



Long-Term Plan 2024-2034 (10-year budget)

Written Feedback

Late Submissions Volume #1

April 2024



AK HAVE YOUR SAY

Long-term Plan 2024-2034 Submission Form

Auckland Council
02 APR 2024
GBD - ALBERT STREET

First and last name:


Email or postal address

Local Board or suburb:



The following section is **optional**:

What is your gender?



My submission

I wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Do you have any other comments?

Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreation facilities. We greatly appreciate this support and investment – without it much of what happens in our sector simply wouldn't be possible. Council's commitment to the sector has provided positive outcomes across the region for an inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I also wish to acknowledge the commitment of council staff in supporting the sector.

Tell us here:

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

Explain why:

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation – improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes.

I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.


The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region:

a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club)

b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.

Signature



Name:

25th March 2024

To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [AKHaveYourSay](#)
Date: Ardmore Community Hall
Tuesday, 9 April 2024 3:20:17 pm

Good Afternoon,

I am writing regarding your decision to sell the Ardmore Community Hall. I am appalled that you would even consider selling it given it was donated to the council, including the land, by the community. You have already decided to sell the land given by the farmer [REDACTED]. This is all morally wrong.

If it was a private gift from [REDACTED] to another private person then that would be different. But you are the council, working for the people. The right thing to do is give it back as the local community has been asking. You by-passed your chance to give the land back to help the community, Ardmore School. What a total disappointment.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Mahere ā-Pae tawhiti 2024-2034

Puka Whakawhiti Kōrero

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Consultation Document
Feedback Form

**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**



**Auckland
Council**

Te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau



➤ Give us your views on our long-term plan

There are a number of ways you can share your views with us on the Long-term Plan 2024-2034. Please take the time to get involved.

Written and online feedback

- You can provide feedback online at akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan
- Or you can complete the feedback form included in this Consultation Document,
- Or you can request documents at libraries, local board offices and council service locations and then send it back to the freepost address provided,
- Or download a copy online and send it to the freepost address provided,



Face-to-face

Face to face events will take place across the region where you can provide feedback in person. The details of these events will be published on the website at akhaveyoursay.nz or you can call for more information on 09 301 0101.



Social media

You will be able to find out more on the following social media channels:

- Facebook
- Instagram
- LinkedIn



Webinars

We will also be holding a range of online webinars, where subject matter experts will be discussing and providing information on the long-term plan. You will have an opportunity to listen and ask questions. For more information and to register for these webinars go online to akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan.



Translations

We want as many people from Auckland's communities as possible to have their say in this process.

To help with this, translated summaries of this consultation document as well as the feedback form are available in Te Reo Māori, Korean, simplified Chinese, traditional Chinese, Samoan, Tongan, New Zealand Sign Language video, Hindi and Easy Read.

The translated documents are available:

- online at akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan for downloadable translations and feedback forms
- on request in libraries and service centres
- by emailing akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
- by calling 09 301 0101

Where to find more information:

You can find everything you need to know at akhaveyoursay.co.nz including the Supporting Information, an online feedback form and a schedule for Have Your Say events. The full Supporting Information that supports this Consultation Document will also be available at libraries, council service locations and local board offices. If none of the above methods are suitable for you, please call us on 09 301 0101 to discuss alternative options.



**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**

➤ We want your feedback

Feedback must be received by Thursday 28 March. Please read the consultation document available at akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan or at any library or Auckland Council service location. It has more information about the issues and choices that we want your feedback on.

We encourage you to give feedback online at akhaveyoursay.nz (where disability-accessible and different language versions are available) or you can:

Email your completed form to:
akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Drop your completed form off at your local library

Post your completed form to:
AK Have Your say
Auckland Council,
Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

Your details

Your name and feedback will be included in public documents. All other personal details will not be made publicly available.

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 2020. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. Please familiarise yourself with this policy before submitting this form.

First name: [Redacted]

Last name: [Redacted]

Email address or postal address: [Redacted]

Your local board or suburb: [Redacted]

Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation or business? (If yes, this confirms you have authority to submit on the organisation's behalf) Yes No Name of organisation or business: NA

All remaining questions are **optional** but will help us understand which groups of the community are engaging with us.

What gender are you?

[Redacted]

➤ Context: Auckland Council's long-term plan is about choices

► For more information on this proposal, read Part three of the consultation document

Our proposal for this 10-year plan balances providing a central level of service focussed on making do with what we have, while spending more where it is needed most.



The proposal includes spending to get Auckland moving. This investment is intended to make public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use.

It also includes strengthening Auckland's resilience to flooding events over 10 years (the Making Space for Water programme).

But there are alternatives. We could do more or do less than what's in our proposal.

We want to know whether Aucklanders think we should make do with what we have (see our central proposal below), plan to do more, or do less.

There are also options and trade-offs in how we fund the services proposed, such as creating an investment fund (Auckland Future Fund), that we want your feedback on.

Pay less and get less

► Paying less to get less could limit average rates increases for residential ratepayers to as low as

- 5.5 per cent in year one
- 3.5 per cent in year two
- 3.5 per cent in year three
- no more than 1 per cent above CPI inflation thereafter.

This will require cuts to some service levels, or will slow down improvements.

CAPEX \$33.5b **OPEX \$69.2b**

Central proposal

► Under our proposal the annual rates increase for the average value residential property is set at

- 7.5 per cent in year one
- 3.5 per cent in year two
- 8.0 per cent in year three
- no more than 3.5 per cent for the years after that.

This provides a central level of service focussed on making do with what we have, while spending more where it is needed most.

CAPEX \$39.3b **OPEX \$72.0b**


Pay more and get more

► Paying more to get more could see average rates increases for residential ratepayers rise by up to

- 14 per cent in year one
- 10 per cent in year two
- 10 per cent in year three
- 5 per cent for the years after that.

This includes speeding up investment in transport services and climate resilience.

CAPEX \$52.0b **OPEX \$76.5b**



There is a lot to consider and some challenging decisions to make - so we'd like you to have your say to inform our decisions.



➤ Overall direction for Long-term Plan

► For more information on this proposal, read pages Part four of the consultation document

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

- Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt
- Proceed with the central proposal
- Do more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases and more debt
- Other I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

(Note that while we can do less of some activities, we will still fund those things that we legally have to do)

	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Transport: Roads, public transport and safety improvements across the transport network	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water: Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
City and local development: Deliver urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Community: A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economic and cultural development: Major events funding and economic development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Council support: Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to **do more of** that you would be prepared **to pay more for**?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council **to do less of** so that you could **pay less**?

Note, for any other feedback, there is a space at the end of the form for other comments.





➤ Transport plan

► **Read pages 32-34 of the consultation document for more information on this proposal.**

Our budget proposes working with government to make progress toward an integrated transport plan for Auckland. It proposes a total capital spend of \$13.4 billion for Auckland Transport over 10 years.

This includes:

- making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes
- network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes
- stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

There are also options to do more, or do less (See page 34)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

- Support all of the proposal
 Support most of the proposal
 Do not support most of the proposal
 Don't support any of the proposal
 I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

heavy rail to airport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Ferry decarbonisation

➤ North Harbour stadium

► **Further information on each option can be found on page 104 of the consultation document.**

In response to future investment needs of North Harbour Stadium, we are considering options for the future of the stadium precinct.

We could keep the stadium precinct as it is now, and maintain it at a cost of \$33 million over 10 years. Or, we could redevelop the stadium precinct to better deliver for the needs of the North Shore community, funded through reallocation of this \$33 million, the sale of some stadium precinct land while retaining the existing community playing fields and any other external funding available.

Another option is to change the operational management of the stadium to ensure greater use by the community. Changes to operational management can be considered in addition to either Option 1 or Option 2.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

(Please select one or more options)

- Keep the stadium precinct as it is
 Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct
 Change the operational management
 Other
 I don't know

Tell us why:



➤ Major investments

► For more information on this proposal, read Part five of the consultation document

We are proposing a diversified investment fund for Auckland (the Auckland Future Fund).

The key objectives of this proposal are to:

- protect the value of the council’s major investments
- provide a funding source to mitigate the risk posed by climate change and other major environmental challenges, and change how we manage our insurance
- enhance cash returns to council to help pay for council services
- spread the risk of council’s investments over a range of different assets in different locations
- better provide for changing community needs and continuing to deliver our strategic objectives

The proposal includes the transfer of council’s shareholding of just over 11 per cent in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) to the fund to enable the subsequent sale of any or all the shares by the fund manager.

The fund may be structured as a trust (or similar structure), and would have clear rules and restrictions around what circumstances the funds can be accessed by the council in the future. This might be a Council Controlled Organisation. It would be managed by a professional fund manager(s) under a clear set of investment objectives and policies set by the council.

As the objectives for the fund would involve diversifying risk by spreading the fund across a range of investments, it is almost certain that most, if not all, of the AIAL shares would be sold over time.

We are also considering changes to the way the Port of Auckland operates, which may also result in further investment into the Auckland Future Fund (see questions 4b and 4c).

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council’s shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

- Proceed with the proposal
 Don’t proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding
 Other I don’t know

Tell us why:

Auckland Council owns 100 per cent of Port of Auckland Limited (POAL), which is the company that owns and operates the Port of Auckland on the central city waterfront. POAL makes profits for and returns a dividend to Auckland Council. The Port land and wharves are currently owned by POAL and are used for commercial freight and cruise ship harbour facilities. We are proposing a change to our investment in the Port.

One option is for Auckland Council group to keep underlying ownership of the port land and wharves but enter into a lease for the port operations for a period of about 35 years. The lease would be subject to a number of conditions to help progress the council’s ownership objectives for the port.

This option is reflected in our central proposal and we estimate this could:

- generate an upfront payment of around \$2.1 billion, which we would then invest in the Auckland Future Fund
- lessen the rates increase for year two of the long-term plan to the proposed 3.5 per cent

Alternatively, the Port of Auckland Limited could continue to operate under the current arrangements and continue to implement their plan to deliver more profits and dividends. These planned financial returns could continue to be used to help fund council services, but as they would be lower than the cash return under the lease proposal, this would require higher rates increases or cuts to council services.

Alternatively, these financial returns from POAL (and any capital distributions from the port) could be invested into the Auckland Future Fund, noting that this would require even higher rates increases or more cuts to council services.

There is also an option to transfer Bledisloe Terminal to the council within 15 years. See question 5b.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

- Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and **continue council group operation of the port** (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council
- Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and **lease the operation of the port** for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Other I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

- Continue** to use it to fund council services **Invest** in the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Other I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Including the proposal for self-insurance and implementation options for the Future Fund and possible changes to the council's shareholding in Port of Auckland Limited and to the ownership of the Port land.

► **For more information** see Part five of this document.

Tell us here:

of

➤ Port land

▶ Read Part six of the consultation document for more information on this proposal

Whether or not the operation of the Port of Auckland is leased, some land and wharves currently used for port operations could be transferred to Auckland Council and used for something else that provides public benefit. This could include the creation of some new public spaces and/or new waterfront residential or commercial developments. Captain Cook and Marsden wharves could be transferred to council within 2-5 years provided that resource consent can be obtained for work at the Bledisloe Terminal. These works are required to allow some port operations to be moved and would cost around \$110 million, but otherwise there would be no significant impact on the operations or value of the port.

The Bledisloe Terminal site could be freed up and transferred to council for use in another way within 15 years. However, this would significantly reduce the scale of port operations in Auckland with more shipments needing to be transported into Auckland by truck or rail. It would also lower the value of the proposed port lease by an estimated \$300 million or reduce the future profits and dividends the council earns from the port. However depending on the alternative use of the site, this could provide some significant future financial benefits for the council.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?


- Proceed** with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.
- No change** – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations
- Other I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

- Keep** Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland **operational area**
- Transfer** Bledisloe Terminal **to council** to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years
- Other I don't know

Tell us why:



➤ Changes to other rates, fees and charges

► For more information on this proposal, read Part nine of the consultation document.

We are also proposing some changes to business rates, targeted rates, fees and charges.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



We are also proposing some changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy (see page 98 in consultation document) and some changes to fees and charges (page 100 in the consultation document).

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Please say which proposals:

➤ Local board priorities

► For more information on this proposal, read Part eleven of the consultation document

We want to hear your feedback on the proposed priorities for local board services and activities.

► Find your local board on the Auckland Council website: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/localboardfinder

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waitemata

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for your local board area in 2024/2025?

- I support **all** priorities
- I support **most** priorities
- I **do not** support **most** priorities
- I **do not** support **any** priorities
- Other I don't know

Tell us why: *There has been enough consultation on Leys Institute - please make sure the work goes ahead. Please do not close any libraries in the City. continue work in improving library services.*

➤ Do you have any other comments?

Including Local Board Funding Policy on page 110, Council Controlled Organisation Accountability Policy on page 19.

Tell us here:





We are also proposing some changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy (see page 98 in consultation document) and some changes to fees and charges (page 100 in the consultation document).

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Please say which proposals:

➤ Local board priorities

► For more information on this proposal, read Part eleven of the consultation document

We want to hear your feedback on the proposed priorities for local board services and activities.

► Find your local board on the Auckland Council website: aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/localboardfinder

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for your local board area in 2024/2025?

- I support **all** priorities
- I support **most** priorities
- I **do not** support **most** priorities
- I **do not** support **any** priorities
- Other I don't know

Tell us why:

➤ Do you have any other comments?

Including Local Board Funding Policy on page 110, Council Controlled Organisation Accountability Policy on page 19.

Tell us here: *Essential work has not been done so that rates can be kept down principally to attract votes. This cannot continue.*

➤ Changes to other rates, fees and charges

► For more information on this proposal, read Part nine of the consultation document.

We are also proposing some changes to business rates, targeted rates, fees and charges.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

➤ Port land

▶ **Read Part six of the consultation document for more information on this proposal**

Whether or not the operation of the Port of Auckland is leased, some land and wharves currently used for port operations could be transferred to Auckland Council and used for something else that provides public benefit. This could include the creation of some new public spaces and/or new waterfront residential or commercial developments.

Captain Cook and Marsden wharves could be transferred to council within 2-5 years provided that resource consent can be obtained for work at the Bledisloe Terminal. These works are required to allow some port operations to be moved and would cost around \$110 million, but otherwise there would be no significant impact on the operations or value of the port.

The Bledisloe Terminal site could be freed up and transferred to council for use in another way within 15 years. However, this would significantly reduce the scale of port operations in Auckland with more shipments needing to be transported into Auckland by truck or rail. It would also lower the value of the proposed port lease by an estimated \$300 million or reduce the future profits and dividends the council earns from the port. However depending on the alternative use of the site, this could provide some significant future financial benefits for the council.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Other

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?


Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland **operational area**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal **to council** to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Other

I don't know

Tell us why:



This option is reflected in our central proposal and we estimate this could:

- generate an upfront payment of around \$2.1 billion, which we would then invest in the Auckland Future Fund
- lessen the rates increase for year two of the long-term plan to the proposed 3.5 per cent

Alternatively, the Port of Auckland Limited could continue to operate under the current arrangements and continue to implement their plan to deliver more profits and dividends. These planned financial returns could continue to be used to help fund council services, but as they would be lower than the cash return under the lease proposal, this would require higher rates increases or cuts to council services.

Alternatively, these financial returns from POAL (and any capital distributions from the port) could be invested into the Auckland Future Fund, noting that this would require even higher rates increases or more cuts to council services.

There is also an option to transfer Bledisloe Terminal to the council within 15 years. See question 5b.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

- Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and **continue council group operation of the port** (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council
- Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and **lease the operation of the port** for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Other I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

- Continue** to use it to fund council services **Invest** in the proposed Auckland Future Fund
- Other I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Including the proposal for self-insurance and implementation options for the Future Fund and possible changes to the council's shareholding in Port of Auckland Limited and to the ownership of the Port land.

► **For more information** see Part five of this document.

Tell us here:

➤ Major investments

► For more information on this proposal, read Part five of the consultation document

**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**

We are proposing a diversified investment fund for Auckland (the Auckland Future Fund).

The key objectives of this proposal are to:

- protect the value of the council's major investments
- provide a funding source to mitigate the risk posed by climate change and other major environmental challenges, and change how we manage our insurance
- enhance cash returns to council to help pay for council services
- spread the risk of council's investments over a range of different assets in different locations
- better provide for changing community needs and continuing to deliver our strategic objectives

The proposal includes the transfer of council's shareholding of just over 11 per cent in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) to the fund to enable the subsequent sale of any or all the shares by the fund manager.

The fund may be structured as a trust (or similar structure), and would have clear rules and restrictions around what circumstances the funds can be accessed by the council in the future. This might be a Council Controlled Organisation. It would be managed by a professional fund manager(s) under a clear set of investment objectives and policies set by the council.

As the objectives for the fund would involve diversifying risk by spreading the fund across a range of investments, it is almost certain that most, if not all, of the AIAL shares would be sold over time.

We are also considering changes to the way the Port of Auckland operates, which may also result in further investment into the Auckland Future Fund (see questions 4b and 4c).

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

- Proceed with the proposal
- Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding
- Other I don't know

Tell us why:

Such a fund seems risky.

Auckland Council owns 100 per cent of Port of Auckland Limited (POAL), which is the company that owns and operates the Port of Auckland on the central city waterfront. POAL makes profits for and returns a dividend to Auckland Council. The Port land and wharves are currently owned by POAL and are used for commercial freight and cruise ship harbour facilities. We are proposing a change to our investment in the Port.

One option is for Auckland Council group to keep underlying ownership of the port land and wharves but enter into a lease for the port operations for a period of about 35 years. The lease would be subject to a number of conditions to help progress the council's ownership objectives for the port.



➤ Transport plan

► **Read pages 32-34 of the consultation document for more information on this proposal.**

Our budget proposes working with government to make progress toward an integrated transport plan for Auckland. It proposes a total capital spend of \$13.4 billion for Auckland Transport over 10 years.

This includes:

- making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes
- network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes
- stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

There are also options to do more, or do less (See page 34)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

- Support all** of the proposal **Support most** of the proposal
 Do not support most of the proposal **Don't support any** of the proposal I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would **spend more** on?

ferries to Gulf Harbour

2b. Is there anything you would **spend less** on?

➤ North Harbour stadium

► **Further information on each option can be found on page 104 of the consultation document.**

In response to future investment needs of North Harbour Stadium, we are considering options for the future of the stadium precinct.

We could keep the stadium precinct as it is now, and maintain it at a cost of \$33 million over 10 years. Or, we could redevelop the stadium precinct to better deliver for the needs of the North Shore community, funded through reallocation of this \$33 million, the sale of some stadium precinct land while retaining the existing community playing fields and any other external funding available.

Another option is to change the operational management of the stadium to ensure greater use by the community. Changes to operational management can be considered in addition to either Option 1 or Option 2.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

(Please select one or more options)

- Keep** the stadium precinct as it is **Consider redeveloping** the stadium precinct
 Change the **operational management** Other I don't know

Tell us why:



➤ Overall direction for Long-term Plan

► For more information on this proposal, read pages Part four of the consultation document

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

- Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt
- Proceed with the central proposal
- Do more (increase council services/investment), with higher rates increases and more debt
- Other I don't know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

(Note that while we can do less of some activities, we will still fund those things that we legally have to do)

	Do less	As proposed	Do more
Transport: Roads, public transport and safety improvements across the transport network	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water: Managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
City and local development: Deliver urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Community: A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economic and cultural development: Major events funding and economic development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Council support: Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Enforcement of regulations/bylaws on beaches eg dogs, cars driving and parking on beaches.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Note, for any other feedback, there is a space at the end of the form for other comments.



► Context: Auckland Council's long-term plan is about choices

► For more information on this proposal, read Part three of the consultation document

Our proposal for this 10-year plan balances providing a central level of service focussed on making do with what we have, while spending more where it is needed most.



The proposal includes spending to get Auckland moving. This investment is intended to make public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use.

It also includes strengthening Auckland's resilience to flooding events over 10 years (the Making Space for Water programme).

But there are alternatives. We could do more or do less than what's in our proposal.

We want to know whether Aucklanders think we should make do with what we have (see our central proposal below), plan to do more, or do less.

There are also options and trade-offs in how we fund the services proposed, such as creating an investment fund (Auckland Future Fund), that we want your feedback on.

Pay less and get less

► Paying less to get less could limit average rates increases for residential ratepayers to as low as

- 5.5 per cent in year one
- 3.5 per cent in year two
- 3.5 per cent in year three
- no more than 1 per cent above CPI inflation thereafter.

This will require cuts to some service levels, or will slow down improvements.

CAPEX
\$33.5b

OPEX
\$69.2b

Central proposal

► Under our proposal the annual rates increase for the average value residential property is set at:

- 7.5 per cent in year one
- 3.5 per cent in year two
- 3.0 per cent in year three
- no more than 3.5 per cent for the years after that.

This provides a central level of service focussed on making do with what we have, while spending more where it is needed most.

CAPEX
\$39.3b

OPEX
\$72.0b

Pay more and get more

► Paying more to get more could see average rates increases for residential ratepayers rise by up to

- 14 per cent in year one
- 10 per cent in year two
- 10 per cent in year three
- 5 per cent for the years after that.

This includes speeding up investment in transport services and climate resilience.

CAPEX
\$52.0b

OPEX
\$76.5b



There is a lot to consider and some challenging decisions to make - so we'd like you to have your say to inform our decisions.



➤ We want your feedback

Feedback must be received by Thursday 28 March. Please read the consultation document available at akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan or at any library or Auckland Council service location. It has more information about the issues and choices that we want your feedback on.

We encourage you to give feedback online at akhaveyoursay.nz (where disability-accessible and different language versions are available) or you can:

Email your completed form to:
akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Drop your completed form off at your local library

Post your completed form to:

AK Have Your say
 Auckland Council,
 Freepost Authority 182382
 Private Bag 92300
 Auckland 1142

Your details

Your name and feedback will be included in public documents. All other personal details will not be made publicly available.

The personal information that you provide in this form will be held and protected by Auckland Council in accordance with our privacy policy (available at aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy and at our libraries and service centres) and with the Privacy Act 2020. The privacy policy explains how we can use and share your personal information in relation to any interaction you have with the council, and how you can access and correct that information. Please familiarise yourself with the privacy policy before submitting this form.

First name: _____ Last name: _____

Email address or postal address: _____

Your local board or suburb: Mairangi

Is your feedback on behalf of an organisation or business? (If yes, this confirms you have authority to submit on the organisation's behalf) Yes No Name of organisation or business: _____

All remaining questions are **optional** but will help us understand which groups of the community are engaging with us.

What gender are you?

Female Male Another gender: _____

What is your age group?

Under 15 15-17 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65-74 75+

Which ethnic group(s) do you belong to? (Please select as many as apply)

Pākehā/NZ European Other European Māori
 Cook Islands Māori Samoan Tongan
 Indian Chinese Southeast Asian
 Other (please specify): _____

➤ Give us your views on our long-term plan

There are a number of ways you can share your views with us on the Long-term Plan 2024-2034. Please take the time to get involved.



Written and online feedback

- You can provide feedback online at [akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ourplan)
- Or you can complete the feedback form included in this Consultation Document,
- Or you can request documents at libraries, local board offices and council service locations and then send it back to the freepost address provided,
- Or download a copy online and send it to the freepost address provided,



Face-to-face

Face to face events will take place across the region where you can provide feedback in person. The details of these events will be published on the website at [akhaveyoursay.nz](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ourplan) or you can call for more information on 09 301 0101.



Social media

You will be able to find out more on the following social media channels:

- Facebook
- Instagram
- LinkedIn



Webinars

We will also be holding a range of online webinars, where subject matter experts will be discussing and providing information on the long-term plan. You will have an opportunity to listen and ask questions. For more information and to register for these webinars go online to [akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ourplan).



Translations

We want as many people from Auckland's communities as possible to have their say in this process. To help with this, translated summaries of this consultation document as well as the feedback form are available in Te Reo Māori, Korean, simplified Chinese, traditional Chinese, Samoan, Tongan, New Zealand Sign Language video, Hindi and Easy Read.

The translated documents are available:

- online at [akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ourplan) for downloadable translations and feedback forms
- on request in libraries and service centres
- by emailing akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
- by calling 09 301 0101

Where to find more information:

You can find everything you need to know at [akhaveyoursay.co.nz](https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/ourplan) including the Supporting Information, an online feedback form and a schedule for Have Your Say events. The full Supporting Information that supports this Consultation Document will also be available at libraries, council service locations and local board offices. If none of the above methods are suitable for you, please call us on 09 301 0101 to discuss alternative options.



Mahere ā-Pae tawhiti 2024-2034

Puka Whakawhiti Kōrero

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Consultation Document
Feedback Form



AK HAVE YOUR SAY**Long-term Plan 2024-2034 Submission Harbour Sport March 2024****AK HAVE YOUR SAY****Long-term Plan 2024-2034 Submission Form**

First and last name: [REDACTED]

Email or postal address: [REDACTED]

Local Board or suburb: Upper Harbour, Kaipatiki, Hibiscus and Bays, Devonport /Takapuna, Rodney

Name of organisation: Harbour Sport Trust

The following section is **optional**:

What is your gender?

Male	Female	Another gender
------	---------------	----------------

What is your age?

Under 15	15-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+
----------	-------	--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----

What describes your ethnicity?

Pakeha/ NZ European	Māori	Chinese	South East Asian	Samoan	Tongan	Indian	Korean	Cook Islands Māori	Other Specify
------------------------------------	-------	---------	------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------------------	---------------

Harbour Sport Submission

I wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. I rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Harbour Sport is a charitable trust that was established in 1989 to support the community in the delivery of sport and recreation in the community. The scope of Harbour Sport has increased over the years as their relationships, knowledge and ability to support the community have become significant. The addition of large health contracts, management of significant community events and a critical support role in the school's sector has seen the important of Harbour Sport to be a pure community facing organisation.

Harbour Sport is a key delivery partner of Auckland Council, Te Whatu Ora, ACC, Aktive and Sport New Zealand. I am also a significant advocacy partner of the 5 Local Boards in the region, and a critical support partner of the 21 High schools, 100 primary and intermediate schools, the 300 sports clubs, and the 30 plus regional sports associations. Harbour Sport is community facing that supports the local organisations and people that implement projects and initiatives that will get more people recreating and playing sport, in the North of Auckland.

I see the following points highlighted in submissions previously as critical since the difficulties of Covid, and the floods, the recovery of Auckland in the sector:

- Support for sport by reduced hire age of council facilities
- Funding to enable making membership fees affordable or free
- Budget to fill the gap for the reduced revenue due to lack of membership fees, loss of income, funding and sponsorship reductions and ongoing administration costs
- Operational support for a loss of staff, not having enough hours for staff, staff affordability and lack of and retention of volunteers.

Unfortunately, these factors have not been addressed and in fact the costs to the community for council facilities has increased substantially for a variety of reasons. With no real plan, or consultation or working with the community to address these issues prior to the events that have exacerbated the concerns.

Consequently:

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector. But would like to be part of the discussion to help design the future.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery, but this needs to be worked through with the right people in the room and with community together at the table.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector, again with the proviso that the community are at the table in the design process, and through implementation.

I **support** the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I also seek that local board have access to development contributions to enhance their local infrastructure and have the ability to support local projects of significant that would effect their local community.
- I support an independent review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

North Harbour Stadium

In response to options proposed about North Harbour Stadium:

Formal Proposal for the Preservation and Revitalization of North Harbour Stadium

Summary

This proposal advocates for the preservation of North Harbour Stadium while acknowledging the recent decline in its utilisation. A thorough investigation, devoid of political influence, is recommended to identify the root causes behind this downturn. Subsequently, a competent management group, inclusive of community representatives, should be established to develop a comprehensive revitalisation plan. This plan should encompass a cohesive approach to Auckland's sporting and entertainment infrastructure while taking into account the financial contributions of the North Shore community.

Preserving North Harbour Stadium: A Strategic Move

The demolition and reconstruction of North Harbour Stadium represent a significant financial outlay. This proposal posits that revitalisation efforts focused on maximizing current infrastructure offer a more cost-effective solution. Preserving the stadium allows for continued community engagement and contributes to the cultural fabric of the region.

Investigating the Decline: A Path to Revitalization

The noticeable decline in North Harbour Stadium's utilisation warrants a comprehensive investigation. This examination should objectively assess the impact of the management shift under council control on factors such as:

- Event frequency and variety
- Community engagement initiatives
- Maintenance practices

Additionally, the broader context of council-managed facilities should be explored. Does this decline reflect systemic issues within the council's management structure? Identifying the root causes behind the underutilisation of North Harbour Stadium is crucial for formulating effective revitalisation strategies.

Collaboration is Key: Building a Sustainable Future

The formation of a competent management group, inclusive of community representatives and industry experts, is paramount. This group will be tasked with:

- Conducting a comprehensive investigation into the decline in usage.
- Assessing all viable options for the future of the stadium.
- Developing a data-driven, long-term plan for maximizing the stadium's potential.

Furthermore, a cohesive approach to the future of Auckland's sporting and entertainment infrastructure is necessary. This necessitates collaboration with stakeholders involved in other stadiums across the region.

Respecting the Stakeholders: A Community-Centric Approach

The financial contributions of the North Shore community towards the construction of the stadium merit due consideration. Their voices, along with those of the broader Auckland populace, should be incorporated into the decision-making process.

Conclusion: A Catalyst for Growth

By prioritising revitalisation over demolition, North Harbour Stadium can be transformed into a vibrant hub once again. Strategic planning, collaborative efforts, and the engagement of knowledgeable experts are key to achieving this objective. A revitalized North Harbour Stadium will serve not only the North Shore community but also act as a valuable asset for the entire Auckland region.

I support the keeping of North Harbour Stadium – Option 1, with an investigation of a new management structure, to then investigate all the options available, which may include redevelopment and finetuning the stadium to meet future needs.

How to submit this form

Email – Email your completed form to akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

In person - Drop your completed form off at your local library or service centre.

By post - Place your completed form in an envelope and send it to freepost address:

AK Have Your say
Auckland Council,
Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142


Note: Your feedback will be included in public documents. All other personal details will remain private.

This submission can also be done online if you prefer:

<https://akhaveyoursay.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/hub-page/long-term-plan-2024-2034>

22 March 2024

AK Have Your Say
Auckland Council
Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142



To Auckland Council,

Re.: Submission on Parks & Community Component of Council's Long-Term Plan

This is a personal submission in support of the funding for sport and recreation facilities as part of the Auckland Council's Long-Term Plan. I am also a member of Winstone Park Tennis Club.

As a resident of Auckland, and someone who is an active sports and recreation participant, I appreciate the commitment and support that Auckland Council has made, and continues to make, to the sport and recreation landscape of the city. I also am very aware of pressures and challenges the Council is facing.

As an active tennis player and club member, I have personally experienced a wide disparity in the quality of club and public tennis facilities across Auckland. A greater level of investment to maintain, improve, and protect facilities from the ever-increasing ravages of weather extremes, would be hugely beneficial to the sport and its participants.

I have been an active member of the above club for over 40 years and welcome funding for sport and recreation facilities as part of the Auckland Council's Long Term Plan

I fully support the retention of the existing Sport & Recreation Facilities Investment Fund at its current level, plus adding the proposed (non-contestable) additional \$35m investment. This will be vital in addressing the sport and recreation infrastructure deficit and upgrading the existing infrastructure.

I hope that the changes to the LTP in the sports and recreation sector are adopted, and the Council can continue to assist in enhancing the infrastructure, to ensure the massive economic, societal, and health & well-being benefits of sport and recreation are maximised.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information of the sender.

AK HAVE YOUR SAY

Long-term Plan 2024-2034 Submission Form

Auckland Council
02 APR 2024
GBD - ALBERT STREET

First and last name:




Email or postal address:



Local Board or suburb:

Mt Eden



My submission

I wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Do you have any other comments?

Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreation facilities. We greatly appreciate this support and investment – without it much of what happens in our sector simply wouldn't be possible. Council's commitment to the sector has provided positive outcomes across the region for an inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I also wish to acknowledge the commitment of council staff in supporting the sector.

Tell us here:

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

Explain why:

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation – improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes.

I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.


The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region:

a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club)


b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.

Signature



Name:



25th March 2024

Auckland Council
02 APR 2024
CBD - ALBERT STREET

AK HAVE YOUR SAY

Long-term Plan 2024-2034 Submission Form

First and last name:




Email or postal address:



Local Board or suburb:

Howick

The following section is optional:



My submission

I wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

I am part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. I participate in the sport of table tennis.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

Do you have any other comments?

Auckland Council is the major provider of our city's sport and recreation facilities. We greatly appreciate this support and investment – without it much of what happens in our sector simply wouldn't be possible. Council's commitment to the sector has provided positive outcomes across the region for an inclusive range of codes, demographics, cultures, ages and abilities. I also wish to acknowledge the commitment of council staff in supporting the sector.

Tell us here:

I submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

I submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

Explain why:

More funding will enable more sport and recreation facilities to be built. There is clear evidence of the huge and wide-ranging benefits of sport and recreation – improved physical and mental health and wellbeing, social connectedness, economic and productivity gains, and educational outcomes.

I participate in the sport of table tennis. Auckland Council has identified there is a shortage of indoor court space across the Auckland region. This includes a lack of capacity to meet the demand for sports such as table tennis.

The Auckland table tennis stadium, 99A Gillies Avenue, Epsom is at capacity many nights of the week. This impacts my ability to participate.

The Auckland Table Tennis Association is involved in two Facilities Development Projects aimed at addressing the shortage of indoor court space in the Auckland region:

a) Lloyd Elsmore Community Hub: Lloyd Elsmore Park, 451 Pakuranga Road, Pakuranga Heights. In the Howick Local Board area. The purpose of the Hub is to construct a multi-club and code facility at Lloyd Elsmore Park to accommodate the four Founding Members (Auckland Table Tennis Association, Howick Gymnastics Club, Pakuranga Bowling Club, and Pakuranga Tennis Club)

b) Gillies Avenue redevelopment project: Pascoe Quarry, 99 Gillies Avenue, Epsom. In the Albert-Eden Local Board area. Auckland Table Tennis Association, Auckland Badminton Association, and Olympic Weightlifting Auckland are collaborating to pursue redevelopment of the existing Gillies Avenue site

I urge investment in the sport and recreation sector under this Long-term Plan. Without this commitment from Council our current and future community sport and recreation spaces will be compromised. This means our growing, increasingly diverse population will not have access to fit-for-purpose facilities to participate in physical activity to enable them to connect with their community and live active, healthy lives.

Signature



Name:



25th March 2024



**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**

▶ 我们需要您的反馈

反馈意见截至3月28日星期四。请在 akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan 网页、图书馆或奥克兰市议会服务网点取阅咨询文件。

除了我们需要您反馈的问题和选项之外，咨询文件里有更为详细的信息。

我们鼓励您通过 akhaveyoursay.nz 网页（提供无障碍和多语种版本）在线提供反馈意见，您也可以通过以下方式参与：

将您填好的反馈表发邮件给

akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

把您填好的表格交到您当地的
图书馆

将您填好的表格邮寄至以下地址：

AK Have Your say Auckland
Council, Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

您的信息

您的姓名和反馈意见会被纳入公开文件。所有其他个人信息都不会被公开。

奥克兰市议会将根据我们的隐私政策（可参阅 aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy，或前往图书馆、服务网点取阅）和《2020隐私法案》持有并保护您在表格中提供的私人信息。隐私政策解释了我们在您跟市议会的互动中使用及分享您的私人信息的方式，以及您获得并修改信息的方式。提交该表格之前，请您先熟悉该政策。

名字：

姓氏：

电子邮件地址或邮寄地址：

您所在的地区委员会或区域：

您的反馈意见是否代表一个企业或机构？（如果填是，则表明您有权力代表该机构）

是

否 机构或企业的名称：

以下问题均为**非必答项**，但有助于我们了解我们在与哪些社区团体沟通。

您的性别为？

女性 男性 其他性别

您属于哪个年龄段？

不满15 15-17 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65-74 75+

您觉得自己属于哪个/些族裔？（请选择所有适合的选项）

西兰欧洲裔

其他欧洲裔

毛利裔

库克群岛毛利裔

萨摩亚裔

汤加裔

印度裔

华裔

东南亚裔

其他（请说明）：

中国

背景：奥克兰市议会长期规划是关于选择

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第三部分

我们本次十年规划中，平衡了两个方面的服务，即在现有能力范围内提供中间水平的服务，以及在最需要的地方增加支出。

规划方案包括让奥克兰动起来的支出。该投资旨在让公共交通更快捷，更可靠，更方便。

方案也包括加强奥克兰的韧性，在未来10年里更有好地抵御水灾（“为水创造空间”项目）

但也有其他替代办法。可以比我们提出的方案，多做一点或者少做一点。

我们想知道奥克兰群众是想让我们在能力范围内做事（参阅下方介绍的中间方案），还是再多做一点，或是少做一点。

各个方案的服务经费怎么划拨，都有选择与取舍。例如，我们希望听听大家的建议，要不要建立一个投资基金（“奥克兰未来基金”）。



少付少得

▶ 少付少得，住宅地税缴纳者支付的平均地税涨幅将限制在以下范围：

- 第一年5.5%
- 第二年3.5%
- 第三年3.5%

之后的涨幅不超过通货膨胀率基础上的1%，但这将要求削减部分服务或减缓改善的速度。

资本支出 \$33.5b 运营支出 \$69.2b

中间方案

▶ 该方案下，平均价值住宅物业的年度地税增长幅度会在以下范围：

- 第一年7.5%
- 第二年3.5%
- 第三年8.0%
- 之后每年不超过3.5%

此举将在我们现有能力范围内提供中间水平的服务，并在最需要的地方增加支出。

资本支出 \$39.3b 运营支出 \$72.0b

多付多得

▶ 多付多得，住宅地税缴纳者支付的平均地税增长将达到：

- 第一年14%
- 第二年10%
- 第三年10%
- 之后每年5%

这涵盖了加速对交通服务和气候韧性的投资。

资本支出 \$52.0b 运营支出 \$76.5b



有很多东西需要考虑，要做的决定也很有挑战—所以我们希望您的反馈意见能帮助我们做决定。


 AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY

长期规划的总体方向

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第四部分

1a. 对于市议会长期规划的总体方向，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 少做（缩减市议会服务/投资），地税少涨点、债务少一点。
- 推进中间方案
- 多做（增加市议会服务/投资），地税多涨点、债务多一点。
- 其他 我不知道

1b. 您希望奥克兰市议会在哪些方面多做或少做一点？

（请注意，虽然我们可以减少某些项目，但是我们仍需给法定的项目拨款）

	少做	按照提议的	多做
交通：道路、公共交通以及交通网络的安全升级	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
水：管理雨水，从而减少洪涝并保护水道。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
市中心和区域发展：实现城市复兴并引领市中心发展	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
环境和规则：保护并恢复我们的自然环境	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
公园和社区：（提供）各类文化、体育、休闲、图书馆和社区服务，包括给地区委员会提供不错的经费。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
经济和文化发展：大型活动经费拨款和经济发展	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
市议会支持：保障服务提供，实现有效治理，紧急管理以及地区便利设施的拨款	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1c. 还有哪些其他事项，是您希望奥克兰市议会多做一点的，且您也准备多支付一点的？

医疗、交通

1d. 还有哪些其他事项，是您希望奥克兰市议会少做一点的，这样您就可以少支付一点的？

城市建设

请注意，反馈表的最后留有空间用于其他评论，您可以在那里写下其他反馈意见。

交通方案

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第32-34页

我们的预算方案拟议与（中央）政府合作，推进奥克兰的整合交通方案。拟议未来10年为奥克兰交通局（Auckland Transport）提供合计134亿新西兰元的资本支出。

这包括：

- 投资于快速交通网络行动方案，让公共交通更快捷、更可靠、更方便，例如实施便捷支付并引入价格封顶的公交周票
- 优化（交通）网络，减少临时交通管制要求，并引入动态车道
- 停止此前规划的部分项目，例如垫高的人行横道和自行车道。还有一些可以多做或少做的选项（参阅第34页）

地区燃油税

（中央）政府已经宣布取消地区燃油税，这比计划中的早了四年。地区燃油税是市议会的一项经费来源。市议会原本计划再利用两年的地区燃油税预算，来投资特定的交通基础设施和服务。但本次长期规划中已经没有了这部分资金。因此，本规划提出的中间方案也有所调整，取消了地区燃油税的经费来源，同时也相应地缩减了对交通项目的投资。具体哪些项目会受影响，还有待确认。

2. 您对拟议的交通方案有什么看法？

支持所有的拟议方案

支持大部分拟议方案

不支持大部分拟议方案

不支持任何拟议方案

我不知道

请说明原因：

2a. 您还希望在哪些方面增加支出？

交通

2b. 您还希望在哪些方面减少支出？

住房

北港体育场（North Harbour stadium）

► 关于各个选项的更多信息，请参阅咨询文件的第104页。

针对北港体育场未来的投资需要，我们为体育场区域的未来考虑了一些方案选项。

我们可以让体育场区域保持现状，这样在未来10年的维护成本是3300万新西兰元。或者，我们可以重新开发体育场区域，使其更好地服务于北岸社区需求。资金来源为，这3300万新西兰元资金的重新分配、出售体育场区域的部分土地但保留现有的社区运动场地，以及其他所有可用外部资金。

另一个选项是改变体育场的运营管理，以确保社区能更多地利用（场地），（此方案）也可与以上方案一并考虑。

3. 针对北港体育场，您支持哪个选项？（请勾选一个或多个选项）

保持体育场区域现状

考虑重新开发体育场区域

改变运营管理

其他

我不知道

请说明原因：

节约资金


 AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY

重大投资

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第五部分

我们提议为奥克兰建立一个分散投资基金（“奥克兰未来基金”）。该提议的主要目标如下：

- 保护市议会重大投资的价值
- 为减轻气候变化和其他重大环境挑战带来的风险提供资金来源，并改变我们管理保险的方式
- 让市议会获得更好的现金回报，以帮助支付市议会的服务
- 把市议会的投资风险分散到不同地点的一系列不同的资产上
- 更好地为变化的社区需求服务，并继续实现我们的战略目标

该提案包括将市议会持有的奥克兰国际机场有限公司 (AIAL) 11%多一点的股权转让给该基金，便于日后基金经理出售部分或全部股份。

拟议将该基金架构设置为信托（或类似架构），对市议会未来在什么情况下可以动用资金设立明确的规则与限制。这可能是一个市议会下辖机构。它将由一名或多名专业基金经理根据市议会制定的投资目标和政策进行管理。

由于基金的目标涉及分散风险，要通过一系列投资来分散资金（投资），几乎可以肯定的是，大部分或全部的AIAL股份将逐步被出售。

我们也在考虑改变奥克兰港的运营方式，这也会带来对“奥克兰未来基金”的进一步投资（参阅问题4b和4c）。

4a. 对于建立“奥克兰未来基金”并将奥克兰市议会持有的奥克兰国际机场有限公司 (AIAL) 的股权转入该基金（允许股份出售），您有什么看法？

推进拟议方案

不要推进建立“奥克兰未来基金”，不要转移AIAL股权

其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

奥克兰市议会持有奥克兰港有限公司 (POAL) 100%的股权。奥克兰港有限公司拥有并运营着位于市中心水岸的奥克兰港。POAL 为奥克兰市议会创造利润并返还分红。港口土地和码头目前由POAL持有并用于商业货运和邮轮靠港业务。我们拟议改变对港口的投资方式。

其中一个方案是，奥克兰市议会集团继续持有港口土地和码头的基本所有权，但把港口运营权租赁出去，租赁期为35年。该租约将受到一系列条件限制，以帮助实现市议会对港口的所有权目标。

在我们提出的“中间方案”中包括了这个选项，我们预计这样做可以：

- 产生约21亿新西兰元的预付款，我们会把钱注资到奥克兰未来基金
- 降低长期规划中第二年的地税涨幅，实现拟议3.5%的涨幅。

另一个方案，是让奥克兰港有限公司继续在目前的安排下运营，并继续实施他们的计划，创造更多的利润和分红。此计划中的财务回报能够继续用来资助市议会提供的服务，但由于这样的回报将低于拟议的租赁方案所产生的现金回报，也就要求有更高的地税涨幅或削减市议会服务。

或者，从POAL获得的财务回报（以及从港口获得所有资本分配）可被用于注资“奥克兰未来基金”，但也要注意此举会要求地税涨幅更高或削减更多的市议会服务。

还有一个选项，是在15年内将布莱迪斯罗（Bledisloe）码头转交给市议会。参见问题5b。

4b. 对于奥克兰港的未来，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 保持市议会对港口土地和码头的基本所有权，并继续由市议会集团（通过奥克兰港有限公司）来运营港口，实施计划来为市议会提高利润率和分红
- 保持市议会对港口土地和码头的基本所有权，并将港口运营权租赁出去，租期35年，将租约的预付款投资于拟议的“奥克兰未来基金”。
- 其他 我不知道

请在此说明原因：

充满期待 相信政府

4c. 如果市议会集团继续运营奥克兰港，您希望怎样使用利润和分红？

- 继续用来资助市议会服务 注资到拟议的“奥克兰未来基金”
- 其他 我不知道

请在此说明原因：

4d. 对于提案的其他部分，您还有什么反馈意见

包括提案当中“未来基金”的自我保险方案和实施方案，市议会在奥克兰港有限公司的持股和港口土地的所有权变动可能。

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅本文件的第五部分。

请在此说明原因：

少说多做

港口土地

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第六部分

不管奥克兰港的运营权是否租赁出去，目前用于港口作业的部分土地和码头都可以转移给奥克兰市议会，另作它用以创造公共效益。例如，创造一些新的公共空间、新的水岸住宅或商业开发。

如果Bledisloe Terminal工程的资源许可获批，Captain Cook Wharf与Marsden Wharf可在2-5年内转交给市议会。这些工程将允许港口部分业务转移，耗资约1.1亿新西兰元，但除此之外并不会对港口的运营或价值产生重大影响。

未来15年内，Bledisloe Terminal也可以被释放出来，并转交给市议会另作它用。但是，此举将严重缩小奥克兰港口业务规模，更多的海运货物要通过卡车或火车运到奥克兰。此举要么会让拟议的港口租赁价值降低约3亿新西兰元，要么降低市议会未来能从港口获得的利润和分红。不过，也要看另作它用的用途是什么，此举可能会在未来给市议会带来一些重大的财务收益。

5a. 对于Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf, 您觉得哪个选项更好?


- 推进拟议的方案，将Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf从港口转交市议会，使其另作它用，创造公共效益。
- 不变—让Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf继续成为港口业务的一部分
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

5b. 对于Bledisloe Terminal, 您觉得哪个选项更好?

- 保持Bledisloe Terminal继续作为奥克兰港的作业区域
- 在15年内，将Bledisloe Terminal转交给市议会，另作它用，创造公共效益。
- 其他 我不知道

請說明原因：



其他税费变更

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第九部分

我们也拟议修改商业地税，专项地税以及其他收费标准。

6a. 您对以下方案有什么看法？

	支持	不支持	其他	我不知道
恢复 自然环境专项地税（简称NETR） 并延长至2034/2035年。这样我们可以继续投入资金保护本土自然生态系统和本土物种。此举将使平均价值住宅物业的地税增加约20.04新西兰元，平均价值商业物业的地税增加约152.71新西兰元。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
恢复 水质专项地税（简称WQTR） 并延长至2034/2035年，且资金仅用来覆盖每年的项目运营和利息成本。此举将确保我们继续为整个地区的港湾和溪流水质改善工作提供资金，且明年的资金量比此前计划的要少。对于平均价值住宅物业，计划的地税收取比之前规划要收取的少6.53新西兰元；对于平均价值商业物业，计划的地税收取比之前规划要收取的少17.10新西兰元。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
扩大由 气候行动交通专项地税（简称CATTR） 资助的公交车服务的定义。这样，每次公交车项目有什么微小变动，就可以减少每年征询意见的需要（CATTR 的设置如果要变更，还是要征询公众意见的）。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
中止 长期差异化战略 ，该战略是逐步减少企业支付的一般地税份额，并增加其他地税缴纳者的地税份额。我们也拟议增加企业支付NETR，WQTR和CATTR的份额，从而与一般地税（的支付份额）保持一致。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
重新实施 学校回收垃圾费	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
按计划，2024/2025年在北岸、Waitākere 和 Papakura 推进由地税出资的垃圾收集服务 ，2025/2026年在Franklin 和Rodney推进这项服务，以取代现有的“扔多少付多少”的垃圾服务，并实现相应的地税更改。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
引入 Franklin地区委员会道路专项地税 ，每个SUIP（即独立使用或有人居住的部分）52新西兰元，来增加对Franklin地区委员会区域内道路的投资。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
修改 Rodney 排水区专项地税 ，以体现群众呼声和最新的分析结果，因为此举对物业和边界有好处。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
上调 Waitākere郊区污水处理专项地税 。在2024/2025年，2025/2026年和2026/2027年间，从296.75新西兰元上调至336.80新西兰元（每年），以便在三年合同期内能覆盖成本，避免每年从一般地税补贴约11.7万新西兰。该项目下一次支出重审是2027/2028年。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

我们还提议对我们的收入和融资政策进行修改（参阅咨询文件第98页），以及部分税费修改（参阅咨询文件第100页）

6b. 对于上面的6a当中提出的方案，对我们的收入和融资政策及其他税费修改，您有其他反馈意见吗？

请说明是给哪个方案提意见和建议：

没有意见。

地区委员会的优先项目

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第七部分

针对地区委员会服务和活动的拟议优先项目，我们希望听到您的反馈意见。

▶ 在奥克兰市议会网站 aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/localboardfinder 上查询您所在的地区委员会

7a. 您的反馈意见是针对哪个地区委员会的辖区？

全部

7b. 您如何看待您所在地区委员会2024/2025年的拟议优先事项？

- 我支持所有优先事项
- 我支持大部分优先事项
- 我不支持大部分优先事项
- 我不支持任何优先事项。
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

提高人民生活水平和生活质量。

您还有其他评论吗？

包括第110页介绍的地区委员会拨款政策，第19页介绍的市议会下属机构问责政策。请在此提出您的看法：

相信政府



**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**

▶ 我们需要您的反馈

反馈意见截至3月28日星期四。请在 akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan 网页、图书馆或奥克兰市议会服务网点取阅咨询文件。除了我们需要您反馈的问题和选项之外，咨询文件里有更为详细的信息。

我们鼓励您通过 akhaveyoursay.nz 网页（提供无障碍和多语种版本）在线提供反馈意见，您也可以通过以下方式参与：

将您填好的反馈表发邮件给
akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

把您填好的表格交到您当地的
图书馆

将您填好的表格邮寄至以下地址：
AK Have Your say Auckland
Council, Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

您的信息

您的姓名和反馈意见会被纳入公开文件。所有其他个人信息都不会被公开。

奥克兰市议会将根据我们的隐私政策（可参阅 aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy，或前往图书馆、服务网点取阅）和《2020隐私法案》持有并保护您在该表格中提供的私人信息。隐私政策解释了我们在您跟市议会的互动中使用及分享您的私人信息的方式，以及您获得并修改信息的方式。提交该表格之前，请您先熟悉该政策。

您的反馈意见是否代表一个企业或机构？（如果填是，则表明您有权力代表该机构）

是 否 机构或企业的名称：_____

以下问题均为非必答项，但有助于我们了解我们在与哪些社区团体沟通。

您的性别为？

女性 男性 其他性别 _____

您属于哪个年龄段？

不满15 15-17 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65-74 75+

您觉得自己属于哪个/些族裔？（请选择所有适合的选项）

西兰欧洲裔 其他欧洲裔 毛利裔
 库克群岛毛利裔 萨摩亚裔 汤加裔
 印度裔 华裔 东南亚裔

其他（请说明）：_____

背景：奥克兰市议会长期规划是关于选择

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第三部分

我们本次十年规划中，平衡了两个方面的服务，即在现有能力范围内提供中间水平的服务，以及在最需要的地方增加支出。

规划方案包括让奥克兰动起来的支出。该投资旨在让公共交通更快捷，更可靠，更方便。

方案也包括加强奥克兰的韧性，在未来10年里更有好地抵御水灾（“为水创造空间”项目）

但也有其他替代办法。可以比我们提出的方案，多做一点或者少做一点。

我们想知道奥克兰群众是想让我们在能力范围内做事（参阅下方介绍的中间方案），还是再多做一点，或是少做一点。

各个方案的服务经费怎么划拨，都有选择与取舍。例如，我们希望听听大家的建议，要不要建立一个投资基金（“奥克兰未来基金”）。



少付少得

▶ 少付少得，住宅地税缴纳者支付的平均地税涨幅将限制在以下范围：

- 第一年5.5%
- 第二年3.5%
- 第三年3.5%

之后的涨幅不超过通货膨胀率基础上的1%，但这将要求削减部分服务或减缓改善的速度。

资本支出 \$33.5b 运营支出 \$69.2b

中间方案

▶ 该方案下，平均价值住宅物业的年度地税增长幅度会在以下范围：

- 第一年7.5%
- 第二年3.5%
- 第三年8.0%
- 之后每年不超过3.5%

此举将在我们现有能力范围内提供中间水平的服务，并在最需要的地方增加支出。

资本支出 \$39.3b 运营支出 \$72.0b

多付多得

▶ 多付多得，住宅地税缴纳者支付的平均地税增长将达到：

- 第一年14%
- 第二年10%
- 第三年10%
- 之后每年5%

这涵盖了加速对交通服务和气候韧性的投资。

资本支出 \$52.0b 运营支出 \$76.5b



有很多东西需要考虑，要做的决定也很有挑战—所以我们希望您的反馈意见能帮助我们做决定。



**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**

▶ 长期规划的总体方向

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第四部分

1a. 对于市议会长期规划的总体方向，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 少做（缩减市议会服务/投资），地税少涨点、债务少一点。
- 推进中间方案
- 多做（增加市议会服务/投资），地税多涨点、债务多一点。
- 其他 我不知道

1b. 您希望奥克兰市议会在哪些方面多做或少做一点？

（请注意，虽然我们可以减少某些项目，但是我们仍需给法定的项目拨款）

	少做	按照提议的	多做
交通：道路、公共交通以及交通网络的安全升级	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
水：管理雨水，从而减少洪涝并保护水道。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
市中心和区域发展：实现城市复兴并引领市中心发展	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
环境和规则：保护并恢复我们的自然环境	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
公园和社区：（提供）各类文化、体育、休闲、图书馆和社区服务，包括给地区委员会提供不错的经费。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
经济和文化发展：大型活动经费拨款和经济发展	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
市议会支持：保障服务提供，实现有效治理，紧急管理以及地区便利设施的拨款	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1c. 还有哪些其他事项，是您希望奥克兰市议会多做一点的，且您也准备多支付一点的？

1d. 还有哪些其他事项，是您希望奥克兰市议会少做一点的，这样您就可以少支付一点的？

请注意，反馈表的最后留有空间用于其他评论，您可以在那里写下其他反馈意见。

交通方案

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第32-34页

我们的预算方案拟议与（中央）政府合作，推进奥克兰的整合交通方案。拟议未来10年为奥克兰交通局（Auckland Transport）提供合计134亿新西兰元的资本支出。

这包括：

- 投资于快速交通网络行动方案，让公共交通更快捷、更可靠、更方便，例如实施便捷支付并引入价格封顶的公交周票
- 优化（交通）网络，减少临时交通管制要求，并引入动态车道
- 停止此前规划的部分项目，例如垫高的人行横道和自行车道。还有一些可以多做或少做的选项（参阅第34页）

地区燃油税

（中央）政府已经宣布取消地区燃油税，这比计划中的早了四年。地区燃油税是市议会的一项经费来源。市议会原本计划再利用两年的地区燃油税预算，来投资特定的交通基础设施和服务。但本次长期规划中已经没有了这部分资金。因此，本规划提出的中间方案也有所调整，取消了地区燃油税的经费来源，同时也相应地缩减了对交通项目的投资。具体哪些项目会受影响，还有待确认。

2. 您对拟议的交通方案有什么看法？

支持所有的拟议方案

支持大部分拟议方案

不支持大部分拟议方案

不支持任何拟议方案

我不知道

请说明原因：

2a. 您还希望在哪些方面增加支出？

2b. 您还希望在哪些方面减少支出？

北港体育场（North Harbour stadium）

▶ 关于各个选项的更多信息，请参阅咨询文件的第104页。

针对北港体育场未来的投资需要，我们为体育场区域的未来考虑了一些方案选项。

我们可以让体育场区域保持现状，这样在未来10年的维护成本是3300万新西兰元。或者，我们可以重新开发体育场区域，使其更好地服务于北岸社区需求。资金来源为，这3300万新西兰元资金的重新分配、出售体育场区域的部分土地但保留现有的社区运动场地，以及其他所有可用外部资金。

另一个选项是改变体育场的运营管理，以确保社区能更多地利用（场地），（此方案）也可与以上方案一并考虑。

3. 针对北港体育场，您支持哪个选项？（请勾选一个或多个选项）

保持体育场区域现状

考虑重新开发体育场区域

改变运营管理

其他

我不知道

请说明原因：


 AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY

重大投资

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第五部分

我们提议为奥克兰建立一个分散投资基金（“奥克兰未来基金”）。该提议的主要目标如下：

- 保护市议会重大投资的价值
- 为减轻气候变化和其他重大环境挑战带来的风险提供资金来源，并改变我们管理保险的方式
- 让市议会获得更好的现金回报，以帮助支付市议会的服务
- 把市议会的投资风险分散到不同地点的一系列不同的资产上
- 更好地为变化的社区需求服务，并继续实现我们的战略目标

该提案包括将市议会持有的奥克兰国际机场有限公司（AIAL）11%多一点的股权转让给该基金，便于日后基金经理出售部分或全部股份。

拟议将该基金架构设置为信托（或类似架构），对市议会未来在什么情况下可以动用资金设立明确的规则与限制。这可能是一个市议会下辖机构。它将由一名或多名专业基金经理根据市议会制定的投资目标和政策进行管理。

由于基金的目标涉及分散风险，要通过一系列投资来分散资金（投资），几乎可以肯定的是，大部分或全部的AIAL股份将逐步被出售。

我们也在考虑改变奥克兰港的运营方式，这也会带来对“奥克兰未来基金”的进一步投资（参阅问题4b和4c）。

4a. 对于建立“奥克兰未来基金”并将奥克兰市议会持有的奥克兰国际机场有限公司（AIAL）的股权转入该基金（允许股份出售），您有什么看法？

- 推进拟议方案
- 不要推进建立“奥克兰未来基金”，不要转移AIAL股权
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

奥克兰市议会持有奥克兰港有限公司（POAL）100%的股权。奥克兰港有限公司拥有并运营着位于市中心水岸的奥克兰港。POAL 为奥克兰市议会创造利润并返还分红。港口土地和码头目前由POAL持有并用于商业货运和邮轮靠港业务。我们拟议改变对港口的投资方式。

其中一个方案是，奥克兰市议会集团继续持有港口土地和码头的基本所有权，但把港口运营权租赁出去，租赁期为35年。该租约将受到一系列条件限制，以帮助实现市议会对港口的所有权目标。

在我们提出的“中间方案”中包括了这个选项，我们预计这样做可以：

- 产生约21亿新西兰元的预付款，我们会把钱注资到奥克兰未来基金
- 降低长期规划中第二年的地税涨幅，实现拟议3.5%的涨幅。

另一个方案，是让奥克兰港有限公司继续在目前的安排下运营，并继续实施他们的计划，创造更多的利润和分红。此计划中的财务回报能够继续用来资助市议会提供的服务，但由于这样的回报将低于拟议的租赁方案所产生的现金回报，也就要求有更高的地税涨幅或削减市议会服务。

或者，从POAL获得的财务回报（以及从港口获得所有资本分配）可被用于注资“奥克兰未来基金”，但也要注意此举会要求地税涨幅更高或削减更多的市议会服务。

还有一个选项，是在15年内将布莱迪斯罗（Bledisloe）码头转交给市议会。参见问题5b。

4b. 对于奥克兰港的未来，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 保持市议会对港口土地和码头的基本所有权，并继续由市议会集团（通过奥克兰港有限公司）来运营港口，实施计划来为市议会提高利润率和分红
- 保持市议会对港口土地和码头的基本所有权，并将港口运营权租赁出去，租期35年，将租约的预付款注资于拟议的“奥克兰未来基金”。
- 其他 我不知道

请在此说明原因：

4c. 如果市议会集团继续运营奥克兰港，您希望怎样使用利润和分红？

- 继续用来资助市议会服务 注资到拟议的“奥克兰未来基金”
- 其他 我不知道

请在此说明原因：

4d. 对于提案的其他部分，您还有什么反馈意见

包括提案当中“未来基金”的自我保险方案和实施方案，市议会在奥克兰港有限公司的持股和港口土地的所有权变动可能。

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅本文件的第五部分。

请在此说明原因：



▶ 港口土地

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第六部分

不管奥克兰港的运营权是否租赁出去，目前用于港口作业的部分土地和码头都可以转移给奥克兰市议会，另作它用以创造公共效益。例如，创造一些新的公共空间、新的水岸住宅或商业开发。

如果Bledisloe Terminal工程的资源许可获批，Captain Cook Wharf与Marsden Wharf可在2-5年内转交给市议会。这些工程将允许港口部分业务转移，耗资约1.1亿新西兰元，但除此之外并不会对港口的运营或价值产生重大影响。

未来15年内，Bledisloe Terminal也可以被释放出来，并转交给市议会另作它用。但是，此举将严重缩小奥克兰港口业务规模，更多的海运货物要通过卡车或火车运到奥克兰。此举要么会让拟议的港口租赁价值降低约3亿新西兰元，要么降低市议会未来能从港口获得的利润和分红。不过，也要看另作它用的用途是什么，此举可能会在未来给市议会带来一些重大的财务收益。

5a. 对于Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf，您觉得哪个选项更好？


- 推进拟议的方案，将Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf从港口转交市议会，使其另作它用，创造公共效益。
- 不变—让Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf继续成为港口业务的一部分
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

5b. 对于Bledisloe Terminal，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 保持Bledisloe Terminal继续作为奥克兰港的作业区域
- 在15年内，将Bledisloe Terminal转交给市议会，另作它用，创造公共效益。
- 其他 我不知道

請說明原因：



其他税费变更

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第九部分

我们也拟议修改商业地税，专项地税以及其他收费标准。

6a. 您对以下方案有什么看法？

	支持	不支持	其他	我不知道
恢复 自然环境专项地税（简称NETR） 并延长至2034/2035年。这样我们可以继续投入资金保护本土自然生态系统和本土物种。此举将使平均价值住宅物业的地税增加约20.04新西兰元，平均价值商业物业的地税增加约152.71新西兰元。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
恢复 水质专项地税（简称WQTR） 并延长至2034/2035年，且资金仅用来覆盖每年的项目运营和利息成本。此举将确保我们继续为整个地区的港湾和溪流水质改善工作提供资金，且明年的资金量比此前计划的要少。对于平均价值住宅物业，计划的地税收取比之前规划要收取的少6.53新西兰元；对于平均价值商业物业，计划的地税收取比之前规划要收取的少17.10新西兰元。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
扩大由 气候行动交通专项地税（简称CATTR） 资助的公交车服务的定义。这样，每次公交车项目有什么微小变动，就可以减少每年征询意见的需要（CATTR 的设置如果要变更，还是要征询公众意见的）。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
中止 长期差异化战略 ，该战略是逐步减少企业支付的一般地税份额，并增加其他地税缴纳者的地税份额。我们也拟议增加企业支付NETR，WQTR和CATTR的份额，从而与一般地税（的支付份额）保持一致。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
重新实施 学校回收垃圾费	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
按计划，2024/2025年在北岸、Waitākere 和 Papakura 推进由地税出资的垃圾收集服务 ，2025/2026年在Franklin 和Rodney推进这项服务，以取代现有的“扔多少付多少”的垃圾服务，并实现相应的地税更改。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
引入 Franklin地区委员会道路专项地税 ，每个SUIP（即独立使用或有人居住的部分）52新西兰元，来增加对Franklin地区委员会区域内道路的投资。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
修改 Rodney 排水区专项地税 ，以体现群众呼声和最新的分析结果，因为此举对物业和边界有好处。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
上调 Waitākere郊区污水处理专项地税 。在2024/2025年，2025/2026年和2026/2027年间，从296.75新西兰元上调至336.80新西兰元（每年），以便在三年合同期内能覆盖成本，避免每年从一般地税贴补约11.7万新西兰。该项目下一次支出重审是2027/2028年。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

我们还提议对我们的收入和融资政策进行修改（参阅咨询文件第98页），以及部分税费修改（参阅咨询文件第100页）

6b. 对于上面的6a当中提出的方案，对我们的收入和融资政策及其他税费修改，您有其他反馈意见吗？

请说明是给哪个方案提意见和建议：

▶ 地区委员会的优先项目

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第七部分

针对地区委员会服务和活动的拟议优先项目，我们希望听到您的反馈意见。

▶ 在奥克兰市议会网站 aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/localboardfinder 上查询您所在的地区委员会

7a. 您的反馈意见是针对哪个地区委员会的辖区？

7b. 您如何看待您所在地区委员会2024/2025年的拟议优先事项？

- 我支持所有优先事项
- 我支持大部分优先事项
- 我不支持大部分优先事项
- 我不支持任何优先事项。
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

▶ 您还有其他评论吗？

包括第110页介绍的地区委员会拨款政策，第19页介绍的市议会下属机构问责政策。请在此提出您的看法：



**AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY**

▶ 我们需要您的反馈

反馈意见截至3月28日星期四。请在 akhaveyoursay.nz/ourplan 网页、图书馆或奥克兰市议会服务网点取阅咨询文件。

除了我们需要您反馈的问题和选项之外，咨询文件里有更为详细的信息。

我们鼓励您通过 akhaveyoursay.nz 网页（提供无障碍和多语种版本）在线提供反馈意见，您也可以通过以下方式参与：

将您填好的反馈表发邮件给
akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

把您填好的表格交到您当地的
图书馆

将您填好的表格邮寄至以下地址：
AK Have Your say Auckland
Council, Freepost Authority 182382
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

您的信息

您的姓名和反馈意见会被纳入公开文件。所有其他个人信息都不会被公开。

奥克兰市议会将根据我们的隐私政策（可参阅 aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/privacy，或前往图书馆、服务网点取阅）和《2020隐私法案》持有并保护您在该表格中提供的私人信息。隐私政策解释了我们在您跟市议会的互动

您所在的地区委员会或区域：

您的反馈意见是否代表一个企业或机构？（如果填是，则表明您有权力代表该机构）

是 否 机构或企业的名称：_____

以下问题均为**非必答项**，但有助于我们了解我们在与哪些社区团体沟通。

您的性别为？

女性 男性 其他性别 _____

您属于哪个年龄段？

不满15 15-17 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65-74 75+

您觉得自己属于哪个/些族裔？（请选择所有适合的选项）

西兰欧洲裔 其他欧洲裔 毛利裔
 库克群岛毛利裔 萨摩亚裔 汤加裔
 印度裔 华裔 东南亚裔
 其他（请说明）：_____

背景：奥克兰市议会长期规划是关于选择

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第三部分

我们本次十年规划中，平衡了两个方面的服务，即在现有能力范围内提供中间水平的服务，以及在最需要的地方增加支出。

规划方案包括让奥克兰动起来的支出。该投资旨在让公共交通更快捷，更可靠，更方便。

方案也包括加强奥克兰的韧性，在未来10年里更有好地抵御水灾（“为水创造空间”项目）

但也有其他替代办法。可以比我们提出的方案，多做一点或者少做一点。

我们想知道奥克兰群众是想让我们在能力范围内做事（参阅下方介绍的中间方案），还是再多做一点，或是少做一点。

各个方案的服务经费怎么划拨，都有选择与取舍。例如，我们希望听听大家的建议，要不要建立一个投资基金（“奥克兰未来基金”）。



少付少得

▶ 少付少得，住宅地税缴纳者支付的平均地税涨幅将限制在以下范围：

- 第一年5.5%
- 第二年3.5%
- 第三年3.5%

之后的涨幅不超过通货膨胀率基础上的1%，但这将要求削减部分服务或减缓改善的速度。

资本支出
\$33.5b

运营支出
\$69.2b

中间方案

▶ 该方案下，平均价值住宅物业的年度地税增长幅度会在以下范围：

- 第一年7.5%
- 第二年3.5%
- 第三年8.0%
- 之后每年不超过3.5%

此举将在我们现有能力范围内提供中间水平的服务，并在最需要的地方增加支出。

资本支出
\$39.3b

运营支出
\$72.0b

多付多得

▶ 多付多得，住宅地税缴纳者支付的平均地税增长将达到：

- 第一年14%
- 第二年10%
- 第三年10%
- 之后每年5%

这涵盖了加速对交通服务和气候韧性的投资。

资本支出
\$52.0b

运营支出
\$76.5b



有很多东西需要考虑，要做的决定也很有挑战—所以我们希望您的反馈意见能帮助我们做决定。



长期规划的总体方向

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第四部分

1a. 对于市议会长期规划的总体方向，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 少做（缩减市议会服务/投资），地税少涨点、债务少一点。
- 推进中间方案
- 多做（增加市议会服务/投资），地税多涨点、债务多一点。
- 其他 我不知道

1b. 您希望奥克兰市议会在哪些方面多做或少做一点？

（请注意，虽然我们可以减少某些项目，但是我们仍需给法定的项目拨款）

	少做	按照提议的	多做
交通：道路、公共交通以及交通网络的安全升级	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
水：管理雨水，从而减少洪涝并保护水道。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
市中心和区域发展：实现城市复兴并引领市中心发展	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
环境和规则：保护并恢复我们的自然环境	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
公园和社区：（提供）各类文化、体育、休闲、图书馆和社区服务，包括给地区委员会提供不错的经费。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
经济和文化发展：大型活动经费拨款和经济发展	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
市议会支持：保障服务提供，实现有效治理，应急管理以及地区便利设施的拨款	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1c. 还有哪些其他事项，是您希望奥克兰市议会多做一点的，且您也准备多支付一点的？

在市政服务引进更多的科学技术，特别是人工智能化技术

提高工作效率和服务品质

1d. 还有哪些其他事项，是您希望奥克兰市议会少做一点的，这样您就可以少支付一点的？

减少半夜时间大部分地区的公交车，避免大量空车造成的浪费
公交车停运安排希望合理，尤其是重复车次的时间，错开一点

请注意，反馈表的最后留有空间用于其他评论，您可以在那里写下其他反馈意见。

交通方案

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第32-34页

我们的预算方案拟议与（中央）政府合作，推进奥克兰的整合交通方案。拟议未来10年为奥克兰交通局（Auckland Transport）提供合计134亿新西兰元的资本支出。

这包括：

- 投资于快速交通网络行动方案，让公共交通更快捷、更可靠、更方便，例如实施便捷支付并引入价格封顶的公交周票
- 优化（交通）网络，减少临时交通管制要求，并引入动态车道
- 停止此前规划的部分项目，例如垫高的人行横道和自行车道。还有一些可以多做一些或少做的选项（参阅第34页）

地区燃油税

（中央）政府已经宣布取消地区燃油税，这比计划中的早了四年。地区燃油税是市议会的一项经费来源。市议会原本计划再利用两年的地区燃油税预算，来投资特定的交通基础设施和服务。但本次长期规划中已经没有了这部分资金。因此，本规划提出的中间方案也有所调整，取消了地区燃油税的经费来源，同时也相应地缩减了对交通项目的投资。具体哪些项目会受影响，还有待确认。

2. 您对拟议的交通方案有什么看法？

支持所有的拟议方案

支持大部分拟议方案

不支持大部分拟议方案

不支持任何拟议方案

我不知道

请说明原因：

2a. 您还希望在哪些方面增加支出？

增加免费停车位、停车场的数量

2b. 您还希望在哪些方面减少支出？

精简AT管理结构，减少半夜空转的公车数量

北港体育场（North Harbour stadium）

► 关于各个选项的更多信息，请参阅咨询文件的第104页。

针对北港体育场未来的投资需要，我们为体育场区域的未来考虑了一些方案选项。

我们可以让体育场区域保持现状，这样在未来10年的维护成本是3300万新西兰元。或者，我们可以重新开发体育场区域，使其更好地服务于北岸社区需求。资金来源为，这3300万新西兰元资金的重新分配、出售体育场区域的部分土地但保留现有的社区运动场地，以及其他所有可用外部资金。

另一个选项是改变体育场的运营管理，以确保社区能更多地利用（场地），（此方案）也可与以上方案一并考虑。

3. 针对北港体育场，您支持哪个选项？（请勾选一个或多个选项）

保持体育场区域现状

考虑重新开发体育场区域

改变运营管理

其他

我不知道

请说明原因：

维持足够的体育设施和大型活动场所


 AK
HAVE
YOUR
SAY

重大投资

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第五部分

我们提议为奥克兰建立一个分散投资基金（“奥克兰未来基金”）。该提议的主要目标如下：

- 保护市议会重大投资的价值
- 为减轻气候变化和其他重大环境挑战带来的风险提供资金来源，并改变我们管理保险的方式
- 让市议会获得更好的现金回报，以帮助支付市议会的服务
- 把市议会的投资风险分散到不同地点的一系列不同的资产上
- 更好地为变化的社区需求服务，并继续实现我们的战略目标

该提案包括将市议会持有的奥克兰国际机场有限公司 (AIAL) 11%多一点的股权转让给该基金，便于日后基金经理出售部分或全部股份。

拟议将该基金架构设置为信托（或类似架构），对市议会未来在什么情况下可以动用资金设立明确的规则与限制。这可能是一个市议会下辖机构。它将由一名或多名专业基金经理根据市议会制定的投资目标和政策进行管理。

由于基金的目标涉及分散风险，要通过一系列投资来分散资金（投资），几乎可以肯定的是，大部分或全部的 AIAL 股份将逐步被出售。

我们也在考虑改变奥克兰港的运营方式，这也会带来对“奥克兰未来基金”的进一步投资（参阅问题4b和4c）。

4a. 对于建立“奥克兰未来基金”并将奥克兰市议会持有的奥克兰国际机场有限公司 (AIAL) 的股权转入该基金（允许股份出售），您有什么看法？

- 推进拟议方案
- 不要推进建立“奥克兰未来基金”，不要转移AIAL股权
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

奥克兰国际机场的股份是本市长期财政支柱，不适合短期融资

奥克兰市议会持有奥克兰港有限公司 (POAL) 100%的股权。奥克兰港有限公司拥有并运营着位于市中心水岸的奥克兰港。POAL 为奥克兰市议会创造利润并返还分红。港口土地和码头目前由POAL持有并用于商业货运和邮轮靠港业务。我们拟议改变对港口的投资方式。

其中一个方案是，奥克兰市议会集团继续持有港口土地和码头的基本所有权，但把港口运营权租赁出去，租赁期为35年。该租约将受到一系列条件限制，以帮助实现市议会对港口的所有权目标。

在我们提出的“中间方案”中包括了这个选项，我们预计这样做可以：

- 产生约21亿新西兰元的预付款，我们会把钱注资到奥克兰未来基金
- 降低长期规划中第二年的地税涨幅，实现拟议3.5%的涨幅。

另一个方案，是让奥克兰港有限公司继续在目前的安排下运营，并继续实施他们的计划，创造更多的利润和分红。此计划中的财务回报能够继续用来资助市议会提供的服务，但由于这样的回报将低于拟议的租赁方案所产生的现金回报，也就要求有更高的地税涨幅或削减市议会服务。

或者，从POAL获得的财务回报（以及从港口获得所有资本分配）可被用于注资“奥克兰未来基金”，但也要注意此举会要求地税涨幅更高或削减更多的市议会服务。

还有一个选项，是在15年内将布莱迪斯罗（Bledisloe）码头转交给市议会。参见问题5b。

4b. 对于奥克兰港的未来，您觉得哪个选项更好？

- 保持市议会对港口土地和码头的基本所有权，并继续由市议会集团（通过奥克兰港有限公司）来运营港口，实施计划来为市议会提高利润率和分红
- 保持市议会对港口土地和码头的基本所有权，并将港口运营权租赁出去，租期35年，将租约的预付款注资于拟议的“奥克兰未来基金”。
- 其他 我不知道

请在此说明原因：

市政府运营会更稳定一些，租赁的话会多一些不确定因素。

4c. 如果市议会集团继续运营奥克兰港，您希望怎样使用利润和分红？

- 继续用来资助市议会服务 注资到拟议的“奥克兰未来基金”
- 其他 我不知道

请在此说明原因：

可以舒缓税赋和其他对政府压力

4d. 对于提案的其他部分，您还有什么反馈意见

包括提案当中“未来基金”的自我保险方案和实施方案，市议会在奥克兰港有限公司的持股和港口土地的所有权变动可能。

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅本文件的第五部分。

请在此说明原因：

港口土地

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第六部分

不管奥克兰港的运营权是否租赁出去，目前用于港口作业的部分土地和码头都可以转移给奥克兰市议会，另作它用以创造公共效益。例如，创造一些新的公共空间、新的水岸住宅或商业开发。

如果Bledisloe Terminal工程的资源许可获批，Captain Cook Wharf与Marsden Wharf可在2-5年内转交给市议会。这些工程将允许港口部分业务转移，耗资约1.1亿新西兰元，但除此之外并不会对港口的运营或价值产生重大影响。

未来15年内，Bledisloe Terminal也可以被释放出来，并转交给市议会另作它用。但是，此举将严重缩小奥克兰港口业务规模，更多的海运货物要通过卡车或火车运到奥克兰。此举要么会让拟议的港口租赁价值降低约3亿新西兰元，要么降低市议会未来能从港口获得的利润和分红。不过，也要看另作它用的用途是什么，此举可能会在未来给市议会带来一些重大的财务收益。

5a. 对于Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf, 您觉得哪个选项更好?

- 推进拟议的方案，将Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf从港口转交市议会，使其另作它用，创造公共效益。
- 不变—让Captain Cook Wharf和Marsden Wharf继续成为港口业务的一部分
- 其他 我不知道


请说明原因:

5b. 对于Bledisloe Terminal, 您觉得哪个选项更好?

- 保持Bledisloe Terminal继续作为奥克兰港的作业区域
- 在15年内，将Bledisloe Terminal转交给市议会，另作它用，创造公共效益。
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因:

对奥克兰就业和卸货有利



其他税费变更

► 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第九部分

我们也拟议修改商业地税，专项地税以及其他收费标准。

6a. 您对以下方案有什么看法？

	支持	不支持	其他	我不知道
恢复 自然环境专项地税（简称NETR） 并延长至2034/2035年。这样我们可以继续投入资金保护本土自然生态系统和本土物种。此举将使平均价值住宅物业的地税增加约20.04新西兰元，平均价值商业物业的地税增加约152.71新西兰元。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
恢复 水质专项地税（简称WQTR） 并延长至2034/2035年，且资金仅用来覆盖每年的项目运营和利息成本。此举将确保我们继续为整个地区的港湾和溪流水质改善工作提供资金，且明年的资金量比此前计划的要少。对于平均价值住宅物业，计划的地税收取比之前规划要收取的少6.53新西兰元；对于平均价值商业物业，计划的地税收取比之前规划要收取的少17.10新西兰元。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
扩大由 气候行动交通专项地税（简称CATTR） 资助的公交车服务的定义。这样，每次公交车项目有什么微小变动，就可以减少每年征询意见的需要（CATTR 的设定如果要变更，还是要征询公众意见的）。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
中止 长期差异化战略 ，该战略是逐步减少企业支付的一般地税份额，并增加其他地税缴纳者的地税份额。我们也拟议增加企业支付NETR，WQTR和CATTR的份额，从而与一般地税（的支付份额）保持一致。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
重新实施 学校回收垃圾费	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
按计划，2024/2025年在北岸、Waitākere 和 Papakura 推进由地税出资的垃圾收集服务 ，2025/2026年在Franklin 和Rodney推进这项服务，以取代现有的“扔多少付多少”的垃圾服务，并实现相应的地税更改。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
引入 Franklin地区委员会道路专项地税 ，每个SUIP（即独立使用或有人居住的部分）52新西兰元，来增加对Franklin地区委员会区域内道路的投资。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
修改 Rodney 排水区专项地税 ，以体现群众呼声和最新的分析结果，因为此举对物业和边界有好处。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
上调 Waitākere郊区污水处理专项地税 。在2024/2025年，2025/2026年和2026/2027年间，从296.75新西兰元上调至336.80新西兰元（每年），以便在三年合同期内能覆盖成本，避免每年从一般地税贴补约11.7万新西兰。该项目下一次支出重审是2027/2028年。	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

我们还提议对我们的收入和融资政策进行修改（参阅咨询文件第98页），以及部分税费修改（参阅咨询文件第100页）

6b. 对于上面的6a当中提出的方案，对我们的收入和融资政策及其他税费修改，您有其他反馈意见吗？

请说明是给哪个方案提意见和建议：

地区委员会的优先项目

▶ 更多相关信息，请参阅咨询文件的第七部分

针对地区委员会服务和活动的拟议优先项目，我们希望听到您的反馈意见。

▶ 在奥克兰市议会网站 aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/localboardfinder 上查询您所在的地区委员会

7a. 您的反馈意见是针对哪个地区委员会的辖区？

7b. 您如何看待您所在地区委员会2024/2025年的拟议优先事项？

- 我支持所有优先事项
- 我支持大部分优先事项
- 我不支持大部分优先事项
- 我不支持任何优先事项。
- 其他 我不知道

请说明原因：

有利奥克兰的发展方向

您还有其他评论吗？

包括第110页介绍的地区委员会拨款政策，第19页介绍的市议会下属机构问责政策。请在此提出您的看法：
