



Representation review

**Summary of feedback received during
Auckland Council's public consultation
from 8 July to 8 August 2024**



How we represent you: Auckland Council representation review



Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

The information in this report summarises feedback received on the proposed representation review during the consultation period of 8 July to 8 August 2024.

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

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

TOTAL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED: 2,359

Overview of the consultation

Auckland Council holds local elections every three years. To ensure we have fair and effective representation at these elections, we must review our representation arrangements every six years.

A representation review makes sure that each councillor represents a similar number of people, known as the 'fairness of representation rule' or the '+/- 10 per cent rule'. The fairness of representation rule also applies to subdivisions within local board areas. It also ensures communities of interest are effectively represented.

Consultation activity included four online webinars, ten drop-in sessions with a targeted approach, and a marketing campaign across radio and social media, which included interviews. In addition, targeted community engagement aimed to increase awareness and opportunities to provide feedback with typically under-represented communities, including six online workshops for Māori (mana whenua and mataawaka groups), Pasifika, Asian and youth communities.

We received feedback via our online feedback form (559), hard copy feedback forms (1,603) and email (197). No feedback was captured verbally from our drop-in events or webinars, but attendees were able to provide written feedback at the drop-in events. Summaries of those events will be made available for review separately.

Submissions came from 2,241 individuals and 27 organisations, including one mana whenua submission from Te Ara Rangatuu o te Iwi o Ngaati te Ata Waiohua, who supported the overall proposal but gave no other feedback.

In this proposed representation review initial proposal, we proposed:

- Changes to the Central Auckland ward boundaries so they match the proposed local board boundary changes while still following the fairness of representation rule
- Expanding North Shore Ward so it better follows the fairness of representation rule
- Adding two subdivisions to Rodney Local Board to better reflect the shared interests of rural communities
- Splitting the Botany subdivision of Howick Local Board to provide better representation for the Flat Bush community
- Not following the fairness of representation rule for certain local boards to avoid splitting established communities
- Minor changes to some local board boundaries to better match community areas with their reserves.

Overall, there was a strong level of support for all proposals with two exceptions.

Of the submitters that supported the proposals, the most common themes raised in comments included improved representation – including having more elected members representing their community or representation that better aligns with the needs of their community, and the proposals seem fair or will provide fairer representation.

The most notable exception was the proposed changes to the Rodney Local Board subdivisions. This received mixed support overall (with 50 per cent of individual submitters supporting and majority opposition from pro forma/templated campaigns and organisations), but strong opposition from submitters that identified themselves as living in the Rodney Local Board area (76 per cent did not support the proposal).

Over half the individual submitters living within the Rodney Local Board area that gave feedback on the proposed changes to the Rodney Local Board subdivisions felt the proposed changes will provide them with insufficient representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community. Other less common themes raised by this group included:

- Concern that a boundary change will have an impact on their ability to access services they currently use regularly, or that their representatives will no longer have any influence or control over those services
- It will negatively impact their feeling of community, i.e. that they would be grouped with communities that did not share common attributes or interests.
- It would divide their communities inappropriately (notably, the Kaukapakapa community).

The other exception is the proposed change to central Auckland wards – in particular, the Waitematā and Orākei Local Board areas.

This proposal still received a majority of support, but there was a notable pro forma/templated campaign led by the Newmarket and Parnell Business Associations (153 submissions) that stated support for “Newmarket and Parnell remaining in the Ōrākei Ward on the basis that the resident demographic is a shared community of interest.” These templated submissions indicated the submitters worked for, if not owned, local businesses but did not indicate whether they live in the local area.

Aside from these templated submissions, we received 94 submissions from individuals indicating they live in the Waitematā and Ōrākei Local Board areas. Of those, around two thirds (60) supported the proposed change to central Auckland wards.

Who we heard from

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

- We received representative spread of feedback across age groups compared to Census figures.
- High proportions of submitters identifying as Asian or Pasifika ethnicities compared to Census, i.e. 36 per cent identified as Asian and 39 per cent as Pasifika, compared to 28 and 16 per cent of the Auckland population. This meant lower proportions identifying as European (20 per cent) and Māori (six per cent).
- We also received submissions from across the Auckland region, with Howick, Rodney, Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Waitematā Local Boards contributing the largest numbers of submissions (and around half of all submissions when combined).

Local board breakdowns

Data tables detailing responses by local board, for both individuals and organisations, can be found in **Attachment Two**.

Horopaki

Context

Every six years, Auckland Council must review representation arrangements to ensure they are fair and effective and are keeping pace with Auckland's growth. This review includes the Governing Body, and local boards. Our last review was in 2018 for the 2019 local government elections.

A representation review makes sure that each councillor represents a similar number of people, known as the 'fairness of representation rule' or the '+/- 10 per cent rule'. The fairness of representation review rule also applies to subdivisions within local board areas. It also ensures communities of interest are effectively represented. In simple terms, communities of interest are groups of people who feel connected to a place, use the same services, and who have similar issues that require representation.

In this proposed representation review initial proposal, we proposed:

- Changes to the Central Auckland ward boundaries (Waitematā and Gulf, Ōrākei, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa) so they match the proposed local board boundary changes while still following the fairness of representation rule
- Expanding North Shore Ward by including an area around Bayview, currently in the Albany Ward, so it better follows the fairness of representation rule
- Adding two rural subdivisions to Rodney Local Board, while reducing the size of the Warkworth and Kumeū subdivisions to match urban and future development zones around these centres, to better reflect the shared interests of rural communities
- Splitting the Botany subdivision of Howick Local Board, into a smaller Botany subdivision and adding a new Flat Bush subdivision, to provide better representation for the Flat Bush community
- Not following the fairness of representation rule for certain local boards (Hibiscus and Bays, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōtāra-Papatoetoe, and Franklin) to avoid splitting established communities
- Minor changes to some local board boundaries (Devonport-Takapuna, Upper Harbour, Kaipātiki, Puketāpapa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki) to better match community areas with their reserves.

Urupare

Feedback

The following breakdown of feedback received provides a high-level summary for individuals and organisations, and via pro forma/templated campaigns separately given differences in who they represent and how that feedback was received.

Feedback received from organisations are counted as a single piece of feedback, as with individuals, though we note they often represent the views of larger specialist and/or interest groups. They may also represent private businesses.

Feedback received via pro forma/templated campaign is also presented separately, given the way campaigns present information and provided a templated response for people to submit as their own feedback.

This approach provides a more granular level of reporting to assist elected members in giving due consideration to all feedback received their decision-making.

Common themes are identified from individuals' comments but not from organisations, as the number of comments from organisations were too low to report common themes.

When submitting via the online feedback form, submitters were asked if they wanted to provide feedback on questions that related to proposed boundary changes in specific areas before being presented with the questions, to avoid asking questions not relevant to them or their communities.

However, on the hard copy feedback form, submitters were presented with all questions. This resulted in a higher proportion of submitters responding to all questions on hard copy feedback forms compared to those submitting via the online feedback form.


All results are presented as a summary of all feedback, with a following section to compare the difference between submitters that identified themselves as living in the affected area against those not living in the affected area.

Each question is presented as a separate section, beginning with the question stated as it was presented on our feedback forms.

Representation review initial proposal

1. Overall, what is your opinion of the changes outlined in the representation review initial proposal?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,443):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	920	8
Do not support	281	7
Other	37	3
I don't know	186	1
TOTAL	1,424	19

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 920 individuals (65 per cent) who **supported** the proposal, 292 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided were:



Improves representation

A perceived improvement in representation, including having more elected members representing their community or representation that better aligns with the needs of their community.

161 comments

55%



Generally support the proposal (no clear reason)

E.g. it makes sense or is reasonable.

49 comments

17%

Other themes included:

- 33 believe the proposal is fair or it will provide fairer representation
- 24 support a specific proposed boundary change or changes.

Of the 281 individuals (20 per cent) who **did not support** the proposal, 215 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided was:



Insufficient representation

A perceived lack of representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community.

121 comments

56%

Other themes included:

- 25 believe it would divide their communities inappropriately
- 20 were concerned that a boundary change will have an impact on their ability to access services they currently use regularly, or that their representatives will no longer have any influence on those services
- 20 did not support a specific proposed boundary change or changes
- 19 believe it is not necessary, not worth the expense, or would turn out worse than their current situation
- 18 believe it will negatively impact their feeling of community, i.e. that they would be grouped with communities that did not share common attributes or interests.

Feedback from Māori individuals

123 of the 1,426 responses (nine per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

Of those, 35 per cent supported the proposal, 19 per cent did not support the proposal, six per cent selected 'Other' and 41 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

There was a clear majority of support for the proposal in most local board areas, with one exception. Around 75 per cent of individuals in the Rodney Local Board area did not support the proposal overall, most notably addressing their concerns over the proposed boundary changes in the Rodney area.

Feedback from organisations


Of the 19 organisations that gave feedback, eight supported the proposal, seven did not support it, three selected 'other' and one 'I don't know'.

This included one mana whenua submission from Te Ara Rangatuu o te Iwi o Ngaati te Ata Waiohau, who supported the overall proposal but gave no other feedback.

Changes to wards from the 2022 elections

2A. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the Central Auckland wards (maps 1.1 to 1.4)?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,007):



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Pro forma/ campaign
Support	572	3	0
Do not support	66	4	153
Other	15	0	0
I don't know	194	0	0
TOTAL	847	7	153

Tell us why

Feedback from templated campaigns

We received 153 submissions from a combined pro forma/templated feedback campaign led by the Newmarket and Parnell Business Associations, via a combination of online forms on each business association's website and forms printed out to replicate the online forms.

These templated submissions indicated the submitters worked for, if not owned, local businesses but did not indicate whether they live in the local area.

These forms asked people to provide the personal information in support of the following statement:

"I SUPPORT Newmarket and Parnell remaining in the Ōrākei Ward on the basis that the resident demographic is a shared community of interest".

The forms also provided a link to the Council website as an alternative to filling in the template supporting the business associations position.

Feedback from individuals

Of the 572 individuals (68 per cent) who **supported** the proposal, 80 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided were:

	Improves representation A perceived improvement in representation, including having more elected members representing their community or representation that better aligns with the needs of their community. 30 comments	38%
	Support the specific proposed boundary change(s) Specifically stated their support for a proposed aspect of a boundary change or changes. 21 comments	26%
	Generally support the proposal (no clear reason) E.g. it makes sense or is reasonable 18 comments	23%

Other themes included:

- Seven believe the proposal is fair or it will provide fairer representation
- Six believe it groups communities appropriately.

Of the 66 individuals (eight per cent) who **did not support** the proposal, 26 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided was:

	Opposition to the specific proposed boundary change(s) Specifically stated their opposition to a proposed aspect of a boundary change or changes. 10 comments	38%
---	--	-----

Other themes included:

- Seven believe it will negatively impact their feeling of community, i.e. that they would be grouped with communities that did not share common attributes or interests
- Five believe it will provide them with insufficient representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community.

Feedback from Māori individuals

13 of the 847 responses (two per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

Of those, six supported the proposal, three did not support the proposal, two selected 'Other' and two selected 'I don't know'.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	65%	68%
Do not support	20%	4%
Other	5%	1%
I don't know	10%	27%
TOTAL RESPONSES	192	655

* Affected areas include Puketāpapa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei and Waitematā Local Boards.

The level of support from individuals living within the affected local board areas was comparable to those not living within the affected areas.


The most common themes raised by individuals living within the affected local board areas were also comparable to those not living within the affected areas.

Feedback from organisations

Of the seven organisations that gave feedback, three supported the proposal and four did not support it.

2B. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the North Shore and Albany wards (map 1.5)?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=796):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	578	3
Do not support	57	0
Other	9	0
I don't know	149	0
TOTAL	793	3

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 578 individuals (73 per cent) who **supported** the proposal, 100 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided was:



Improves representation

A perceived improvement in representation, including having more elected members representing their community or representation that better aligns with the needs of their community.

71 comments

71%

Other themes included:

- 13 generally support the proposal without providing any clear reason, e.g. it makes sense or is reasonable
- Eight believe the proposed change will have minimal impact on them or their community.

Of the 57 individuals (seven per cent) who **did not support** the proposal, 20 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided were:

- Five believe it will provide them with insufficient representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community
- Four believe it is not necessary, not worth the expense, or would turn out worse than their current situation.

Feedback from Māori individuals

12 of the 793 responses (two per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

Of those, five supported the proposal, three did not support the proposal, one selected 'Other' and three selected 'I don't know'.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	90%	69%
Do not support	4%	8%
Other	0%	1%
I don't know	6%	22%
TOTAL RESPONSES	155	638

* Affected areas include Kaipātiki and Upper Harbour Local Boards.

The level of support from individuals living within the affected local board areas was significantly more supportive (90 per cent) than those not living within the affected areas (69 per cent).

The most common themes raised by individuals living within the affected local board areas were comparable to those not living within the affected areas.


Feedback from organisations

Three organisations gave feedback on this proposal and all supported it.

Changes to local board representation from the 2022 elections

3A. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the proposed Rodney Local Board subdivision (maps 2.1 and 2.2)?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,011):



Response	Individuals	Organisations	Pro forma/ campaign
Support	487	2	0
Do not support	224	7	28
Other	10	0	0
I don't know	252	1	0
TOTAL	973	10	28

Tell us why

Feedback from templated campaigns

We received 28 submissions from a Kaukapakapa community templated feedback campaign. These were all submitted on hard copy forms.

These forms asked people to provide their personal information in support of a templated response. The full response can be viewed in **Attachment Three**, but a summary of points made includes:

'Concerns regarding the proposed boundary adjustments that would divide the Kaukapakapa community, including:

- The level of notification and consultation has been inadequate.*
- The proposed boundary adjustment cuts through our community, disregarding the shared interests and needs of both sides of the river.*

- *It is difficult to understand how merging 'North Kaukapakapa' with 'North Rural' provides reasonable representation for our community.*
- *Kaukapakapa is experiencing population growth and many residents commute to urban areas for work and being represented by 'North rural' may not align with the community's values and development aspirations.'*

"In conclusion, Kaukapakapa is a unique and vibrant community that should remain whole and united. If it is necessary to separate from the Kumeu Subdivision, we strongly believe that aligning with 'South Rural' would better reflect our community's identity and needs."

Feedback from individuals

Of the 487 individuals (50 per cent) who **supported** the proposal, 53 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided were:



Improves representation

A perceived improvement in representation, including having more elected members representing their community or representation that better aligns with the needs of their community.

19 comments

36%



It is fair or more fair than the current boundaries

The proposal is fair or it will provide fairer representation

11 comments

21%

Other themes included:

- Nine support the proposal because it favours the views of, and representation for, rural communities
- Eight generally support the proposal without providing any clear reason, e.g. it makes sense or is reasonable.

Of the 224 individuals (23 per cent) who **did not support** the proposal, 164 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided were:



Insufficient representation

A perceived lack of representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community.

109 comments

66%



Will impact access to services

Concern that a boundary change will have an impact on their ability to access services they currently use regularly, or that their representatives will no longer have any influence or control over those services.

29 comments

18%



Impact on feeling of community

It will negatively impact their feeling of community, i.e. that they would be grouped with communities that did not share common attributes or interests.

26 comments

16%



It divides communities

It would divide their communities inappropriately.

26 comments

16%

Other themes included:

- 22 believe it is not necessary, not worth the expense, or would turn out worse than their current situation
- 19 proposed an alternative boundary alignment
- 12 do not support the proposal because they believe it favours the views of, and representation for, rural communities
- 12 believe it will impact their social connection to the area, i.e. where people go to explore, play, eat and drink with friends, or that their representatives will no longer have any influence or control over those services
- 12 specifically stated their opposition to a proposed aspect of a boundary change or changes.

Feedback from Māori individuals

20 of the 973 responses (two per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

Of those, three supported the proposal, 14 did not support the proposal and three selected 'I don't know'.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected area*	Not affected
Support	20%	59%
Do not support	76%	7%
Other	2%	1%
I don't know	1%	33%
TOTAL RESPONSES	221	752

* Affected area is the Rodney Local Board only.

While the majority of submitters support for the proposed local board subdivision changes, this was largely influenced by individual submitters that do not live in the Rodney Local Board area.

Individuals living within the Rodney Local Board area were strongly against the proposal local board subdivision changes, with 76 per cent selecting **do not support**.

The most common themes raised by individuals living within the Rodney Local Board area were:

- 98 believe it will provide them with insufficient representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community
- 28 believe a boundary change will have an impact on their ability to access services they currently use regularly, or that their representatives will no longer have any influence or control over those services
- 26 stated it would divide their communities inappropriately
- 26 believe it will negatively impact their feeling of community, i.e. that they would be grouped with communities that did not share common attributes or interests
- 21 believe it is not necessary, not worth the expense, or would turn out worse than their current situation.


In contrast, 59 per cent of individuals living outside the Rodney Local Board area supported the proposal. Their most common reasons related to the board's representation, with 11 believing it would provide insufficient representation and 10 believing it would improve their representation.

Feedback from organisations

Of the 10 organisations that gave feedback, two supported the proposal, seven did not support it and one selected 'I don't know'.

3B. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the proposed Howick Local Board subdivision (map 3)?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=1,484):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	1,167	3
Do not support	69	1
Other	14	1
I don't know	229	0
TOTAL	1,479	5

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 1,167 individuals (79 per cent) who **supported** the proposal, 146 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided was:



Improves representation

A perceived improvement in representation, including having more elected members representing their community or representation that better aligns with the needs of their community.

103 comments

71%

Other themes included:

- 18 believe the proposal is fair or it will provide fairer representation
- 18 generally support the proposal without providing any clear reason, e.g. it makes sense or is reasonable
- Nine specifically supported the proposed boundary change to create a Flat Bush subdivision given the area's increase in population.

Of the 69 individuals (five per cent) who **did not support** the proposal, 24 provided comments. The most common themes from comments provided were:

- Eight believe it is not necessary, not worth the expense, or would turn out worse than their current situation
- Four believe the proposal to add additional local board members would provide too many elected representatives
- Four believe the proposal will provide them with insufficient representation, including having fewer elected members representing their community or representation that they don't believe will adequately align with the needs of their community.

Feedback from Māori individuals

42 of the 1,479 responses (three per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

Of those, 43 per cent supported the proposal, five per cent did not support the proposal, seven per cent selected 'Other' and 45 per cent selected 'I don't know'.

Comments from Māori individual submitters raised common themes consistent with overall themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected area*	Not affected
Support	86%	77%
Do not support	7%	4%
Other	1%	1%
I don't know	6%	18%
TOTAL RESPONSES	353	1,126

* Affected area is the Howick Local Board only.

The level of support from individuals living within the Howick Local Board area was more **supportive** (86 per cent) than those not living within Howick Local Board area (77 per cent).

The most common themes raised by individuals living within the affected local board areas were comparable to those not living within the affected areas.

Individuals living outside the Howick Local Board area also supported the proposal, with 77 per cent selecting **support**. Their most common reasons were comparable to those living within the Howick Local Board area.

Feedback from organisations

Five organisations gave feedback on this proposal. Three supported the proposal, one did not support it, and one selected 'Other'.

Non-complying subdivisions

4. Do you have any feedback on the proposal to maintain some subdivision arrangements that are currently not compliant with the rule for fairness of representation?

Submitters were asked to provide feedback in an open comment space (n=336).

Feedback from individuals

Of the 326 individuals that provided a comment on this proposal, the most common themes was that around half (169) generally supported the proposal without providing a clear reason.

Feedback from Māori individuals

10 of the 326 responses (three per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Areas affected by this proposal are the Hibiscus and Bays, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōtāra-Papatoetoe and Franklin Local Boards.

Of the responses from submitters living in the affected areas, around half also most commonly expressed general support for the proposal without providing a clear reason.


Feedback from organisations

10 organisations gave feedback on this proposal. There were not enough comments to determine clear common themes.

Changes to local board boundaries

5A. We are proposing that Saunders Reserve, currently split across Devonport-Takapuna and Upper Harbour Local Boards, will be fully in the Upper Harbour Local Board (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=718):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	515	2
Do not support	35	0
Other	13	0
I don't know	152	1
TOTAL	715	3

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 715 submitters that selected a response to this proposal, only 31 (four per cent) provided a comment. As such, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from Māori individuals

Six of the 715 responses (one per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	86%	71%
Do not support	7%	5%
Other	2%	2%
I don't know	5%	23%
TOTAL RESPONSES	56	659

* *Affected areas are the Devonport-Takapuna and Upper Harbour Local Boards.*

The level of support from individuals living within the affected local board areas was more **supportive** (86 per cent) than those not living within the affected local board areas (71 per cent).


As above, given the lack of comments overall, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from organisations

Of the three organisations gave feedback on this proposal. Two supported it and one selected “I don't know”.

5B. We are proposing to move part of Kereru Reserve, currently split across Kaipātiki and Upper Harbour Local Boards, to the Upper Harbour Local Board (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=701):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	495	1
Do not support	40	0
Other	9	0
I don't know	155	1
TOTAL	699	2

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 699 submitters that selected a response to this proposal, only 25 (four per cent) provided a comment. As such, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from Māori individuals

Four of the 699 responses (one per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	81%	68%
Do not support	2%	7%
Other	1%	1%
I don't know	17%	23%
TOTAL RESPONSES	133	566

* *Affected areas are the Kaipātiki and Upper Harbour Local Boards.*

The level of support from individuals living within the affected local board areas was more **supportive** (81 per cent) than those not living within the affected local board areas (68 per cent).


As above, given the lack of comments overall, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from organisations

Two organisations gave feedback on this proposal. One supported it and one selected “I don't know”.

5C. We are proposing to shift the section of the Upper Harbour / Kaipātiki boundary that lies between Caribbean Drive and Albany Highway southwards, so it follows a road boundary (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=701):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	515	1
Do not support	30	0
Other	7	0
I don't know	147	1
TOTAL	699	2

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 699 submitters that selected a response to this proposal, only 24 (four per cent) provided a comment. As such, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from Māori individuals

Six of the 699 responses (one per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	81%	72%
Do not support	2%	5%
Other	1%	1%
I don't know	17%	22%
TOTAL RESPONSES	133	566

* Affected areas are the Kaipātiki and Upper Harbour Local Boards.

The level of support from individuals living within the affected local board areas was more **supportive** (81 per cent) than those not living within the affected local board areas (72 per cent).


As above, given the lack of comments overall, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from organisations

Two organisations gave feedback on this proposal. One supported it and one selected “I don't know”.

5D. We are proposing to align Bayview, currently split across Upper Harbour and Kaipātiki Local Boards, to the Kaipātiki Local Board (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=712):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	518	1
Do not support	31	0
Other	14	0
I don't know	147	1
TOTAL	710	2

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 710 submitters that selected a response to this proposal, only 28 (four per cent) provided a comment. As such, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from Māori individuals

Four of the 710 responses (one per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	81%	71%
Do not support	2%	5%
Other	1%	2%
I don't know	17%	22%
TOTAL RESPONSES	133	577

* *Affected areas are the Kaipātiki and Upper Harbour Local Boards.*

The level of support from individuals living within the affected local board areas was more **supportive** (81 per cent) than those not living within the affected local board areas (71 per cent).


As above, given the lack of comments overall, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from organisations

Two organisations gave feedback on this proposal. One supported it and one selected “I don't know”.

5E. We are proposing to align Taumanu Reserve (Onehunga), currently split across Puketāpapa and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Boards, to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (Map 4.2). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Submitters were asked to select one of the following response options (n=715):



Response	Individuals	Organisations
Support	424	1
Do not support	49	0
Other	8	0
I don't know	233	0
TOTAL	714	1

Tell us why

Feedback from individuals

Of the 714 submitters that selected a response to this proposal, only 37 (five per cent) provided a comment. As such, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from Māori individuals

Four of the 714 responses (one per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from individuals by local board area

Response	Affected areas*	Not affected
Support	53%	60%
Do not support	24%	5%
Other	3%	1%
I don't know	21%	34%
TOTAL RESPONSES	80	634

* Affected areas are the Puketāpapa and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Boards.

Most individuals living within the affected local board areas supported the proposal, however they were less supportive (53 per cent) than those not living within the affected local board areas (60 per cent).

As above, given the lack of comments overall, there are no common themes within the comments provided.

Feedback from organisations

One organisation gave feedback on this proposal and supported it.

Other feedback

6. Do you have any other feedback about how you and your community can be better represented through local boards and the governing body?

Submitters were asked to provide feedback in an open comment space (n=376).

Of the 359 individuals that provided additional comments, the most common themes were:

- 148 (41 per cent) wanted better communication, whether referring to this consultation process or more generally wanting Auckland Council and its elected representatives to communicate better with their communities
- 31 continued to discuss issues around insufficient representation
- Other minor topics related to a wider scope than the initial review, such as:
 - 16 discussed elections, including increased candidate and voter participation, and more general political issues
 - 15 discussed issues relating to a wider review or change to the council governance model, including the role and number of local boards and wards
 - 14 wanted to see more transparency or accountability in Auckland Council, including visibility of decision-making, funding and access to elected representatives.

Feedback from Māori individuals

13 of the 359 responses (four per cent) to this question came from individuals who identified as Māori.

There were not enough comments from Māori individual submitters to determine clear common themes.

Feedback from organisations

15 organisations gave feedback on this proposal. There were not enough comments to determine clear common themes.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

No.	Title	Page
1	Who we heard from	32
2	Local board breakdowns by question	34
3	Pro forma/templated campaigns	54

ATTACHMENT ONE: Who we heard from

Feedback was received via:

- Our hard copy feedback form (1,603 / 68 per cent)
- Our online feedback form (559 / 24 per cent)
- Email (197 / eight per cent)

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



RESPONSES

GENDER	#	%
Male	881	43%
Female	1,156	56%
Another gender	11	1%
Total	2,048	100%

AGE	Male	Female	Other	Total	%
< 15	63	82	0	145	7%
15 – 24	158	203	3	370	18%
25 – 34	150	188	1	344	17%
35 – 44	125	201	1	334	16%
45 – 54	120	143	2	268	13%
55 – 64	94	139	2	238	12%
65 – 74	117	148	2	276	13%
75 +	44	37	0	81	4%
Total submitters providing data				2,056	100%

ETHNICITY	#	%
European	406	20%
Pākehā/NZ European	379	18%
Other European	27	1%
Māori	133	9%
Pacific	808	39%
Samoan	532	26%
Cook Island Māori	60	3%
Tongan	60	3%
Other Pasifika	156	8%
Asian	748	36%
Chinese	329	16%
Indian	282	14%
Korean	95	5%
Southeast Asian	29	1%
Other Asian	13	1%
Middle Eastern/ Latin American/ African	91	4%
Other (incl. Kiwi/New Zealander)	19	1%
Total submitters providing data*	2,068	NA

COMPARISON TO CENSUS



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

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

RESIDENT LOCAL BOARD	#	%
Albert-Eden	66	3%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	33	1%
Franklin	35	1%
Henderson-Massey	152	6%
Hibiscus and Bays	39	2%
Howick	364	15%
Kaipātiki	105	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	175	7%
Manurewa	71	3%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	50	2%
Ōrākei	63	3%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	288	12%
Papakura	51	2%
Puketāpapa	84	4%
Rodney	302	13%
Upper Harbour	76	3%
Waiheke	3	0%
Waitākere Ranges	18	1%
Waitematā	208	9%
Whau	77	3%
Other (Not supplied, outside Auckland or regional organisation)	99	4%

ATTACHMENT TWO: Local Board breakdowns

Representation review initial proposal

1. Overall, what is your opinion of the changes outlined in the representation review initial proposal?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	54	70%	17%	2%	11%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	33	61%	9%	9%	21%
Franklin	24	54%	21%	4%	21%
Henderson-Massey	70	84%	9%	3%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	38	74%	11%	8%	8%
Howick	206	83%	7%	1%	8%
Kaipātiki	100	94%	2%	1%	3%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	25	72%	8%	4%	16%
Manurewa	38	89%	0%	3%	8%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	34	85%	3%	3%	9%
Ōrākei	53	57%	26%	4%	13%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	114	57%	2%	1%	40%
Papakura	49	71%	6%	6%	16%
Puketāpapa	82	78%	10%	0%	12%
Rodney	247	19%	76%	2%	2%
Upper Harbour	73	70%	5%	1%	23%
Waiheke	3	67%	33%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	6	67%	0%	0%	33%
Waitematā	47	60%	15%	11%	15%
Whau	41	66%	15%	0%	20%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

Changes to wards from the 2022 elections

2A. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the Central Auckland wards (maps 1.1 to 1.4)?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	50	70%	16%	2%	12%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	12	42%	0%	0%	58%
Franklin	9	89%	0%	0%	11%
Henderson-Massey	49	90%	6%	0%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	19	47%	0%	0%	53%
Howick	150	81%	1%	0%	17%
Kaipātiki	86	15%	0%	2%	83%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	90%	10%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	96%	0%	0%	4%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	27	67%	4%	7%	22%
Ōrākei	53	68%	23%	2%	8%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	59	73%	2%	0%	25%
Papakura	36	89%	3%	0%	8%
Puketāpapa	71	65%	24%	1%	10%
Rodney	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	44	52%	2%	0%	45%
Waiheke	2	50%	50%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	41	59%	22%	15%	5%
Whau	29	66%	24%	3%	7%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

2B. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the North Shore and Albany wards (map 1.5)?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	32	44%	25%	0%	31%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	17	65%	18%	6%	12%
Franklin	9	67%	0%	0%	33%
Henderson-Massey	50	98%	0%	2%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	27	85%	0%	4%	11%
Howick	149	60%	1%	0%	39%
Kaipātiki	96	95%	1%	0%	4%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	96%	0%	0%	4%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	71%	0%	0%	29%
Ōrākei	33	61%	12%	0%	27%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	55	76%	0%	0%	24%
Papakura	34	82%	3%	0%	15%
Puketāpapa	58	52%	22%	3%	22%
Rodney	21	38%	62%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	59	81%	8%	0%	10%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	1	100%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	9	44%	22%	11%	22%
Whau	20	70%	15%	5%	10%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

Changes to local board representation from the 2022 elections

3A. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the proposed Rodney Local Board subdivision (maps 2.1 and 2.2)?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	33	48%	18%	0%	33%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	12	17%	25%	0%	58%
Franklin	12	58%	25%	0%	17%
Henderson-Massey	46	96%	4%	0%	0%
Hibiscus and Bays	28	57%	11%	0%	32%
Howick	151	59%	1%	1%	39%
Kaipātiki	89	15%	1%	0%	84%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	9	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	96%	0%	0%	4%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	76%	5%	0%	19%
Ōrākei	35	46%	26%	0%	29%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	56	73%	0%	0%	27%
Papakura	34	82%	0%	0%	18%
Puketāpapa	59	61%	24%	2%	14%
Rodney	221	20%	76%	2%	1%
Upper Harbour	47	45%	4%	0%	51%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	10	60%	40%	0%	0%
Whau	20	70%	15%	5%	10%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

3B. What is your opinion of the proposed changes to the proposed Howick Local Board subdivision (map 3)?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	35	54%	17%	0%	29%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	8	0%	0%	0%	100%
Franklin	19	100%	0%	0%	0%
Henderson-Massey	122	90%	1%	0%	9%
Hibiscus and Bays	18	28%	6%	11%	56%
Howick	353	86%	7%	1%	6%
Kaipātiki	89	11%	0%	0%	89%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	159	90%	9%	0%	1%
Manurewa	58	100%	0%	0%	0%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	38	95%	0%	0%	5%
Ōrākei	31	58%	19%	0%	23%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	243	91%	0%	0%	9%
Papakura	37	95%	3%	0%	3%
Puketāpapa	59	64%	17%	2%	17%
Rodney	15	100%	0%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	43	35%	0%	5%	60%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	11	73%	9%	0%	18%
Waitematā	5	80%	0%	0%	20%
Whau	55	93%	2%	0%	5%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

Changes to local board boundaries

5A. We are proposing that Saunders Reserve, currently split across Devonport-Takapuna and Upper Harbour Local Boards, will be fully in the Upper Harbour Local Board (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	29	41%	21%	3%	34%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	12	75%	17%	8%	0%
Franklin	9	78%	0%	0%	22%
Henderson-Massey	46	93%	0%	2%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	19	74%	0%	0%	26%
Howick	149	56%	0%	4%	40%
Kaipātiki	85	82%	0%	0%	18%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	96%	0%	0%	4%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	71%	0%	0%	29%
Ōrākei	30	63%	10%	0%	27%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	52	79%	0%	0%	21%
Papakura	34	79%	0%	0%	21%
Puketāpapa	58	53%	29%	2%	16%
Rodney	7	86%	14%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	44	89%	5%	0%	7%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	5	60%	0%	0%	40%
Whau	19	74%	11%	5%	11%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

5B. We are proposing to move part of Kereru Reserve, currently split across Kaipātiki and Upper Harbour Local Boards, to the Upper Harbour Local Board (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	29	34%	24%	0%	41%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	9	89%	11%	0%	0%
Franklin	9	78%	0%	0%	22%
Henderson-Massey	46	89%	2%	4%	4%
Hibiscus and Bays	18	83%	0%	0%	17%
Howick	146	56%	1%	2%	41%
Kaipātiki	88	80%	1%	1%	18%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	9	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	96%	0%	0%	4%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	22	59%	9%	5%	27%
Ōrākei	28	57%	14%	0%	29%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	44	89%	0%	0%	11%
Papakura	34	79%	0%	0%	21%
Puketāpapa	58	50%	29%	2%	19%
Rodney	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	45	84%	2%	0%	13%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	4	75%	0%	0%	25%
Whau	20	70%	15%	0%	15%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

5C. We are proposing to shift the section of the Upper Harbour / Kaipātiki boundary that lies between Caribbean Drive and Albany Highway southwards, so it follows a road boundary (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	29	41%	21%	0%	38%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	9	89%	0%	0%	11%
Franklin	9	78%	0%	0%	22%
Henderson-Massey	46	91%	0%	2%	7%
Hibiscus and Bays	19	84%	0%	0%	16%
Howick	146	55%	0%	1%	44%
Kaipātiki	87	85%	0%	0%	15%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	24	92%	0%	0%	8%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	76%	0%	0%	24%
Ōrākei	27	63%	15%	0%	22%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	45	93%	0%	0%	7%
Papakura	34	85%	0%	0%	15%
Puketāpapa	58	52%	24%	2%	22%
Rodney	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	48	94%	2%	2%	2%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	4	75%	0%	0%	25%
Whau	18	72%	17%	0%	11%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

5D. We are proposing to align Bayview, currently split across Upper Harbour and Kaipātiki Local Boards, to the Kaipātiki Local Board (Map 4.1). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	29	34%	21%	3%	41%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	10	70%	20%	10%	0%
Franklin	9	78%	0%	0%	22%
Henderson-Massey	47	94%	2%	2%	2%
Hibiscus and Bays	25	88%	0%	0%	12%
Howick	146	55%	1%	3%	42%
Kaipātiki	89	83%	1%	1%	15%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	92%	0%	0%	8%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	71%	0%	0%	29%
Ōrākei	27	63%	11%	0%	26%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	45	84%	0%	0%	16%
Papakura	34	79%	0%	0%	21%
Puketāpapa	59	64%	20%	2%	14%
Rodney	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	45	84%	2%	2%	11%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	5	80%	0%	0%	20%
Whau	18	72%	11%	0%	17%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

5E. We are proposing to align Taumanu Reserve (Onehunga), currently split across Puketāpapa and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Boards, to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (Map 4.2). What is your opinion of this proposal?

Feedback from individuals by local board

Local Board	Total responses	Support	Do not support	Other	I don't know
Albert-Eden	35	51%	23%	0%	26%
Aotea/Great Barrier	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Devonport-Takapuna	7	0%	0%	0%	100%
Franklin	9	78%	0%	0%	22%
Henderson-Massey	46	93%	4%	0%	2%
Hibiscus and Bays	18	28%	0%	0%	72%
Howick	146	56%	3%	3%	38%
Kaipātiki	86	9%	0%	0%	91%
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	10	100%	0%	0%	0%
Manurewa	25	92%	0%	0%	8%
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	25	80%	4%	0%	16%
Ōrākei	29	69%	10%	0%	21%
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	45	87%	0%	0%	13%
Papakura	35	77%	3%	0%	20%
Puketāpapa	62	55%	39%	0%	6%
Rodney	6	100%	0%	0%	0%
Upper Harbour	42	40%	2%	2%	55%
Waiheke	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitākere Ranges	0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Waitematā	4	100%	0%	0%	0%
Whau	26	73%	12%	4%	12%

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

Feedback from organisations by local board

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

ATTACHMENT THREE: Pro forma/templated campaigns

Kaukapakapa community campaign

Dear Auckland Council Representation Review,

I am writing on behalf of the Kaukapakapa community to express our concerns regarding the proposed boundary adjustments that would divide our community. Currently, Kaukapakapa is represented within the Kumeu Subdivision. However, the proposal suggests splitting our community, with one part being represented by 'South Rural' and the other by 'North Rural'. While we understand the necessity of adjusting boundaries to accommodate urban and future development, we believe this proposal warrants further consideration and consultation.

Lack of Notification and Consultation

We feel that the level of notification and consultation has been inadequate. Given the significant impact this proposal would have on our small, close-knit community, we expected more direct and thorough engagement. A simple Facebook notification is not sufficient for a decision of this magnitude. It is crucial that the community's voices be heard and considered, especially when such a fundamental change is being proposed.

Research on Proposed Boundary Adjustments

Kaukapakapa is a rural community with the school at its heart. The proposed boundary adjustment cuts through our community, disregarding the shared interests and needs of both sides of the river. It is essential that both parts of Kaukapakapa are represented by the same representatives, as our families have common concerns and aspirations. The current proposal seems divisive and fails to consider the community's cohesive nature.

Identity and Representation

It is difficult to understand how merging 'North Kaukapakapa' with 'North Rural' provides reasonable representation for our community. As residents, we identify more closely with Helensville and its surrounding areas. For essential services such as local council facilities, we travel to Helensville, which is a mere 10-minute drive, as opposed to the 40+ minutes it takes to reach Wellsford. Our daily lives revolve around Helensville's amenities, including the supermarket, library, medical facilities, schools, and small businesses. Therefore, it would be more appropriate for the entire Kaukapakapa community to join with 'South Rural' rather than being divided.

Future Considerations

Kaukapakapa is experiencing population growth, primarily from the Hibiscus Coast and Auckland central region. While we cherish the semi-rural nature of our area, it is important to note that most residents commute to urban areas for work, as viable farms are limited. Being represented by 'North Rural', a large, under-resourced, and distant community board, may not align with our community's values and development aspirations. We believe that such representation would be disadvantageous for our future growth and cultural expectations.

In conclusion, Kaukapakapa is a unique and vibrant community that should remain whole and united. If it is necessary to separate from the Kumeu Subdivision, we strongly believe that aligning with 'South Rural' would better reflect our community's identity and needs.

Thank you for considering our concerns. We hope for a constructive dialogue to ensure the best possible representation for Kaukapakapa.