset or funding source, and officers should cost both. Published evidence, standards for the evidence Council relies on, and measures with named owners are what make the LTP an accountability document, as section 93 intends.

City Builders Association Limited asks that this paper be placed on the public record, distributed to the Mayor and all Governing Body members, and considered in preparing the Mayoral Proposal, the draft LTP 2027–2037, the Consultation Document and supporting information. We will lodge a formal submission when consultation opens, and we would welcome the chance to speak to committees and work with officers on any of these proposals.

Mark Pervan
Founder and Director
City Builders Association Limited
October 2026

Annex A: Matters for central government

These matters are outside Council's LTP decision-making but affect it. Where relevant, we ask Council to advocate to central government for them.

#	Matter and CBA position	Addressed to	Council's role	Source
A.1	Rates Capping Bill (CBA's Finance and Expenditure Committee submission, recommendations FEC-1 to FEC-5): (FEC-1) prevent councils raising the business share to stay within the band; (FEC-2) require a rates distribution statement in LTPs and Annual Plans; (FEC-3) ensure exemptions cannot embed higher business differentials; (FEC-4) require shifts out of capped rates to be identified and justified; (FEC-5) protect the integrity of the rating-unit divisor and the water exclusion.	Finance and Expenditure Committee; Minister of Local Government	Adopt R4.1–R4.2 voluntarily; support FEC-1 to FEC-5 in Council's own submission	[7, 30, 32]
A.2	Dedicated transit policing capability within NZ Police, rostered at priority stations and on trains, with explicit funding.	NZ Police Commissioner; Minister of Police	Advocate; coordinate with Auckland Transport (R6.8)	[38]
A.3	National direction under the new planning statutes that allows listing of urban trees with demonstrated climate-infrastructure value, and interim protection for nominated trees.	Minister responsible for planning; Ministry for the Environment	Advocate (Government Relations)	[56]
A.4	Review of parking provisions in national direction, including differentiated minimums outside frequent-transit catchments.	Minister responsible for planning	Advocate; provide evidence from R7.12	[54, 52]
A.5	Local Government Act amendments for cities of scale: value capture, streamlined approvals, a clearer Governing Body and local board split.	Minister of Local Government	Advocate	[86]
A.6	Local Government Commission review of Auckland's local board structure (fewer, better-resourced boards). The deadline for changes before the 2028 elections has passed.	Local Government Commission	Consider initiating a review for 2031	[15, 87]
A.7	Waitematā Harbour crossing: tight scope, cross-party accord, independent senior responsible owner, early market pricing, demand management.	NZTA; Minister of Transport	Contribute only against a fixed scope (R6.28)	[49]
A.8	A co-educational state school at 74 Epsom Avenue. Council's role is precinct planning, trees, the memorial avenue and transport.	Ministry of Education; Crown	Plan supporting infrastructure	[88]
A.9	Hauraki Gulf high protection areas: no commercial ring-netting where recreational fishing is banned.	Department of Conservation; Ministry for Primary Industries	None (outside LTP)	[89]
A.10	Repeal or amendment of the MOTAT Act 2000 only after the conditions in R15.1–R15.3 are met.	Parliament	Set conditions before promoting any Bill	[82]

Annex B: Index of asks by owner and timing

Every numbered ask in sections 3–17, grouped by the body that acts and by timing. Where an ask names more than one body, it is listed under the first. Timing columns: **Now** = before the Mayoral Proposal; **Draft LTP** = draft LTP 2027–2037 and Consultation Document (expected early 2027); **Year 1** = 2027/28, including at LTP adoption; **Ongoing** = recurring, or throughout the LTP period; **Dated** = tied to a specific later milestone or decision. Council departments (Regulatory Services, Parks, RIMU and Regional Parks) are grouped under Chief Executive / officers.

Owner	No.	Now	Draft LTP	Year 1	Ongoing	Dated
Governing Body	54	–	R3.1, R3.4, R3.7, R3.8, R3.10, R3.12, R4.1, R4.3, R4.4, R4.7, R5.1, R5.5, R5.6, R6.1, R6.4, R6.5, R6.16, R6.28, R7.3, R7.8, R7.15, R9.1, R9.4, R9.9, R10.1, R10.2, R11.1, R12.2, R12.3, R15.4, R16.1, R17.1	R3.5, R5.2, R5.4, R6.2, R6.13, R8.9, R9.3, R9.6, R16.3	R3.9, R5.10, R7.6, R10.4, R12.4, R16.2, R16.4	R6.14, R6.25, R6.26, R6.27, R10.3, R15.3
Chief Executive / officers	33	R6.23, R13.2	R3.6, R3.13, R4.5, R5.9, R7.1, R8.8, R9.11, R17.2, R17.3	R5.3, R5.8, R7.2, R7.7, R7.10, R7.13, R8.2, R8.4, R8.5, R8.6, R8.7, R9.7, R10.5, R13.1, R13.3, R13.4, R14.1, R17.4	R7.9, R8.3, R9.8, R9.10	–
Chief Financial Officer	8	–	R3.2, R3.3, R3.14, R4.2, R4.6, R9.2, R11.3, R12.5	–	–	–
Transport and Infrastructure Delivery directorate	8	–	R6.21	R6.17, R6.18, R6.19, R6.20, R6.22, R7.11, R7.12	–	–
Auckland Transport	6	–	R6.8	R6.10	R6.7, R6.9, R7.14	R6.6
Local boards	6	R6.24, R14.2	–	R7.4, R9.5, R12.1	R8.10	–
Auckland Regional Transport Committee	4	–	–	–	–	R6.3, R6.11, R6.12, R6.15
Audit and Risk Committee	2	–	–	R5.7	R3.11	–
Policy, Planning and Development Committee	2	–	R8.1	R7.5	–	–
Budget and Performance Committee	1	–	–	–	R3.15	–
Watercare	1	–	R11.2	–	–	–
Value for Money Committee	1	–	–	–	–	R15.1
Tātaki Auckland Unlimited	1	–	–	–	–	R15.2
Total	127	4	53	40	17	13

Annex C: Local board matters

Matter	Local board	CBA position	Source
Wairaki Stream daylighting, Lynfield Cove	Puketāpapa (with Healthy Waters)	Fund maintenance after construction; publish the consent documents; take the capital decision through the local board agreement or the LTP.	[90]

Matter	Local board	CBA position	Source
Better Journeys, Green Lane West	Albert-Eden / Puketāpapa (TID directorate)	CBA lodged an objection on 18 August 2026 pending analysis. The general principle (kerbside evidence before removal) is in R6.20.	[46]
Permanent speed limits below 50 km/h	Albert-Eden	Await Council's legal position before any consultation (R6.23–R6.24).	[20]
Piha Domain campground	Waitākere Ranges	Public Reserves Act decision; cost options before withdrawal (R14.2).	[80]

Annex D: Matters for further work

These questions are open on CBA's Question Hub. They are **not yet CBA positions**. We list them so that officers and members can see where we are seeking evidence.

Question	Possible direction	Source
Controlling Council construction costs	Tiered per-square-metre benchmarks, independent peer review and strict change control.	[91]
Phased ('as-ready') intensification	Open precincts to intensification as their infrastructure is funded.	[92]
Flood resilience	Sponge-city measures alongside Making Space for Water.	[93]
Indoor courts	A multi-use approach to indoor sports facility provision.	[94]
Parking and small business	The evidence on parking access and small-business viability.	[95]

References

Sources are numbered in order of first citation. CBA articles are published on thecitybuilder.com. Where a CBA article summarises a primary document, the primary document should be read for the original figures.

[1] City Builders Association, 'Our Long-Term Vision' – formal combined submission on the LTP 2027–2037 (6 August 2026). https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a73e318a8e38cc32b24d01b

[2] Auckland Council, AK Have Your Say, 'Planning for the future of Auckland' (Annual Plan 2026/2027 – discussions in 2027 on the LTP 2027–2037). https://akhaveyoursay.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/annual-plan-2026-2027/planning-future-Auckland

[3] Auckland Council, AK Have Your Say, 'Timeline – Long-term Plan 2024–2034'. https://akhaveyoursay.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/timeline-long-term-plan-2024-2034

[4] Local Government Act 2002 (in particular ss 76–83, 93, 100 and 101, Schedule 8 (statements of intent: drafts due by 1 March, cl 1(2)) and Schedule 10). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2002/0084/latest/whole.html

[5] CBA-WATCH-84, 'A minute at the boom is not a $2.7 billion problem', 28 September 2026 (summarising the Auckland Rail Programme Business Case and Auckland Transport patronage data). https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6abad5140b36899640dab1bf

[6] New Zealand Parliament, Local Government (Rates Capping) Amendment Bill 340-1 – bill progress page. https://bills.parliament.nz/v/6/242B9208-AA6E-49BE-94CE-08DF0234FB92

[7] CBA-WATCH-91, 'Rates cap and the business share: our submission to the Finance and Expenditure Committee (Part 1 of 2)', 18 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ad40c29c2c0ac5ea0c125e3

[8] CBA-WATCH-87, 'Protected on Paper: How Auckland's Strongest Heritage Rules Met a Vacant Building and a New Planning System', 12 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6acc362b24589fe417350502

[9] City Builders Association, Vote Recorder (Governing Body and committee votes, including fairer funding, 29 September 2026, and Proposed Plan Change 120, Governing Body 23 July 2026, Item 12). Note: some meeting dates display one day early on the site; dates in this paper follow the Council minutes. https://thecitybuilder.com/vote-recorder

[10] Auckland Council, Governing Body draft (unconfirmed) minutes, 29 September 2026, Item 8.4, resolution GB/2026/1608. https://aucklandcouncil.resolve.red/portal/meeting/13576/104949?showMinutes

[11] CBA-WATCH-88, 'Council's Paper Tiger: A Vote That Sounds Tough and Changes Little', 15 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ad10cb301cee1e3bb9ef4d3

[12] Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, including the Transport Governance amendments of 2026 (ss 14–23 local boards; ss 90–92 substantive CCO accountability; s 47 road controlling authority). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2009/0032/latest/whole.html

[13] CBA-WATCH-078, 'Auckland's New Transport Overlords: Accountability or Just a More Political Mess?', 17 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a82c9cf47d1c41b317459bd

[14] CBA-WATCH-26, 'Auckland Transport's name has changed. The playbook hasn't.', 6 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a9d2d0a8d4bff68da8af58e

[15] CBA-WATCH-080, 'The Structure Is the Problem', 24 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a8bf1a27abcf938d19ead1b

[16] Auckland Council, 'Budget plans' (Long-term Plan 2024–2034 and Annual Plan pages). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/en/plans-policies-bylaws-reports-projects/our-plans-strategies/budget-plans.html

[17] Auckland Council, Letter of Expectation to Tātaki Auckland Unlimited 2026–2029 (asset management plan input to the LTP 2027–2037). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/reports/ccos/au-letter-expectation-2026-2029.pdf

[18] Auckland Council investor update (NZX announcement), 2026. https://announcements.nzx.com/attachment/478987.pdf

[19] CBA-WATCH-83, 'Twenty-one plans, one checkbox', 21 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ab1951c6bf18b815fbd6336

[20] AP-10, 'Request for legal advice: permanent speed limits below 50 km/h on urban streets', 22 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ab1fb0bed4d861da8d52add

[21] Auckland Council, Annual Plan 2026/2027, Volume 1 (key financial projections; rates; City Rail Link costs; credit ratings and Moody's outlook; savings target $106 million 2026/27, pdf p.28; average interest rate 4.65%, pdf p.55). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/misc/annual-plan-2026-2027-volume-1.pdf

[22] Local Government (Rates Capping) Amendment Bill 340-1 – text (including new ss 26D and 26F–26J, Schedule 1AA clauses 8–9 and 66, and new s 93(9C) of the Local Government Act 2002). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/bill/government/2026/0340/latest/whole.html

[23] CBA-WATCH-86, 'The 4% Cap Does Not Cap Your Bill', 5 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ac41970c7264f9330dc84b4

[24] CBA-WATCH-10, 'PC120 Unlocks Homes. Council's Delivery System Locks Them Out.', 26 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a6570271e0922b278b4b873

[25] Auckland Council, 'Timeline for the Independent Hearings Panel for PC 120' (hearing process August 2026–April 2027; IHP recommendations mid-2027; final decisions June 2027; accessed 18 October 2026). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/en/have-your-say/hearings/types-of-hearings/pc120-housing-intensification-resilience-hearings/timeline-independent-hearings-panel-pc-120.html

[26] Auckland Council, OurAuckland, 'Annual Plan: what's happening with rates?' (2026/2027 rates: 7.9% average residential, 10.47% average business, 8.36% farm/lifestyle; business 31% share). https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/news/2026/03/annual-plan/

[27] Auckland Council, OurAuckland, transcript 'Council rates: here's how it works' (rating policy: 31% business / 69% non-business; differential categories). https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/media/br1hul0c/transcript-council-rates-heres-how-it-works.pdf

[28] Business North Harbour, Submission on the Auckland Council Annual Plan 2026/2027 (Long-term Differential Strategy and the earlier 25.8% pathway). https://businessnh.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/BNH-Submission-to-Annual-Plan-2026-2027.pdf

[29] Auckland Council, 'Changes to your property rates for the 2025/2026 rating year' (archived copy of 19 November 2025; the live page at the same address now shows 2026/2027). https://web.archive.org/web/20251119191209/https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/en/property-rates-valuations/changes-rates-bills-this-year.html

[30] CBA-WATCH-92, 'Rates cap and the business share: our submission to the Finance and Expenditure Committee (Part 2 of 2)', 18 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ad4128a8ef78305eaa6cc5e

[31] AP-05, 'Rates Target Model – Risk of Further Shifting the Burden onto Auckland Business' (letter to the Minister of Local Government), 20 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a85fd88738c6fda12fc403d

[32] CBA-WATCH-90, 'Rates cap and the business differential: our letter to the Minister of Local Government', 17 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ad3ebf6483acddec4985c59

[33] Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (s 5 principle of availability; s 7(2) withholding grounds). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1987/0174/latest/whole.html

[34] CBA-WATCH-077, 'It started with the berms', 17 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a82c890cfe79f677844b8f2

[35] CBA-WATCH-01, 'Budget Creep Exposed: How Auckland Council's Contracts and Commercial Secrecy …', 15 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56f81cef8f657ad1c34c83

[36] CBA-WATCH-09, 'Stop Waiting for Council: Co-Funding Is Auckland's Only Realistic Path', 26 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a656deb4cbb65248015357a

[37] Minister of Transport, 'Statement on land transport investment', 13 August 2026 (preparation of LTPs, RLTPs and the 2027–30 NLTP; draft GPS 2027 consultation in early 2027). https://www.mcert.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Transport/Ministerial-statement-on-land-transport-13-August-2026.pdf

[38] CBA-WATCH-25, 'Making the Rail Network Safe', 1 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a9649e0af26e0fa6d8b74ee

[39] CBA-WATCH-073, 'CRL Fails East, West Auckland and Onehunga', 20 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a5daf8c8f9ab713764c9cfb

[40] CBA-WATCH-024, 'Auckland's Port Delusion', 10 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a7979112788d09f81da9f48

[41] Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative), Chapter K Designations – KiwiRail Holdings Ltd, designation 6303 Avondale Southdown Railway Line (lapse date 31 August 2029). https://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20Operative/Chapter%20K%20Designations/KiwiRail%20Holdings%20Ltd.pdf

[42] KiwiRail, 'Avondale to Southdown Rail Corridor' (feasibility and scoping study 2025–2026; designation due to lapse in 2029). https://www.kiwirail.co.nz/our-network/our-regions/amp/future-of-auckland-rail/avondale-to-southdown-rail-corridor/

[43] Auckland Council, 'Transport and Infrastructure Delivery Committee' (committee page). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/en/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/governing-body-wards-committees/committees/committees-whole/transport-infrastructure-committee.html

[44] CBA-WATCH-081, 'Gold-Plated Safety and Geometric Denial', 24 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a8bf72fefc821722e9b75ea

[45] CBA-WATCH-24, 'The Real Cost of Widening a Road: Why Multimodal Projects Cost Vastly More', 25 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a8d0ca150f5946c31334234

[46] AP-03, 'Objection – Better Journeys on Green Lane West', 18 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a8417bd49e911a6d405e093

[47] AP-02, 'Active transport funding floor – 12% of the transport budget', 15 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a5769c0f21f11567696b39b

[48] CBA-WATCH-082, 'If You're Hell Bent on Charging Us, Make Sure You Provide Better Alternatives', 25 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a8ddd645e6a28fd99dd26a6

[49] CBA-WATCH-079, 'The Paper Crossing', 19 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a85f4ed5c9635cdaf82f6a7

[50] Auckland Council, AK Have Your Say, 'Auckland's Future Housing Plan – Plan Change 120' (proposed changes agreed July 2026; submissions 27 August–24 September 2026; process to be completed by mid-2027). https://akhaveyoursay.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/aucklands-future-housing-plan

[51] CBA-WATCH-076, 'Why Auckland Cannot Deliver the Homes It Plans For – And the Path Out', 17 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a82c615200b45b3945f2980

[52] CBA-WATCH-028, 'Rethinking the Connected City', 15 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a800c359ad3954b9fdeb4bd

[53] CBA-WATCH-22, 'Will the push for public transport kill the Kiwi adventurer spirit?', 4 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a713091eccf2e25376f4944

[54] CBA-WATCH-11, 'Proof of Parking in Auckland: A Possible Future Reality Under Current Intensification', 26 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a6570e5aa8d256c6ae166e0

[55] CBA-WATCH-08, 'Wellington is rewriting how New Zealand decides what can be built', 15 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6aa99fa8c5b193c1332ab29c

[56] AP-08, 'Urban Canopy and Heat Resilience Policy Framework' (draft for committee), 12 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6aa529547a9b2475625252b3

[57] CBA-WATCH-026, 'The Future of Parks and Reserves', 15 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a800747c35d8d87747ae08a

[58] CBA-WATCH-21, 'New Zealand's community sports clubs are running on a funding model that is quietly failing them', 4 August 2026. (Note: Council's regional sport grants were retained in the final Annual Budget 2023/2024; see section 9.1.) https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a712cf7f52c0f9e431aac9b

[59] AP-06, 'A Targeted Rate to Fund Amateur and Community Sport in Tāmaki Makaurau', 5 September 2026. (Note: the regional sport grants proposed for removal in 2023/24 were retained in the final Annual Budget 2023/2024.) https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a9b63c2b80d3527c91b70c3

[60] Aktive – Auckland Sport and Recreation, 'Making a submission on Auckland Council's Annual Budget 2023/2024' (proposed removal of regional sport and recreation grants; the grants were retained in the final budget). https://aktive.org.nz/News-and-Events/Blogs/Making-a-submission-on-Auckland-Councils-Annual-Budget-2023-2024

[61] Auckland Council, Annual Budget 2023/2024, Volume 1 (savings: $7.9 million ongoing reduction in regional services; $4 million reduction to local board funding; open-space maintenance reductions). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans/budgets/annual-budget-2023-24-volume-1.pdf

[62] OurAuckland, 'Mayor supports reducing cuts to arts and social services as part of balanced, sustainable budget', 17 May 2023 (regional grants and regional events/arts reinstated in the final Annual Budget 2023/2024). https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/news/2023/05/mayor-supports-reducing-cuts-to-arts-and-social-services-as-part-of-balanced-sustainable-budget/

[63] Auckland Council, Long-term Plan 2024–2034, Volume 1 (community spending; Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund increase), pdf p.19. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans/budgets/long-term-plan-2024-2034-vol-1.pdf

[64] Auckland Council, Long-term Plan 2024–2034, Volume 2 (Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund, pdf p.278; major events funding, Table 60, pdf p.310). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans/budgets/long-term-plan-2024-2034-vol-2.pdf

[65] OurAuckland, 'Auckland Council pool and leisure service delivery model confirmed', 1 August 2024. https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/news/2024/08/pools-and-leisure-service-delivery-model/

[66] Auckland Council, Revenue, Expenditure and Value Committee, 19 August 2025, End of Term report (savings, value-for-money reviews including Pools and Leisure and Full Facilities Maintenance Contracts, fees and charges, asset recycling) – Internet Archive copy. https://web.archive.org/web/20251103/https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Open/2025/08/20250819_ECPCC_AGN_11559_AT_SUP.HTM

[67] Auckland Council, Annual Plan 2026/2027 Supporting Information (local board consultation items), pdf pp.60, 66, 78, 91. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/misc/annual-plan-2026-2027-supporting-information.pdf

[68] Auckland Council, Annual Plan 2026/2027, Volume 2 (local board agreements), p.153. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/misc/annual-plan-2026-2027-volume-2.pdf

[69] PMN / Local Democracy Reporting, 'Mayor's $6m shuffle saves South Auckland from service cuts', 7 May 2026. https://pmn.co.nz/read/local-democracy-reporting/mayor-s-usd6m-shuffle-saves-south-auckland-from-service-cuts

[70] Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 (s 16 targeted rates). https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2002/0006/latest/whole.html

[71] Auckland Council, Governing Body agenda, 28 August 2025, item 12 (Tātaki Auckland Unlimited major events funding and underwrite) – Internet Archive copy. https://web.archive.org/web/2025/https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Open/2025/08/20250828_GB_AGN_11289.htm

[72] Auckland Council, 'Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund' ($24.1 million 2026/2027; $29.3 million 2027/2028). https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/en/grants-community-support-housing/grants/grants-calendar/sport-and-recreation-facilities-investment-fund.html

[73] OurAuckland, 'Council's value for money programme gains momentum', 20 February 2025 ("For every $25 million of planned savings in the council's budget, rates rise of around 1 per cent is avoided"). https://ourauckland.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/news/2025/02/council-s-value-for-money-programme-gains-momentum/

[74] CBA-WATCH-075, 'Profit Is Not the Enemy of Community. Stagnation Is.', 17 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a82c410ed55bcb78bea88c6

[75] WM New Zealand, 'WM New Zealand to fast-track Redvale extension to protect regional waste resilience' (media pack, 17 November 2025). https://www.wm.nz/contentassets/ef369b67216a4919a3e3f549ab4e9981/media-pack-17112025.pdf

[76] WM New Zealand, 'Auckland Regional Landfill' (update of 17 June 2026: Redvale consented to 31 December 2028; ARL unlikely to be operational until the mid-2030s). https://www.wm.nz/my-region/auckland/auckland-regional-landfill/

[77] AP-01, 'Three Waters reform – local accountability safeguards', 17 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a5946e2996674e191bd49bb

[78] CBA-WATCH-05, 'Auckland's Local Board "Spend It or Lose It" Funding Model Is Wasteful, Short-Termist, and Structurally Broken', 15 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56f81cef8f657ad1c34c87

[79] CBA-WATCH-19, 'That Monster House Children Avoid on the Street', 31 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a6c14612c3880009529d77c

[80] CBA-WATCH-27, 'Piha Campground Is Shut. Auckland Council Has Not Said When It Will Reopen.', 19 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6aae43969d2e600dfa23caf4

[81] CBA-WATCH-08, 'Collaboration Without Capture: Auckland Museum, MOTAT and the Fight for Creative Autonomy', 27 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a66cfa34a18c666a695e672

[82] AP-07, 'MOTAT stronger model – conditions for in-principle VFMC support', statement to the Value for Money Committee, 10 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6aa241670043c055f32e66e4

[83] AP-ADV02, 'Safeguarding Creative, Cultural & Memorial Autonomy', 18 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a5ac49139c24a5a74e3e4e4

[84] CBA-WATCH-074, 'Bread and Circuses: Auckland's Preferred Distraction', 15 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a800f77b7064b5601677f5c

[85] CBA-WATCH-89, 'Fit-for-Purpose Evidence: The Standards Auckland Council Must Apply to All Data Used in Analysis', 15 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ad1433ddbfcc7dc257ce0c4

[86] CBA-WATCH-06, 'Unlocking Auckland's Potential: Reforming the Local Government Act for Cities of Scale', 15 July 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56f81cef8f657ad1c34c88

[87] CBA-WATCH-025, 'Auckland's Local Democracy is Mostly Theatre', 15 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a80064f92e18498bce744b7

[88] CBA-WATCH-85, 'The land that taught the teachers should teach again', 4 October 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6ac1d4c116ad2f2c7cd7c221

[89] CBA-WATCH-027, 'Locked Out of Our Own Backyard', 15 August 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a800920e256023f8f1c2831

[90] CBA-WATCH-09, 'The Wairaki Stream project at Lynfield Cove', 16 September 2026. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6aaadd87bd72cdd602683c97

[91] CBA Question Hub Q.4.1, construction cost control. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56fb524e7376964e952796

[92] CBA Question Hub Q.5.1, phased intensification. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56fb524e7376964e952798

[93] CBA Question Hub Q.7.2, flooding. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56fb524e7376964e95279d

[94] CBA Question Hub Q.3.2, indoor sports facilities. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56fb524e7376964e952795

[95] CBA Question Hub Q.8.1, parking and small business. https://thecitybuilder.com/article/6a56fb524e7376964e95279e