

Comments on Richardson's Report on CBs to the RCGA:

Charles Crothers
Social Sciences
AUT, Auckland
October, 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction: Orientation of Comments

(1) Comments on Argument of Report

(2) Argument

(2.1) Spatial Levels of Living:

(2.2) Involvements in Local 'Communities'

(3) Evidence to be referred to

(3.1) Data to be assembled:

(3.2) The Current CB Situation in Auckland

(3.3) Evidence concerning Spatial Organisation of Services etc.

(3.4) People's Knowledge and Images of Local Government:

(3.5) Voter Turnout Data

(3.6) People's Knowledge and Images of Auckland and Divisions within it:

References

(4) Appendices

- Appendix 1: Data on Community Involvement

- Appendix 2: Data on Auckland facilities

- Appendix 3: North Shore CC 'Re-suburbification' Exercise

- Appendix 4: UK Government Press Release

- Appendix 5: Survey data on attitudes to local government

Introduction: Orientation of Comments

These comments are written from what is intended as a ‘bottom-up’ perspective on Auckland local government organisation and possible restructuring, and attempt to articulate the ‘voices of the people’ in so far as their views might be known.

Moreover, there is also an attempt to mobilise the appropriate academic literature from the social sciences (and, in principle, public administration) and bring it to bear on the issues around appropriate local government structures (this includes drawing on the recent UK experience). In particular, I have endeavoured to locate NZ studies that might be relevant. However, again, there are many limitations as the relevance of the few studies which seem most appropriate is problematic. Finally, my perspective is much more ‘local’ than the author of the report: based on a couple of decades of living in Narrow Neck, Ponsonby, Mt Albert and Pt Chev.

(1) Comments on Argument of Richardson’s Report

The argument put forward (as in the paper commented upon) is to endeavour to ‘test’ alternative possible models for the future governance of Auckland. In general, my considered views largely concur with those offered by Richardson, albeit with some qualifications and amendments.

In sum:

- enhance CBs (across the region) including ensuring they are linked upwards and downwards
- consider whole package of spatial delivery of services, rather than merely the ‘councillor’ (ie CB in the narrow sense) component.

In more detail:

- the neighbourhood level of governance needs to be formally recognised, albeit admitting that at this level local engagement remains (except where there is a neighbourhood crisis) on a very low level of intensity. In particular, public libraries should continue, and considerably upgrade, their function as quite active information centres in relation to local governance and council community advisers might also be linked in and service centers may also be required. CBs need a foothold down into neighbourhoods. This might involve trying to ensure each has a rep. on the ‘sub-regional’ CB, although it is doubtful if this should be done formally through separate voting wards (largely because the boundaries of suburbs are so porous).
- the sub-region level probably needs more and smaller CBs than at present, and these need better statistical support from SNZ (which appropriately attended to wards with 2006 census data but now needs to focus more carefully also on CBs). I think the report suggests (without adequate supporting evidence) a larger size of CB than is likely to be effective. The difficulty with this level of spatial operation is that there are few clear-cut boundaries or scales around which solid sub-regional entities (CBS) can be formed. It is clear enough though, that it either ‘double or quit’: enhanced and well-supported CBs are needed rather than limping along with a limited set-up as at present. Extra enhancement requires dealing with a wider range of issues than suggested in the report, including linkage to the Regional Council level, partially unlinking their relationship to LA voting wards, considering links to Maori local organisations, energising CB by giving them a role in the planning apparatus such as through working with their own component of a LTCP (e.g. a

‘neighbourhood plan’ - note that the current naming of “LTCP”s is unfortunate as the term ‘community’ is very ambiguous). Features of recent UK interest in this level of activity might well be emulated (see appendix).

- whether (as the report speculates) the continued existence of a ‘city’ identity (Westie, North Shore resident, South Auckland/Manukau resident etc) is sufficient to be a basis for the continuance of a city level of local governance is a thinly-supported argument. In my view there are (to a limited extent) some ‘city identities’ and I do think these have a slight effect on (or manifestation in) life-styles and can be recognised by many residents, but their consequences are minimal. It is likely that people tend to circulate (daily and over longer-time periods) within one or other of the cities (e.g. in terms of home/work links, shifting dwellings etc.) and certainly for shopping and service provision, and this may be a more substantial argument for the retention of a city level. The 4-city scheme is not quite as clear-cut, though, since for some services (notably DHBs and Police) Waitakere and North Shore are combined) whereas Manukau includes a some separate ‘East Auckland’ identity based around the more affluent suburbs closer to the Waitemata as well as its main ‘South Auckland’ persona.

There are some further **Qualifications** concerning any LG arrangements not or only slightly mentioned in the Richardson report which should be borne in mind by the RC:

- the agenda of social, economic and environment responsibilities of local governance: while local governance cannot take aboard responsibilities for all aspects of people’s lives to the extent that central government can, nevertheless Richardson’s comments on the functions of local government beyond the narrowest interpretations of their role (usually seen as involving local roads and other infrastructure provision) need to be firmed up, with local governance needing to be designed to fulfil some responsibilities for facilitating economic development, social cohesion, cultural enhancement and environmental standards which arise from their (limited) abilities to - shape the built environment, provide local services (eg community development) and to foster social cohesion;
- future-proofing: arrangements should bear in mind likely changes such as increased social distress if the current economic slowdown continues and more spatial constraints with rising costs of fuels (perhaps mitigated slightly by likely better public transport in future).
- NIMBY-proofing: too small areas are vulnerable to being swayed by extreme views which dissipate over wider areas and when brought under the control of more formal institutions, and there needs to be ways to divert those with localised interests from vigorously defending these to the detriment of considering wider regional views and responsibilities.
- Social balance-proofing: It seems unwise for ghettoes of either the rich or the poor to develop any more than is likely to occur ‘naturally’, and the spatial arrangements of local government should not aggravate social divisions.
- Maori interests: in the general Auckland region Maori linkages are most developed at the ‘city’ level through Orakei and Waikato hapu/iwi groupings and the Waipareira Trust and Manukau MUA (and now the Destiny Church!). To link formally these to the CB level might stretch capacity, although links to community-based Maori organisations should be explored.

- Regional coverage and linkage: all CBs need to be linked to the regional level and – especially since they have (town in countryside) situations where CBs would be particularly appropriate RDC and FDC should be encouraged to develop CBs.

(2) Argument:

Having commented on Richardson's report I now want to turn to my own perspective, outlining the argument in this section and providing supporting evidence in the following section and the appendices.

The social argument advanced in this commentary is that local governance should be appropriate to the conceptions residents have of local government, and to fit readily into the spatial configurations of their daily lives. Broadly, the most appropriate spatial fit between citizen's views and behaviours and the structure and tasks of local governance should lead to better linkages and hence effectiveness of local government. This is particularly pertinent where the functions to be served by local authorities have been expanded in recent years beyond earlier limitations which still narrow many views on local government. As with the report's reference to 'social capital' local government needs to take some responsibility for the social wellbeing of residents in its area, especially as these are shaped by the built environment which remains its key function to shape, together with councils' service provision, facilitation and advocacy roles.

On the other hand, it needs to be recognised that people's attitudes and behaviour in relation to local governance has been shaped by their experiences of the current system, and they might react (at least slightly) differently to new arrangements, and furthermore new arrangements might create their own levels of support.

(2.1) Spatial Levels of Living:

For many residents in an urban metropolitan area such as Auckland, their life is spatially organised at the following levels:

- immediate neighbouring area: where some neighbours are known. A loose zone which is usually different for each household. Perhaps corresponds to census meshblock. (If so, then there are some 10,000 of these in Auckland region).
- neighbourhood: centred on school and usually local shopping centre (with services including dairies, a butchery, grocery/supermarket, stationers etc. takeaway shops) – at least for families with younger children. Corresponds broadly to Census area unit (usually combined)
- subregion: a wider area (usually) within the present cities in which people go for weekly retail (but also wholesale/retail) shopping (supermarkets and shopping malls), secondary and tertiary education, government services etc.. Broadly similar to current wards/community board areas although the size of subregion varies considerably amongst users.
- Cities: provide traditional 'downtown shopping' areas, associated office areas and local authority services. To some extent cities also function as 'axes' within the overall region with residents anchoring their short-term and long-term spatial behaviour in relation to them. (Also separate Police and Health Board areas broadly follow City lines.)
- the Metropolitan Region: regional HQs and general urban infrastructure services.

(2.2) Involvements in Local ‘Communities’

There is a considerable involvement in communities amongst their residents, which varies by several different social characteristics. These involvements lead on to peoples’ view on local political/government.

There is little systematic information on how local government is best embedded in community processes. In the past, a more-or-less hegemonic ‘community’ was a local spatial framework within which many residents (and especially children and women) were confined (although even in NZ’s brief European history there have been massive flows of internal migration between communities). Such communities are more likely to form where there are clear marker boundaries (e.g. coast, river, motorway, hill) and often centre on local shopping facilities and particularly on a primary school. Moreover, studies have shown that it is those who are more securely anchored in an area (e.g. through home ownership and/or long residence) that have higher propensities to be involved in the community. Moreover, some local studies have illustrated that there can be high levels of local attachment in particular areas.

Against this view of community it must be pointed out that very many New Zealanders shift house (and often locality) after short intervals, many remain renting (and relatively ‘footloose’ as a result), and there are large volumes of commuter traffic to work and for schooling, let alone other activities.

(3) Supporting Evidence

(3.1) Data to be assembled:

A variety of sources are drawn on in supporting/illustrating the above argument.

- international literature
- NZ scholarly literature
- LGNZ/DIA reports
- NZ survey data (with Auckland inflection)
- data on existing CBs
- North Shore re-suburbing exercise.
- Auckland data on spatial hierarchy of retailing, services etc.
- DIA data on size relationships, voter turnout, and election competitiveness (no. of candidates)

other data might be **needed** were the evidence base to be extended:

- Mental Maps of Auckland held by residents
- Inter-census (within-Auckland) migration patterns
- Journey to work patterns within Auckland.

(3.2) The Current CB Situation in Auckland

Currently there are 28 CBs in the 4 main cities of Auckland.

Ward	TIA	Population	CB Members	Liaison Cllrs
Albany	NSC	31209	4	2
Birkenhead Northcote	NSC	41124	3	2
Devonport	NSC	11142	4	2
East Coast Bays	NSC	42204	4	2
Glenfield	NSC	50106	4	2
Takapuna	NSC	29817	4	2
Henderson	WC	40047	5	2
Massey	WC	51372	6	3
New Lynn	WC	49842	5	2
Waitakere	WC	27456	6	3
Avondale	AC	76000	5	2
Eastern Bays	AC	36000	5	2
Eden - Albert	AC	53000	6	3
Great Barrier	AC	1200	5	1
Hobson	AC	52000	6	3
Maungakiekie	AC	79000	5	2
Mt Roskill	AC	76000	5	2
Tamaki	AC	79000	5	2
Waiheke	AC	7500	5	1
Western Bays	AC	36000	5	2
Botany	MC	31263	5	1
Clevedon	MC	12279	5	1
Howick	MC	39438	5	2
Mangere	MC	55266	5	3
Manurewa	MC	77508	6	4
Otara	MC	34257	4	1
Pakuranga	MC	38301	5	2
Papatoetoe	MC	40659	5	2

Summary Statistics

			Mean	Minimum	Maximum
TLA	NSC	Population	34267	11142	50106
		CB Members	3.83	3.00	4.00
		Liaison Cllrs	2.00	2.00	2.00
		Population per CB member	.14	.07	.36
	WC	Population	42179	27456	51372
		CB Members	5.50	5.00	6.00
		Liaison Cllrs	2.50	2.00	3.00
		Population per CB member	.14	.10	.22
	AC	Population	49570	1200	79000
		CB Members	5.20	5.00	6.00
		Liaison Cllrs	2.00	1.00	3.00
		Population per CB member	.56	.06	4.17
	MC	Population	41121	12279	77508
		CB Members	5.00	4.00	6.00
		Liaison Cllrs	2.00	1.00	4.00
		Population per CB member	.15	.08	.41
Group Total	Population	42821	1200	79000	
	CB Members	5	3	6	
	Liaison Cllrs	2.07	1.00	4.00	
	Population per CB member	.29	.06	4.17	

In addition, there are 2 large rural CBs in CMDC. It is not clear what physical presence the CBs have. (According to the phone book) only NSCC has any service centers (area offices: Albany, Birkenhead, Devonport, ECB, Glenfield, Takapuna), although MCC does have community advisors for each ward -whose functions are:

- networking and linking to other resources
- funding information
- advice and information about managing your community group
- group facilitation
- conflict resolution/mediation
- local community project development
- liaising with other parties

(Note: Often previous Council's offices are used for local services, often thereby continuing historical traditions).

(3.3) Evidence concerning Spatial Delivery of Services etc.

(3.3.1) Neighbourhood level:

There are some 250 CAUs in Auckland region and c200 in the metropolitan area. This is similar to the 316 primary schools in the region, but larger than the c140 'suburbs' identified in the Min. of Education schools directory.

The NSCC 'resuburbing' exercise is instructive. It came out with c45 suburbs compared to c55 CAUs in the City. Both process and criteria used are appropriate for demarcating new suburbs. (See appendix 3).

(3.3.2) Subregion level:

There is quite a wide range (between 20 and 60) for various 'subregional' functions:

- police stations: c45
- fire stations: c35
- WINZ offices: c35
- Medlab collection centers: c55
- Ambulance stations: c20
- State Secondary Schools: c65.

This suggests that the present CBs are towards the smaller number/larger population size end of the range, and that (perhaps over time) smaller CB areas might be moved towards.

(3.4) People's Knowledge and Images of Local Government:

Relevant survey research material which can be mobilised to begin to answer these questions includes:

LGC, LGNZ, DIA and other survey work on elector and candidate attributes, behaviour and motivations: e.g.

(3.5) Voter Turnout Data

The Dept. of Internal Affairs kindly released provisional figures from the 2007 local authority elections (a report is due to be published later this year). Some analyses were carried out on the extent to which residential (or overall turnout was affected by community characteristics. (Similar data was also released in analysis-friendly form for the previous 2 local elections but these have yet to be analysed, although such analysis would usefully confirm trends over time through time series. Turnout is affected by various local features, including type of voting mechanism, but especially number of candidates and other characteristics of particular elections but it has been assumed in these analyses that these are 'random', and will be further investigated.)

Tables 1 & 2 report turnout for Auckland Region Local authorities for 2007, and means are also given. Since voting is usually carried out for a package of authorities turnout figures are similar. (Interestingly, mayoral turnout is not the highest, which – rather- is for CBs). However, there are some instructive figures. In the North Shore perhaps the less affluent Glenfield has lower turnout for that reason, whereas the highly affluent Eastern Bays (ACC) has a high turnout. (Census data on wards are available from Stats NZ but the analysis linking census and turnout characteristics has not been carried out.) Smaller and well-bounded communities produce high turnouts (e.g. Waiheke and Great Barrier). In particular, there is an apparent strong congruence between council ward turnouts and CB figures.

Table 1: Average Residential Turnouts for Auckland Regional LAs 2007

Type (%)	lacode
CB	.3958
CC	.3815
DHB	.3832
LT	.3704
MAYOR	.3797
RC	.3836
TA	.3867

Table 2: Detailed Turnout Data

Type (%)	Authority	Residential turnout		
CB	North Shore City	.3548	ALBANY	
		.3342	BIRKENHEAD-NORTHCOTE COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3763	DEVONPORT COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3742	EAST COAST BAYS COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3194	GLENFIELD COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3667	TAKAPUNA COMMUNITY BOARD	
		Waitakere City	.3957	HENDERSON COMMUNITY BOARD
			.3571	SSEY COMMUNITY BOARD
			.3558	NEW LYNN COMMUNITY BOARD
			.4326	WAITAKERE COMMUNITY BOARD
	Auckland City	.3728	AVONDALE COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.4826	EASTERN BAYS COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3804	EDEN-ALBERT COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.5938	GREAT BARRIER COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.4136	HOBSON COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3613	MAUNGAKIEKIE COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.3901	MOUNT ROSKILL COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.2953	TAMAKI COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.5669	WAIHEKE COMMUNITY BOARD	
		.4193	WESTERN BAYS COMMUNITY BOARD	
Manukau City	.3962	BOTANY COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.4425	CLEVEDON COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.4588	HOWICK COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.3714	MANGERE COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.3377	MANUREWA COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.3264	OTARA COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.4215	PAKURANGA COMMUNITY BOARD		
	.3861	PAPATOETOE COMMUNITY BOARD		
Mean		.3958		
CC	North Shore City	.3496	NORTH SHORE CITY COUNCIL	
	Waitakere City	.3789	WAITAKERE CITY COUNCIL	
	Auckland City	.3956	AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL	
	Manukau City	.3846	MANUKAU CITY COUNCIL	
Mean		.3772		
DC	Rodney District	.4495	RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL	
	Papakura District	.3458	PAPAKURA DISTRICT COUNCIL	
	Franklin District	.3491	FRANKLIN DISTRICT COUNCIL	
	Mean		.3815	
DHB	Rodney District	.3813	WAITEMATA DISTRICT HEALTH BOARD	
	Auckland City	.3957	AUCKLAND DISTRICT HEALTH BOARD	
	Manukau City	.3728	COUNTIES MANUKAU DISTRICT HEALTH BOARD	
Mean		.3832		
LT	Rodney District	.	PARAKAI LICENSING TRUST	

	North Shore		
	City	.	BIRKENHEAD LICENSING TRUST
	Waitakere City	.3935	WAITAKERE LICENSING TRUST
		.3558	WAITAKERE LICENSING TRUST
		.3826	WAITAKERE LICENSING TRUST
		.4201	WAITAKERE LICENSING TRUST
		.3810	WAITAKERE LICENSING TRUST
	Auckland City	.3155	MT WELLINGTON LICENSING TRUST
		.3692	PORTAGE LICENSING TRUST
		.3403	PORTAGE LICENSING TRUST
		.4066	PORTAGE LICENSING TRUST
		.3756	PORTAGE LICENSING TRUST
	Manukau City	.3343	WIRI LICENSING TRUST
Mean		.3704	
MAYOR	Rodney District	.4495	RODNEY DISTRICT COUNCIL
	North Shore		
	City	.3538	NORTH SHORE CITY COUNCIL
	Auckland City	.3956	AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL
	Manukau City	.3847	MANUKAU CITY COUNCIL
	Papakura		
	District	.3458	PAPAKURA DISTRICT COUNCIL
	Franklin		
	District	.3414	FRANKLIN DISTRICT COUNCIL
Mean		.3797	
RC	.	.3832	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
	Rodney District	.4495	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
	North Shore		
	City	.3538	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
	Waitakere City	.3761	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
	Auckland City	.3956	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
	Manukau City	.3819	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
	Papakura		
	District	.3454	AUCKLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL
Mean		.3836	
TA	Rodney District	.3815	CENTRAL
		.4756	HIBISCUS COAST
		.5067	NORTHERN
		.3711	WESTERN
	North Shore City	.3694	CENTRAL
		.3156	HARBOUR
		.3659	NORTHERN
	Waitakere City	.3957	HENDERSON
		.3571	MASSEY
		.3558	NEW LYNN
		.4326	WAITAKERE
	Auckland City	.3822	AVONDALE-ROSKILL
		.4826	EASTERN BAYS
		.3804	EDEN-ALBERT
		.5698	HAURAKI GULF ISLANDS
		.4136	HOBSON
		.3304	TAMAKI-MAUNGAKIEKIE
		.4193	WESTERN BAYS
	Manukau City	.4077	BOTANY-CLEVEDON
		.4588	HOWICK
		.3714	MANGERE
		.3377	MANUREWA
		.3264	OTARA
		.4215	PAKURANGA
		.3861	PAPATOETOE
	Papakura District	.2881	ARDMORE
		.3774	DRURY
		.4018	PAHUREHURE
		.3056	RED HILL
	Franklin District	.	NORTHERN
		.3566	PUKEKOHE

	.3133	SOUTHERN
	.3731	WAIUKU-AWHITU
Mean	.3885	

(3.6) People's Knowledge and Images of Auckland and Divisions within it:

The BCQOL survey includes a tantalising question that bears on what residents see as their 'city centre'. Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing what respondents had in mind when asked about the 'city centre': given that the rest of the survey concerned local authority matters it is likely that many saw this in relevant terms. However, it is likely that other activities e.g. shopping is more relevant in general to people's movements and that this affected some people's responses. (It also seems likely that people do not think about local politics in a sharply spatial way: e.g. they often interact with local authorities by post or telephone and may seldom contact the LA officials directly (see evidence from surveys referenced above).

Although allegiance to 'downtown Auckland' is most concentrated in ACC, there is still considerable levels of recognition from residents of Rodney, North Shore, Waitakere and Manukau (the question was not asked of Franklin respondents). (It is possible that the 'CBD' response was intended to indicate downtown Auckland but we can't be sure. Manukau and Henderson are well-recognised but Takapuna obtains only minority support and Orewa is seldom recognised. Many of the remaining responses may well refer to LA 'service centres', although there clearly is a 'random' element involved, including a Manukau resident who related to Birkenhead. It is possible that there are social patterns common to those affiliating with the Downtown or with a 'subregional centre' but this has not been investigated.

Reference Material:

- Crothers (2008). **Candidates, Issues and Outcomes in Auckland Local Election Voting** Future of Local Government Symposium AUT with Massey University, Wellington, April 2, 2008.
<http://www.ipp.org.nz/localgovtfiles/Seminars/FutureofLGSymposium/Crothers.ppt>
- Crothers, Charles (2008) Some Sociological Studies Relevant to Local Authorities in Auckland Social Sciences, AUT
- DIA (2006) “Public Knowledge about Local Government”**
- Harrington, Carol (1997) Family friends and neighbours: personal life as resistance, and as hard work *New Zealand Sociology*, v.12 n.2:p.159-182
- Local Government Commission (2007) **“National survey 2007: Knowledge of, and participation in, local government – Final report”**
- Richardson, Mary (2008) *Roles and Functions of Community Boards* Report to LGNZ
- Richardson, Mike (2008) *Setting Community Boards in context*. A report prepared for the Royal Commission on Auckland Governance

(4) Appendices:

(4.1) Data on Community Involvement

Which area do you regard as your city centre? *

Local Authority (from meshblocks) Crosstabulation

% within Local Authority (from meshblocks)

		Local Authority (from meshblocks)						Total
		Rodney District	North Shore City	Waitakere City	Auckland City	Manukau City	Not found	
Which area do you regard as your city centre?	Albany	14.5%	8.1%	.3%	.3%			2.6%
	Botany Downs		.3%		2.6%	14.6%	6.3%	4.6%
	Helensville	5.3%	.3%					.4%
	Highbury/Birkenhead village	.7%	18.8%	.3%	.3%	.2%		3.5%
	Howick			.3%	.8%	9.5%	6.3%	2.7%
	Kumeu/Huapai village	1.3%						.1%
	Manukau City Centre			.6%	6.6%	62.4%	87.5%	18.3%
	Orewa	14.5%	1.0%		.1%			1.2%
	Queen Street/Downtown Auckland	20.4%	21.4%	14.6%	57.8%	12.0%		30.5%
	Silverdale	2.0%	.0%		.3%			.2%
	Takapuna	3.9%	36.2%	.0%				6.6%
	West City/Henderson	5.3%	.3%	69.3%	4.7%	.2%		12.7%
	Westgate	3.3%	.5%	10.4%	.4%			2.1%
	Whangaparaoa/Pacific Plaza	16.4%						1.1%
	Newmarket				8.1%	.2%		2.9%
	St.Lukes			.3%	3.0%			1.1%
	Mt.Wellington / Sylvia Park	.0%			3.4%	.2%		1.2%
	CBD unspec	3.3%	11.7%	1.5%	9.0%	.6%		5.8%
Dont know	9.2%	1.6%	2.4%	2.7%	.2%		2.3%	
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q24a Community sense important netts * Local Authority (from meshblocks) Crosstabulation

% within Local Authority (from meshblocks)

		Local Authority (from meshblocks)							Total
		Rodney District	North Shore City	Waitakere City	Auckland City	Manukau City	Papakura District	Franklin District	
Q24a	Disagree	5.0%	7.6%	8.4%	10.4%	6.0%	6.2%	5.6%	7.8%
	Neither	14.9%	21.7%	21.3%	20.2%	19.6%	14.2%	25.9%	20.1%
	Agree	80.1%	70.7%	70.3%	69.4%	74.4%	79.6%	68.5%	72.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q24b Community sense felt netts * Local Authority (from meshblocks) Crosstabulation

% within Local Authority (from meshblocks)

		Local Authority (from meshblocks)							Total
		Rodney District	North Shore City	Waitakere City	Auckland City	Manukau City	Papakura District	Franklin District	
Q24b	Disagree	8.1%	17.4%	22.5%	19.9%	14.1%	20.9%	12.0%	17.4%
	Neither	18.1%	28.7%	27.5%	27.3%	26.2%	19.6%	21.1%	25.8%
	Agree	73.8%	53.9%	50.0%	52.8%	59.7%	59.5%	66.9%	56.7%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q27 Main social network * Local Authority (from meshblocks) Crosstabulation

% within Local Authority (from meshblocks)

		Local Authority (from meshblocks)							Total
		Rodney District	North Shore City	Waitakere City	Auckland City	Manukau City	Papakura District	Franklin District	
Q27	Mostly based in the same local area where you live	28.9%	24.9%	27.5%	17.9%	27.5%	13.4%	49.3%	24.6%
	Mostly based on shared interests or beliefs, but not necessary	11.9%	22.3%	18.0%	23.4%	13.2%	14.6%	11.8%	18.3%
	A mixture of both	54.1%	48.4%	50.2%	53.5%	55.6%	67.5%	31.9%	52.4%
	No social networks DO NOT READ	2.5%	2.9%	3.1%	3.6%	2.4%	4.5%	5.6%	3.3%
	Family networks only DO NOT READ	2.5%	1.6%	1.2%	1.6%	1.3%		1.4%	1.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Appendix 2: Data on Auckland Facilities:
 Schools
 State-only

	LA							Group To
	RD	NSC	WC	AC	MC	PD	FD	Count
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
Secondary	3	9	8	19	18	3	4	64
Full Primary	20	1	15	21	21	10	28	116
Contributing	10	41	30	50	55	4	10	200
Intermediate		8	6	13	13	2	1	43
Special School		1	3		1			5
Teen parent Unit				1	1			2
Restricted Composite					1			1
Secondary (extd)	2	1		1	1		1	6
Composite			1	1	2		1	5
Group Total	35	61	63	106	113	19	45	442

Local Authority

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid RD	13	9.2	9.2	9.2
NSC	21	14.9	14.9	24.1
WC	23	16.3	16.3	40.4
AC	45	31.9	31.9	72.3
MC	28	19.9	19.9	92.2
PD	3	2.1	2.1	94.3
FD	8	5.7	5.7	100.0
Total	141	100.0	100.0	

Appendix 3: North Shore CC ‘Re-suburbification’ Exercise (Source: http://www.northshorecity.govt.nz/default.asp?src=http://www.northshorecity.govt.nz/our_council/News_Releases/Releases-2008/June/suburbs-get-seal-of-approval.html)

Over the past few decades North Shore City has grown and with this growth has come the creation of new houses, areas and communities. To reflect the changes in our city, the council felt it was necessary to look at its composition and better define the city’s suburbs. We also wanted to make it easier for the Emergency Services’ centralised call centres such as Police, Ambulance and Fire Service to locate specific addresses when calls are made for help.

Suburbs were last defined in the 1970s and since then the city has experienced the amalgamation of the former local authorities in 1989, urban development, and emerging and changing communities. As a result a number of locality names have been adopted by the communities living in the city.

We worked closely with Community Board members to ensure that the views of their local communities were taken into consideration. We also consulted with a number of key organisations (including Iwi, the Real Estate Institute and Emergency Services) to define suburbs based on the communities that had already established in the city.

Under the New Zealand Geographic Board Act of 1946, local councils are required to clearly define and name all suburbs. Many of the suburbs already existed but needed to be better defined as did a few new suburbs that had established. Following public consultation, the suburbs were approved by the council and the New Zealand Geographic Board, the government agency responsible for approving place names including suburbs.

North Shore City now has 44 suburbs. These became official upon publication in the *New Zealand Gazette*, the New Zealand government’s official newspaper.

Criteria used to define suburbs

A variety of criteria were used to define the suburbs including existing names and reference material, heritage values and historic identity, community neighbourhoods and characteristics, physical and natural features, growth patterns and geographic location.

The following criteria were used to define the suburbs:

Existing names and reference material:

- ▶ North Shore City’s mailing address records
- ▶ Police suburb maps
- ▶ Statistic New Zealand’s Census Area Unit boundaries
- ▶ the Regional Growth Strategy
- ▶ Discussions with local people and council staff
- ▶ Published street maps e.g. Wisers, Mini maps.

Neighbourhood characteristics:

- ▶ Existing neighbourhood and shopping centre or plans for one
- ▶ Existing name and sense of identity

- ▶ Unique characteristics, e.g. age of housing, distinctive street patterns, heritage qualities etc.
- ▶ Accessibility of area and whether it is well connected without having to pass through another suburb.

Physical and natural features:

- ▶ Natural/physical boundaries e.g. motorways, main arterial roads, parks, open space
- ▶ Overall size of the area
- ▶ Relative size of an area: if a proposed suburb was small, there needed to be a strong sense of identity and other significant factors.

Growth patterns:

- ▶ New residential areas defined in North Shore City's District Plan in Okura, Albany and Greenhithe.
- ▶ Consideration of established communities in areas to avoid subdivision names becoming the known name.

Statistics NZ census area boundaries:

- ▶ Existing boundaries in older areas of the city such as Stanley Point and Bayswater

Note: Boundaries do not necessarily follow Community Board delineations as these are political boundaries and do not necessarily take into account geographical features which may divide an area.

Geography:

- ▶ Natural geography of the ridgelines and main roads
- ▶ New motorways, subdivisions and business parks which have led to the creation of new communities
- ▶ Review of the council's mailing address records to clarify people's perception of which suburb they are in.

New Zealand Geographic Board:

- ▶ Use of original names where applicable, i.e. historic relevance
- ▶ Correct spelling
- ▶ Avoiding duplication of suburb names that already exist in other cities
- ▶ Avoiding names which sound similar when spoken
- ▶ Avoiding offensive names.

Appendix 4: UK Government Press Release

Blairs heralds a new era of 'parish power'

Published 21 May 2008

Communities Secretary Hazel Blairs today heralded a new era of 'parish power' where parishes have a real purpose in modern society - a far cry from the way they are often perceived as outdated, 19th century institutions.

Speaking in Eastbourne to representatives of local parish councils, she praised local parishes as a force for local pride and empowerment. As the smallest unit of local democracy, there are 10,000 parish and town councils covering 90 per cent of the country. But their small size belies the big impact they can have addressing the issues that make a real difference to people's quality of life like parks, trees and allotments, bus stops, community halls and litter bins.

Parish councils have an important contribution to make in reinvigorating local democracy - they are often the most immediate form of representation, acting as a focal point for local debate and identity. Parish councils can also be very effective at connecting with local people, and stoking enthusiasm for getting involved.

An 'Empowerment' White Paper, with proposals designed to reinvigorate local democracy and devolve power to the grass roots, is due within weeks, and this will be complemented by separate powers for parish councils including;

- Plans to make it easier to bring in local experts onto parish councils to help drive key priorities and shape services that matter. Parishes will be able to temporarily appoint local experts as additional councillors to advise on issues within their field of expertise, such as teachers on schools or businessmen on finance.
- A new 'wellbeing' power for eligible local parish councils. This would shift more power locally, so eligible parish councils can freely make decisions as long as they are in their community's interest and promote the wellbeing of its area. This might be for example, local town centre development, support for a community rail service, or new initiatives to create jobs. The wellbeing power is currently only applicable to Local Authorities.

More local parishes are being set up - with nineteen established in the last year - which can invest in local projects, from community transport, to green spaces, to benches, that can boost local pride. And with a strong track record of involving people in planning for their neighbourhood's future, they have a crucial role to play at an important time for local democracy.

Hazel Blairs said:

"We are seeing a new era of modern 'parish power'. It's high time we got away from stereotypes that parishes are sleepy, out of touch operations. Parishes are about local democracy in action and I'm proud to be strengthening their arm.

"As the smallest unit of local democracy, their small size belies the big impact they can have. The truth is new parishes can revive democracy, and modernise communities by putting more power into local people's hands. That's why we are boosting the power of parishes, devolving more power from central and local governments to local people.

"Our forthcoming Empowerment White Paper will herald a significant shift of power, giving people a real say over the local issues that matter to them - schools, hospitals, police and housing. We need to learn from the best, and many parish councils are past masters at giving local people a voice."

Notes

1. Hazel Blears was speaking at the National Association of Local Councils conference in Eastbourne.
2. A survey by Aberystwyth University found that 75 per cent of parish and town councils were expecting to make use of the wellbeing power, once it is in operation. The new power was extended to eligible parish and town councils by last year's Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act. Secondary legislation is being drawn up, in order to bring it into operation alter in 2008. Any parish or town council can decide to use the power, if it meets criteria that are currently being finalised.
3. The Local Government Act also introduced a new power for parish councils to appoint a limited number of additional councillors in order to bring extra skills and expertise to their work, on a temporary basis. This provision will also be brought in later in 2008.
4. Last year's Local Government Act devolved responsibility for creating parish councils to local authorities. Parishes - the most local form of local government - generate high levels of local participation. For example, 4000 parishes across England have involved people in drawing up a parish plan - sometimes getting input from nine in ten residents.
5. Last week, Hazel Blears announced 'three new rights to right local wrongs' under next year's legislative programme that could be enjoyed by local parishes including: A new right to ask for a stronger say on spending decisions that affect them or their communities; A new right to ensure councils consider the sale or transfer of under-used properties, lands or parks to local community groups, co-ops and social enterprises; and a new right to force a debate on specific local issues onto the council agenda. (www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/804997).
6. For more information on the forthcoming Empowerment White Paper visit: www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/712771.

Appendix 5: Survey data on attitudes to local government

Extracts from Local Government Commission (2007) “**National survey 2007: Knowledge of, and participation in, local government – Final report**” and DIA (2006) “**Public Knowledge about Local Government**”

A brief consolidation of findings from these surveys is now given, together with some reworking of information provided in the supplementary tables provided.

LHC Report:

Knowledge of local government

Knowledge of Local government is low. (“Nearly a quarter of New Zealanders aged 18+ (22%) are not aware there is a difference between local council and regional council, and 30% have never heard of community boards”.)

- New Zealanders tend to know more about city or district councils (22% know ‘a lot’) than regional councils (14%) or community boards (13%).
- Non-voters, those who do not pay rates, and younger New Zealanders have less knowledge than others about all realms of local government.

Awareness of the role of council

- New Zealanders are able to name a wide variety of public services and facilities provided by council, although there are urban/rural differences.

Awareness of the wider role of council

- More than half of (55%) are unaware of the wider purpose of council to promote the overall wellbeing of their communities. Nevertheless, the majority of New Zealanders (88%) feel it is important that their council promotes the overall wellbeing of their community. Sixty five percent agree that councils consider the needs of future generations, and 18% disagree.

Participation in council decisions

- Around four in every five feel it is important that they have a say in the decisions of council, and just over two thirds (67%) say they are likely to give their views to council about an issue they feel is important. Older New (35 and above) are more likely to say they would give their views, as would those with a combined income over \$50,000 pa.

Influencing council decisions

Common responses were writing a letter to council (26%), voting in the local elections (23%), making a written submission, attending formal council meetings, and attending or holding public meetings (18% versus 10%).

Motivations and barriers to voting

Those who vote tend to be: Older, NZ European, living with a partner or spouse or Ratepayers although there was no statistically significant association between voting behaviour and income.

Voting in the local elections vs voting in the general election

- The majority of all respondents (81%) say that they usually vote in the general election, especially local election voters say that they usually vote in the general election (94%).

DIA Survey

“Results in this report are based upon questions asked in the UMR Research nation-wide omnibus survey. This is a telephone survey of a nationally representative sample of 750 New Zealanders 18 years of age and over.

77% of respondents (n=575) in the survey were ratepayers. Fieldwork was conducted from 1st to 5th June 2006 at UMR Research’s national interview facility in Auckland. The margin of error for a 50% figure at the ‘95% confidence level’ for the sample of 750 is +3.6%.

Overview

Improved communications, which more effectively raise levels of knowledge about the relevance to people of what councils do for their communities and which make it easy for people to express their views to their elected representatives, are likely to increase levels of public engagement with councils. Councils will also need to convince people that their views will be listened to and that their views can influence change.

While there is a positive foundation to build communication around civic duty and the importance of what councils do for individuals and their families, there are underlying trust and confidence issues that need to be addressed in any communications campaign. For example, a large minority of people agree that councils waste money and agree that taking an active interest in what they do can be driven by a desire to see value for money from rates.

Councils should consider focusing on the quality of their postal communications to households as this is rated as the most effective channel for providing information. Regional councils have a greater challenge as identification with them as well as knowledge of and interest in them is far lower than for city or district councils. Overall, there is a much stronger preference for passive communications from councils to households than to attend local, community meetings. And in terms of expressing views to council, people prefer to express them to elected representatives.

(Traditional communication methods target ratepayers, for example newsletters sent with the rates bill. Non-ratepayers though express as much a desire to have more of a say in what councils do as ratepayers, yet their level of declared knowledge about councils is significantly lower than ratepayers.

A newsletter to all households should be considered to ensure non-ratepayers receive information.)

Knowledge and interest

More people identify their "local council" as their city council or district council than their regional council. There are much lower levels of declared knowledge and interest in regional councils than city or district councils.

Increased knowledge of and interest in councils is suggestive of higher levels of public engagement.

This study showed a consistent and strong association between those who declare they are knowledgeable, have an interest in, and receive information from councils more frequently, and those who make contact with their local council more frequently".

Some further points can be gleaned by examining the supplementary tables attached to the DIA report, which (inter alia) include breakdowns for Auckland v other areas in NZ. Aucklanders were no more likely to identify with the RC as opposed to the LA level, and show similar levels of knowledge and interest in both LAs and RCs. However, there is a little evidence of an information (& information capacity) and contact dearth together with a low appreciation of the importance of LA services supplied and a slightly elevated feeling that 'most local councils waste ratepayer's money'. But there is also something of a pent-up demand for involvement with a higher proportion wishing to become involved.

