

# REPRESENTATION REVIEW

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

### PROPOSAL 1: Changes to ward boundaries affecting Waitematā & Gulf, Ōrākei, Albert-Eden-Roskill, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, and Whau

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
2	Andrey Kuzminov	Support	I support those changes however I disagree with moving Eden Terrace from Waitemata board. It is a part of an urban central Auckland and separating it into a different ward does not make any sense
3	Alistair Kendrick	Support	Keeping the wards similar in population is essential for fair democratic representation. These changes seem reasonable (and are quite similar to recent changes to electorate boundaries for general elections).
7	Brendan Doherty	Oppose	I object to the idea of removing parts of the dense inner city from Waitemata and Gulf. Why is the most most dense intensified Ward mixed with the rural Gulf islands.  The more obvious solution would be to remove the islands from our Ward and move them to a rural Ward like Franklin.
8	Swanie Nelson	No opinion	I only have interest in the split that affects my ward.
9	Lotu Fuli	Support	As long as this does not affect the communities of interest then that is fine.
11	Damien Spurdle	Oppose	Newmarket and Parnell have far more connections to what is happening within the Waitematā and the Auckland CBD than it does than moving into the Ōrākei Ward which encompasses a different geographic and spatial development with Newmarket a 'city' within itself and Parnell many historical connection as an extension of Auckland City.
12	Matt Cole	Oppose	Having continuity of governance from Auckland Central east to include Parnell and Newmarket provides great continuity. Now is a crucial time for active mode transport, cycling and walking links, to be substantially improved into the Centre. By having the same local board the chances of the plans aligning well are higher.  Closer links to Orakei Board should be developed to help consistency - a good example is in the area of the Hobson Walkway - this should be consistent and of a good standard - whether influenced by Glen Innes to Tamaki Drive link - or the partially developed path from Orakei Station to Takutai Street. Developing for cycling and walking into the Centre would ease pressure on Tamaki Drive.
13	Lance Millward	Oppose	Our ward in howick is one of the largest. It seems sensible to look at larger wards with good representation and resources. Ones with high populations or forcast growth. Not wards like manukau that would suffer if their representation was split.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
15	Emily B	Oppose	<p>It is already confusing for residents having wards and local board areas that do not align, this will serve to further confuse voters and potentially switch them off voting.</p> <p>We already struggle engaging voters in local elections and I feel this will exacerbate the problem. If wards change, local board areas should change and with any change it would be helpful to ensure these actually align with each other, and have consistent naming. Currently some wards have similar names to local board areas, and others are very different. E.g. Puketapapa LB falls under Albert-Eden-Roskill ward.</p>
18	carrie ashworth	Oppose	<p>There is no real reason to fix something that is not broken. WHY is Auckland City council now wanting to break up into further divisions - its meant to be all under one umbrella !! The land costs are all the bloody same - so why change the boundaries now??? I am not impressed...spend your time in a better way!</p>
20	Sasha Myles	Support	<p>One person looking after a smaller area makes sense (Mangere )</p>
21	Mayleen Scott	No opinion	<p>No interest. Don't live in the area.</p>
29	Will Brydon	Oppose	<p>Ward boundaries should align to the boundaries of their constituent local boards. Suburbs should not be split across multiple local boards or wards.</p> <p>The risk is that this would split communities of interest or join dissimilar communities of interest, resulting in different local policies and service levels within one suburb or neighborhood. (I note that this risk is the same justification Auckland Council itself has given for not proposing changes to the Rodney boundaries.)</p> <p>in this context:</p> <p>The Parnell, Newmarket changes are positive in this respect as they appear to align to suburb boundaries and consolidate representation within one ward (Orakei). The changes affecting Westmere and Eden Terrace appear to align to suburb boundaries, and consolidate representation within a single ward (Albert-Eden) The Ellerslie changes are concerning, as it is not clear whether the entire suburb is consolidated within Maungakiekie-Tamaki. The Whau boundary changes appear not to align with the suburb boundaries of Lynfield or New Windsor.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
30	Elizabeth Turner	Support	<p>Ward and local board internal boundaries feedback</p> <p>• move the communities of Parnell and Newmarket from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Orakei Ward</p> <p>• I support this proposal</p> <p>• move part of Ellerslie and the community between College Road and the Glen Innes Railway Station from Orakei to the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward</p> <p>• I support this proposal</p> <p>• move the communities of Westmere, west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill</p> <p>• I support this proposal with the caveat that the ward boundary matches the watercourse - as drawn currently on maps it does not exactly - or make it clear that the thalweg of that watercourse is the official boundary.</p> <p>• move small areas of Onehunga and Royal Oak to become part of the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward</p> <p>• I support this proposal but query why the boundary does not continue up Queenstown road all the way to Mount Albert road, and then not include the corner north of Mount Albert Road</p> <p>• extended the Whau Ward's eastern boundary to encompass a small area of Mount Roskill that was previously in the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward.</p> <p>• I support this proposal</p>
32	Pam Morris	Support	Seems to be a logical solution to the problem.
33	Paul Forder	Support	I agree in principle with the equalisation of ward sizes. What is proposed seems fair, reasonable and practicable.
35	Gillianne Ray	Support	Some of those places such as Parnell and Newmarket have been more publicly linked to Orakei just by proximity.
37	Erin Wi	Oppose	I would rather keep it as it is.
39	Emerald Gilmour	Support	It is a cohesive residential area.
43	Lizette Buitendag	Oppose	<p>The moving of St John's into Maungakiekie Tamaki ward, means that half of the children will now go to school in a different ward than they live in.</p> <p>It also splits the residents association between 2 wards. And splits a community as Stonefields, Meadowbank and St John's all belong together and have similar community profiles.</p>
44	Rita Unasa	Support	To make it comply with the legal requirements
48	Robyn Gray	Oppose	I find it odd that the wards will change and the board boundaries stay the same. We will be in Eden Albert ward but Waitemata board. Eden Albert is a huge geographical area.
55	Hayley King	No opinion	I believe some communities of interest are being separated.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
58	Julian Gonzalez	No opinion	I live in Parnell which is inside the Waitemata and Gulf Ward, specifically, the Waitemata Local Board. I understand and accept that the Waitemata and Gulf Ward is increasing in population which requires the shrinking of the ward's boundary to comply with the 10% rule. Personally, I prefer living in the Waitemata Local Board because of the fantastic local board members. After the boundary changes, I'll live in the Orakei Local Board, and I'm not very excited by that.
59	Stuart Young	Oppose	<p>There should be an option for partially support. I support all the boundary changes except for moving Westmere, Grey Lynn and Eden Terrace to Albert-Eden. That splits communities of interest. Eden Terrace and Grey Lynn which are undergoing much development has more in common with city fringe. This proposal will leave Waitemata and Gulf with only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Rich suburbs: Herne Bay, Freemans Bay and Ponsonby</li> <li>* Inner city apartment blocks</li> <li>* Gulf islands</li> </ul> <p>This is clearly joining dissimilar communities.</p> <p>I support single member wards rather than multi member wards because multi-member two-vote first-past-the-post elections are extremely unfair electoral systems. I think that Albert-Eden should be split as well. Thus we could have one ward for western suburbs which could include Westmere and Herne Bay along with Pt Chev, and Mt Albert (a clearly similar community). And another ward for the central suburbs centred around Mt Eden. This would leave the city fringe developments of Arch Hill and Eden Terrace and Freemans Bay in the Waitemata and Gulf ward.</p>
61	Reece Moody	Support	Balanced areas for representation is good. No area is advantaged or disadvantaged.
66	Geoffrey Page	Support	Maintaining the representative balance is important. The changes appear rational.
71	Elisabeth Truttman	Oppose	I feel that Waterview, which has significant historical and community ties with Avondale going back over 150 years, should be reunited with Avondale in the Whau Local Board area.
76	Darren Le Comte	Support	Maungakike is adversely dominated by the super rich around the Cornwall park suburb; that does not represent the majority of decile 1-4 households median income.
80	Katie Hunter-Philpott	Support	I feel the change of boundaries is an accurate reflection of the communities, and the points that are of interest to them.
81	Amy Hopper	Support	It makes sense to make the adjustments now before the difference differs too much.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
84	Nessie Sharpe	Oppose	We are in the St Johns area that is proposed to move to Maungakiekie-Tamaki ward (map 1d). I oppose this proposal. It is illogical to carve out part of a suburb to be governed by a different councillor to the facilities and communities it is most closely linked with. Services, parks and the community is more closely linked to Orakei. If reallocation needs to happen due to numbers the changes should be readjusted from the proposal to include Newmarket and Parnell into Orakei rather than divide up a single suburb / community.
97	Steven McAneney	Support	Next step, please align the voting electorates with the wards! Onehunga should be part of Maungakiekie, not Mt. Roskill.
98	Shiraz Munshi	Support	A smaller area for the Waitemata LB would be easier to manage.
100	Jane Welsh	Oppose	I oppose moving Westmere, and west of Surry Crescent and splitting up West Lynn to the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward. It splits up our community.  I have no opinion on the other ward changes
101	Elizabeth Hancock	Oppose	As a resident of Grey Lynn, I strongly oppose the proposal to split the Grey Lynn ward in two as this will lead to a greatly fractured community and make it extremely difficult to manage local issues while having to juggle across two different wards and boards. I support the Grey Lynn Residents association submission, and particularly feel that: - The western boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward should remain the same as the Waitemata Local Board boundary - Remind Auckland Council that the Local Electoral Act 2001 notes the importance of keeping communities of interest together, and that this is of particular importance for the Grey Lynn/West Lynn shopping centres and Grey Lynn School - Point out that the motorway gully from the Strand through Grafton gully forms a natural boundary, with the city on one side, and Parnell, Grafton and Newmarket on the other, so it seems logical to group these suburbs together in a move from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to Orakei Ward.  Thank you

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
166	Bruce Lockie	Oppose	<p>The Waitemata ward changes as affecting Grey Lynn are totally illogical and go against the established ground rules for keeping communities together.</p> <p>Please abandon this proposal.</p> <p>Some of the more obvious supporting reasons for this are below.</p> <p>The current boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward runs along Meola Creek through to the motorway and this forms a much more natural and logical western boundary for the ward. This western boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward is also the Waitemata Local Board boundary and it makes good sense for these boundaries to be aligned.</p> <p>If the proposed alteration to the western ward boundary goes ahead then we will end up with some very confusing electoral arrangements. Someone living on the eastern side of Richmond Road would be able to vote for the Waitemata Local Board representatives and a Waitemata and Gulf Ward councillor, while their neighbours on the other side of the road could vote for Waitemata Local Board members and an Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward councillor.</p> <p>The Local Electoral Act 2001 notes the importance of keeping communities of interest together. The shopping centres, Grey Lynn School, St Columba Church and the surrounding communities are surely all part of a community of interest so running a boundary line through and beside them seems nonsensical.</p> <p>If the proposed changes go ahead we will end up with a very complicated situation along the boundary. For example, if there was an issue at one of the shopping centres and the local community and businesses wanted to engage with their local councillor on the matter, they would have to contact one councillor for issues on one side of the street, and another for issues on the other side.</p> <p>There are numerous sports clubs that serve the Grey Lynn area which are located just inside the western edge of the current Waitemata and Gulf Ward. The boundary changes would mean that these sporting groups would be removed from our ward becoming a distant part of the large Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward but still within the Waitemata Local Board area. This seems far from ideal.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Bruce Lockie Francis Street Grey Lynn.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
169	Margo Lockie	Oppose	<p>The Waitemata ward changes as affecting Grey Lynn are totally illogical and go against the established ground rules for keeping communities together.</p> <p>Please abandon this proposal.</p> <p>Some of the more obvious supporting reasons for this are below.</p> <p>The current boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward runs along Meola Creek through to the motorway and this forms a much more natural and logical western boundary for the ward. This western boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward is also the Waitemata Local Board boundary and it makes good sense for these boundaries to be aligned.</p> <p>If the proposed alteration to the western ward boundary goes ahead then we will end up with some very confusing electoral arrangements. Someone living on the eastern side of Richmond Road would be able to vote for the Waitemata Local Board representatives and a Waitemata and Gulf Ward councillor, while their neighbours on the other side of the road could vote for Waitemata Local Board members and an Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward councillor.</p> <p>The Local Electoral Act 2001 notes the importance of keeping communities of interest together. The shopping centres, Grey Lynn School, St Columba Church and the surrounding communities are surely all part of a community of interest so running a boundary line through and beside them seems nonsensical.</p> <p>If the proposed changes go ahead we will end up with a very complicated situation along the boundary. For example, if there was an issue at one of the shopping centres and the local community and businesses wanted to engage with their local councillor on the matter, they would have to contact one councillor for issues on one side of the street, and another for issues on the other side.</p> <p>There are numerous sports clubs that serve the Grey Lynn area which are located just inside the western edge of the current Waitemata and Gulf Ward. The boundary changes would mean that these sporting groups would be removed from our ward becoming a distant part of the large Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward but still within the Waitemata Local Board area. This seems far from ideal.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Margo Lockie Francis Street Grey Lynn.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
206	David Holm	Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed changes because all the population growth in the Waitemata and Gulf ward has been spread into just the four isthmus wards plus Whau. This, and the overall population growth on the isthmus has led to the Albert Eden Roskill ward with 182,400 people having 2.84 times the population of Rodney and 2.45 times the population of Franklin but only twice the number of councillors.</p> <p>This is clear underrepresentation, making Albert Eden Roskill councillors much less accessible to residents and reducing the number of candidates likely to be able to afford to campaign for a ward seat. Electorate MPs with around 70,000 residents to service and much better resources than councillors, are much more accessible.</p> <p>This is not much compensated for by having two councillors. They have more issues to deal with than councillors in one member wards. While they might be able to parcel up local issues or localities between each other, it is unlikely that constituents would understand this. If two member wards provide effective representation, why doesn't Parliament have two member electorates?</p>
208	Erwin Zimmet	Oppose	Because you would be destroying the cohesion of our community
240	Raewyn Alexander	Oppose	<p>No reason to spend money and time on this, when urgent and serious matters require attention now.</p> <p>Also, stop trying to create tension and disruption with such red herrings as this.</p> <p>The Waitemata Board is trying to hide their terrible plans for our area, behind moves like this one.</p> <p>Moving Westmere to Mt Albert is illogical.</p> <p>Stop being so irresponsible.</p>
241	Chris de Lautour	Oppose	<p>This does not make sense. All of the suburbs in the Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward are historical suburbs and villages that are similar in nature. They have history as inner city and fringe suburbs, with unique character and history. They are "communities of interest". Westmere has already been removed in to the Albert-Eden electorate which has left it with no identity, as it is physically separated by a major motorway. The cost associated with doing this unnecessary change is another Council waste of money. It will not achieve more effective or representation. There are many non-resident, non-permanent inhabitants of Auckland Central, which totally distort the figures that are purported to comply with the "10% rule).</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
243	Zainab Mulla	Oppose	<p>Auckland Council wants to further destroy the Cohesion of our Community by REDRAWING the Boundaries in the Western Bays (Waitemata area) so Westmere becomes part of Mt Albert. So I say NO to Boundary Change.</p> <p>Auckland Council is recommending major changes to the Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward boundaries "carving off Parnell and Newmarket to the east and Westmere to the west" but does not propose to alter the present Waitemata Local Board boundary. Such misalignment in my personal view is unnecessary and will cause needless cost as well as confusion and inconvenience, especially at election time.</p>
244	Grant Gothard	Oppose	<p>This does not make sense. All of the suburbs in the Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward are historical suburbs and villages that are similar in nature. They have history as inner city and fringe suburbs, with unique character and history. They are "communities of interest". Westmere has already been removed in to the Albert-Eden electorate which has left it with no identity, as it is physically separated by a major motorway. The cost associated with doing this unnecessary change is another Council waste of money. It will not achieve more effective representation. There are many non-resident, non-permanent inhabitants of Auckland Central, which totally distort the figures that are purported to not comply with the "10% rule"</p>
245	Sophia Fiossetti	Oppose	<p>Splitting up the Grey Lynn community for a ward boundary issue is not a consideration for those that live in the Grey Lynn community. We want Jacinda Arden to be our labour electorate representative. We do not want overseas investor's buying anymore New Zealand land, ripping up communities, and making things difficult for those who live in the Grey Lynn area, because Auckland city council want to allow overseas investors to destroy our community neighborhood "s for there own financial gain allowing overseas investors to build concrete Jungles. Housing in Auckland is too busy expensive as it is for New Zealanders, first home owner's have to buy at of Auckland as it is. I say no to the boundary split affecting the Grey Lynn community. This boundary split shows the lack of social psychological development inherent in the old and 50 Year outdated belief systems of the past. These types of decisions being suggested and made are not concerned with the healthy social and Psychological development of the Auckland community. Preserving our community social development is neglected in favor of greed producing higher levels of crime, drug dependency, suicide ,depression, homelessness. The Auckland community will never healthily develop until local government become more accountable and active in their social responsibilities to the Auckland community.</p>
255	Helen Dare	Oppose	<p>These areas need to remain as they are. Otherwise it's just a waste of time and ratepayers' money plus will cause confusion at election time. Also the areas that you want to move have nothing in common with the areas you want to combine them with and are too far away. It would split communities of interest and join together dissimilar communities.</p>
309	Tauasili Anesi	Oppose	<p>Things are currently</p>
317	Senerita Hendrikse	Support	<p>Needs new proposal</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
335	Natalie Nand	Support	I support to the extent that the extra large population growth in the Waitemata (CBD) ward requires moving people out of this ward to even up representation between wards. However, this has led to 182,400 people in Albert Eden Roskill, making it the most populated ward in the city. This results in a constituency which is: 1). far too big for two councillors to serve especially with far fewer resources than electorate MPs who represent around 70,000 people each, and 2). very costly for election campaigning, which is likely to limit the number of people willing to stand.
345	Lai Yeen Tham	Oppose	It is a waste of resources and I don't think it brings any benefit to communities.
346	Sue Perkins	Support	I support to the extent that the extra large population growth in the Waitemata (CBD) ward requires moving people out of this ward to even up representation between wards. However, this has led to 182,400 people in Albert Eden Roskill, making it the most populated ward in the city. This results in a constituency which is: 1). far too big for two councillors to serve especially with far fewer resources than electorate MPs who represent around 70,000 people each, and 2). very costly for election campaigning, which is likely to limit the number of people willing to stand.
373	Terry Samuels	Oppose	Divide we fall, stay as one
402	Kate Stanton	No opinion	<p>Rumour has it that there are to be different boundaries for the board and Councillor.</p> <p>That would be crazy.</p> <p>Already, people are confused as to which ward they are in, but to add another set of wards for Councillors would add enormously to the confusion.</p> <p>As a previous Local Board member, I experienced Councillors and Board working together. To have a councillor looking after bits of several wards would make this very difficult for both Councillors and wards.</p> <p>I do hope this is not really proposed.</p>
418	Tememane Naga	Oppose	Rather than splitting the Council should look at more housing outside of Manukau then they wont have to split
448	Fiapaipai Lusia Namulauulu	Support	So we can be more focussed on
475	felix toepfer	Support	As well as ensuring each citizen of the city's voice is not diluted by different sized wards, having waitemata ward representing fewer communities will allow more focused work on its core. The communities to be moved are more fitting with the suburban character of other wards than the nearly fully urban waitemata.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
476	Amanda Rees	Oppose	<p>I live in Grey Lynn in the area known to (some) locals as West Lynn. The boundary changes to the ward don't make sense for our representation. My local centres are both West Lynn &amp; Grey Lynn, my community is in both areas being a 15 min between the two. West Lynn where I live would become split into two down the middle line of the main street which is odd and cumbersome should there be matters in our local township that require attention, and which is disconnecting for me. The thought of me no longer being a part of my local community is distressing. Grey Lynn is a beautiful community which needs to be kept in tact as a community and not split into two in a way which is geographically weird and insensitive to the local community.</p> <p>I understand the move of Parnell and Newmarket to Orakei because it keeps whole communities intact.</p> <p>I don't have an opinion on the other communities as i am not familiar with them.</p>
478	Anna Breckon	Support	<p>I live in Parnell, and I definitely support the boundary change between the Waitemata and Gulf ward and the Orakei ward because the environmental amenities in Parnell and Newmarket (e.g. reserves and walkways) connect more closely to those in the Orakei ward, and they should be managed and funded together. A good example of this is the Hobson Bay walkway, which is currently split between these two wards but could be better managed and developed if the applicable resources were administered by one ward. Moreover, I believe that the population in Parnell/Newmarket has closer community interests with the population in the Orakei ward than with the population in the Waitemata and Gulf ward. This proposed ward boundary change is logical and long overdue.</p>
480	Emily Reeves	Oppose	<p>I believe that the cite centre should have it's own ward. While I support the reduction of zone to ensure better representation I think it could go one step further. The city is a unique place and those that don't live really don't understand what it is like to live there. As such, I would like to see a local board that lives in the area they represent to better serve each person living in the area. I also don't believe that this plan is future proofed with the expected population growth the zones will again be outdated long before the next 6 year review.</p>
517	Diane Davis	Support	<p>With the population growth boundaries do need moving from time to time. However, this change makes the Albert/Eden/Roskill ward too big. This needs to be split into 2 especially with the housing developments in Owairaka and Mt Roskill happening next year the population will go up even more. It is not possible for the councillors to represent us properly in such a large ward. I understand this would give us 182,000 people living in the ward, yet Rodney only has 64,300.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
520	Alec van Helsdingen	Support	<p>I support the need to reduce the population in the Waitemata and Gulf ward. A 43% deviation in an urban area is simply not acceptable. I oppose the arguments of Councillor Mike Lee regarding basing ward boundaries on the numbers of electors not the whole population. It has been long accepted in New Zealand that electorates and wards for parliamentary and local government purposes are based on total population. This ensures that non-voters, the majority of whom are children, are represented through the votes of eligible voters in their community. I also note that the population of the Waitemata and Gulf ward has high numbers of younger people (20-30 especially), and that many younger people are not enrolled. Therefore the number of people qualified to vote is likely to be much higher than the number actually enrolled.</p> <p>I support all the proposed boundary changes with the exception of moving Newmarket into Orakei ward. Newmarket's identity, character and transport links are far more closely aligned with the Auckland Central area rather than Orakei and East Auckland. This will also reduce the misalignment between the local board and ward boundaries.</p> <p>I also strongly urge Auckland Council to either liaise with parliament and the government, or else present a Local Bill to parliament, to allow for the local board boundaries to be changed so that they align with ward boundaries. This should be done promptly so it can be implemented before the 2019 elections.</p>
542	Yvonne Mahosqsm	Oppose	There will be less representation
638	Lisa Prager - Occupy Garnet Rd	Oppose	<p>On behalf of Occupy Garnet Road, a grassroots organisation of over 2000 locals in the Waitemata Local Board area here is our submission and why we STRONGLY OPPOSE the boundary change in our area.</p> <p>For over 70 years we have had a close historic relationship with Ponsonby, West Lynn &amp; Grey Lynn. We share common community facilities like halls, parks, shops, bus routes and concerns over chemical spraying in our streets, unsafe cycleways and the negaitve redevelopment of our heritage shops.</p> <p>The argument that this is just juggling the numbers to spread the workload over the elected councillors is absurd. The Council has driven the intensification of the CBD.</p> <p>Many of the people living in the CBD are transiant, foreign students, tempoary workers etc. Their investment in our local government process is limited. Where as we the long term citizens &amp; residents have a clear investment in our area and how it functions. We own homes &amp; businesses, our kids attend local schools, go to local clubs, Libraries, theatre, art exhibitions etc. We support, fund &amp; use these local facilities including sports grounds like Seddon Fields &amp; Coxes Bay. We are effected by events at Western Springs like concerts, festivals, sports matches and speedway. We care for and advocate as gaurdians over sensitive ecological areas like Western Springs Park and the 75 year old native forest under the iconic Monterey Pines behind the Zoo. We use and watch over Meola Reef. Making sure that dog owners have a places to exercise their animals, while runners &amp; walkers can enjoy the peace provided by these special places.</p> <p>We have a long history with the Local Board who are best placed to deal with these issues, to advocate for funds to drive proper mainatence of these public spaces.</p> <p>These areas are not transferable assets and these issues reside here in the Western Bays Ward now called Waitemata.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
			<p>We do not feel that we would be well represented by Mt Albert Local Board and have found over issues like Chamberlian Park &amp; the Mt Albert shop redevelopment including the unsafe cycleway, that our views are in direct opposition to the Mt Albert Local Board. Why should they care about our area, when it is traversed by roads, motorways and train tracks. Why should we care about the issues specific to their area when we are geographically separate?</p> <p>We do not accept the argument that it is just a numbers game, that we need to shuffle rate payers into a different area. This Boundary Change is " Political." It is about removing a vocal group of locals and squeezing them into an area where there is No commonality, No shared cultural history and only anommosity.</p> <p>Our objections are wide &amp; diverse. We will encourage all our members to write individual submissions so that the Council understands clearly why we individually &amp; collectively OBJECT to this Boundary Change.</p>
724	Jennifer Gill	Support	support equal representation. Changes suggested appear to meet this objective.
726	David Stuteley	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to the proposed ward boundary changes in my immediate neighbourhood, being the core Ellerslie village area, for two main reasons related to effective representation of communities of interest.</p> <p>Firstly, Ellerslie racecourse should not be in a separate ward to the rest of the core Ellerslie village area. It is close to and an integral part of Ellerslie village. The various proposed housing developments on parts of the racecourse will result in hundreds to thousands more residents in the Ellerslie village area. All access to the developments and all traffic to and from the new housing will flow through the core Ellerslie village area (there is no other access to the developments). The new residents will use Ellerslie public transports, schools, and the local shopping area. Residents elsewhere in the core Ellerslie village area will suffer the resulting increased traffic, parking and congestion, and benefit from the increased trade. There is a community of interest.</p> <p>Secondly, the motorway (and Great South Road) divides this part of Auckland into two very different communities of interest. Suburbs to the north of the motorway look towards the Waitemata Harbour, those to the south of the motorway look towards the Manukau Harbour. There is little common interest between the core Ellerslie village area and neighbouring parts of the Maungakiekie-Tamaki ward. The current ward boundaries recognise and respect this. The natural centre to the south of the motorway is Onehunga, and Ellerslie village residents do not feel any affiliation with Onehunga township. In an attempt to deliver numerically-fair representation elsewhere in the Auckland region, the proposed change to the ward boundary here breaks up existing communities of interest, joins communities of dissimilar interest, and thereby takes away coherent, meaningful, and effective representation of the core Ellerslie village area.</p> <p>Please keep Ellerslie racecourse and the core Ellerslie village area in the same ward, and please keep that ward being Orakei, to continue to deliver fair and effective representation respecting our community of interest!</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
728	Daphne Lawless	Support	Concentrating the central-city ward around the central city makes a lot of sense. Westmere has much more in common with Albert-Eden-Roskill and Newmarket-Parnell have much more in common with Orakei.
731	Dave Maher	Support	Even representation in terms of numbers is important to ensure there is fair and equitable representation
733	colin cattanach	No opinion	Not my area
735	Fergus Sumich	Oppose	The area of St Johns which you propose to change is closer to the current ward (Orakei) than the new area of Stonefields which more naturally fits into Maugakeikei- Tamaki ward. Merton Rd would be a better boundary.  Take a close look and see for your selves. Population would be similar in both areas.
737	Rodd Eddy	Support	Logical outline and similar community basis..
741	Julia Woodhouse	Oppose	Westmere is part of the inner suburbs community and should remain so. It has issues related to those neighbouring suburbs. The Mt Albert ward is quite separate from us and has their own issues more relative to its neighbours. Leave us alone!
743	SJ Purchase	Support	sounds fair
746	Julia Damrow	Support	The city is changing and it makes sense to ensure representation changes with it. I live on lower Albert Street, and I would not be surprised that as a true inner city dweller, my views on things will be different to say, Parnell which has a very different and specific vibe. So it just makes sense to shift the boundaries.
747	Carolyn Sylvester	Oppose	Because you are effectively removing home owners from Waitemata - surely the large population around central Auckland has a high percentage of transient or renters. What are the figures for household types with the wards? Surely that mix should be important in order to gain fair representation?
749	Issy Cheng	Support	Make more logical sense of where suburb now belongs appropriately
754	Penny Buckley	Oppose	The Grey Lynn boundary change has not taken in the community as a whole. How can the Grey Lynn Primary School not be in the same ward as the rest of Grey Lynn. This proposal splits communities which is the very reason that is stated for the Rodney Ward.
755	Joshua Fowkes	Support	This would make ward elections fairer.
760	Heather Kelly	Oppose	As i look at the various maps it seems that I would elect a councillor in Orakei but be in the Mangakiekie local board which seems to lack logic. If the local board boundaries change so should the borders for election of a councillor
763	David Levin	Support	To keep the wards of a similar size.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
765	Gavan Hogg	Oppose	It is my opinion that Westmere should stay with Waitemata Board as changing the ward would split communities of interest or join dissimilar communities of interest.
766	Lindsay McMorran	Oppose	I oppose moving Parnell and Newmarket into the Orakei ward. Residents in these suburbs relate much more to the central city than to the eastern suburbs. There is very little community of interest with the Orakei ward, which is separated both culturally and geographically from Parnell and Newmarket. The latter two areas are urban in character and outlook, while the Orakei ward is essentially suburban. The Waitemata local board has a strong history of advocacy for urban enhancements, such as better pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, which are essential in a high density residential environment. This advocacy is likely to be greatly reduced if these areas are absorbed into the Orakei local board.
767	James Cooper	No opinion	I live on the North Shore, so this really won't have much of an impact on me. So long as the locals affected are happy with it, I'm fine either way.
768	Graham Dunster	Oppose	<p>I support the proposed boundary changes which move the boundary in from the eastern side of the ward, removing Parnell and Newmarket from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward and incorporating them within the Orakei Ward. I also support the removal of Eden Terrace from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward and its inclusion in the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward.</p> <p>I further propose moving the Newton, Grafton and Domain areas to the Orakei Ward as well. The motorway from the Strand through Grafton gully forms a natural boundary, with the city and western suburbs on one side, and Parnell, Grafton and Newmarket on the other, so it seems sensible to group these suburbs together in a move from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to Orakei Ward.</p> <p>I do not support the proposal to move the western part of Grey Lynn, West Lynn and Westmere out of the ward. These areas are part of a homogenous community and cleaving them will make a mockery of the way that we all live. The zoo, Western Springs itself and the Motat/Seddon fields areas are an integral part of the community, as are Western Springs College and the Pasadena primary school. The community is best served by keeping all these areas in one ward. The Local Electoral Act 2001 notes the importance of keeping communities of interest together, the proposal for this western change does exactly the opposite.</p> <p>The Waitemata Local Board boundaries are not being amended and thus the Ward should reflect the local board area of responsibility.</p>
769	Jess Etheridge	Support	The merging of these communities makes sense. I would add that Lynfield should become part of Whau

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
770	Juliette Laird	Oppose	<p>I write with regard to the changes 1a, b and c [I am not familiar with the communities in the other areas]</p> <p>These proposed changes split off parts of the Auckland Central community. The population has increased probably due to intensive development of apartments in the CBD but Westmere and Newmarket/Parnell are still historically closely linked to the city and not far from it so I imagine most of the residents feel part of the City.</p> <p>It is unfortunate you have not given figures for the different ward areas. Would it not make sense to create a separate Waiheke and Gulf ward? This would be based on specific community features not shared by mainland residents.</p>
771	Keith Stone	Support	If moving the boundaries means that the ward's comply without having to increase the number of elected members then that is a good result
773	Jennifer Goldsack	Support	Looks reasonable
775	Ian zhang	Support	for the old culture can be see this area's people compete the ponsonby GP, PM, UK''s royal family treating me in the taharoto unite no human being, it's the time they get the penalty.
779	Max Robitzsch	Oppose	It seems too many changes at once over too many areas. Suggest to do only some changes to get part-way there.
782	Jamie Hosking	Oppose	<p>The proposed changes cut Grey Lynn in two.</p> <p>In particular, Grey Lynn School and surrounding streets would be in a different ward from the rest of Grey Lynn.</p> <p>The streets between Surrey Crescent and the Northwestern Motorway are an important part of Grey Lynn, as are Francis Street (which has the Grey Lynn Returned Services Club) and the West Lynn shops (which would be split in two by the plan).</p> <p>I believe that at least Francis St, the West Lynn shops and the streets to the southeast should remain together with the rest of Grey Lynn.</p> <p>Although I feel it is most important that Grey Lynn remain together, I would also prefer that Grey Lynn remain in the Waitemata Local Board as I think there is a strong connection between Grey Lynn and that Local Board. For example, the local board chair lives in Grey Lynn.</p>
801	Angela Lane	Support	Seems logical.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
804	Lance Wiggs	Oppose	<p>The proposed change leaves Waitemata 9.22% over the average ward size, which is unfair, discriminatory and will result in massive distortions in the future.</p> <p>1: Today, in September 2018, the population of the proposed Waitemata ward has already breached the 10% cap, so the boundary is already unfair to residents.</p> <p>The study uses one year old, 2017, data, and does not take into account changes in population from then until now.</p> <p>Central Auckland (West &amp; East) alone grew at a rate of 13.7% from 2016 to 2017.(1) If we apply the same growth rate to the 2017 data we have added 5,229 people to the area. (As a resident this feels light). If we keep everything else the same for Waitemata then the population would be 95,929, and percent difference from quota 15.5%.</p> <p>I would expect a more complete analysis would show the difference exceeds 15.5% as the remainder of the proposed Waitemata ward is also experiencing much higher growth than average.</p> <p>2: This exercise sets the Wards for the next six years. As mentioned above it starts with data that is a year old, and it will therefore finish based on 7 year old data. This discriminates against the population of Waitemata, in particular the inner-city.</p> <p>At the 15.7% growth rate (from above) the population of Central Auckland will increase by 145% over the 7 years (116% in 6 years), adding 39,000 people in 6 years (56,000 in 7 years).</p> <p>To put this in context Central Auckland alone will, soon after 2020, have a greater population than the current Rodney Ward.</p> <p>Waitemata, at that growth rate, would in 6 years be at 200% my estimate of the then average size of a ward, given the same number of councillors.</p> <p>In summary the review is bound by its parameters, but it is easy to argue that it is grossly unfair and biased to put Waitemata at just under the 10% limit - for 3 reasons: 1: Waitemata, as at September 2018, is already well over the 10% limit 2: The forecast population will drive wildly unreasonable and undemocratic limit excession over the next 6 years " with votes in Central Auckland/Waitemata eventually counting for under half of the average vote in Auckland.</p> <p>If this proposal is required to be bound by its rules then the Waitemata Ward population should be set as close as possibly to the 90% lower limit. Ideally, however, this process would also consider the effect of vast differences in population growth, and the Ward size reduced further to compensate.</p> <p>3: Auckland inner city has a very high percentage of less wealthy and non-white people, who are very low participants in elections. As a result the surrounding suburbs and Waiheke Island (wealthy, white, older) have dominated elections. It is even easy to argue that the Ward could have been, despite our neutral system, been deliberately constructed to remove the voices of these inner city</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
			<p>residents.</p> <p>While the surrounding suburbs have been clipped, Waiheke residents (40+ minutes away) remain part of the Ward. This is unfair to them and to downtown residents who have very different priorities.</p> <p>The answer is to move Waiheke Island to Rodney, reducing Waitemata's Population by 9,630 to 80,870, or 97.6% of the average Ward (and increasing Rodney's population to just under 90%).</p> <p>The East and West boundaries should then be further reduced so that Waitemata's Population is close to 90% of the average.</p> <p>(1):  <a href="http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLECODE7541#">http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLECODE7541#</a></p>
805	Nick Hodgson	Oppose	<p>Waiheke should not come under Waitemata but instead be moved into Rodney.</p> <p>This is because the population of Waiheke has disproportionate influence over outcomes for central city / downtown.</p> <p>Given the demographic of Waiheke, these votes are not reflective of the desires of central Aucklanders. Encompassing the two areas into the same voting block when residents in each have such wildly differing realities is doing nothing for the advancement of the city.</p> <p>By moving Waiheke to Rodney, this allows voting for central city to be more reflective of opinions of those directly affected by legislation rather than those affluent residents living on an island 45 minutes away with a totally different reality with regards to infrastructure.</p>
807	Theresa smith	Oppose	<p>The voting population in Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward 61,000 is less than Orakei 66,000 but the council wants to carve off the high voting areas of Parnell and Westmere and shift them to Orakei &amp; Albert Eden. Thus radically changing the Ward boundary but not the Local Board boundary.</p> <p>Only 51% of the Waitemata &amp; Gulf population is on the roll compared to 67 % across Auckland and 68% across NZ because of the non eligibility of the transient international population of the inner city. No wonder 80% of surveyed Aucklanders do not have confidence in council decisions.</p>
808	Fraser Morgan	Oppose	<p>I disagree with the both shifts in the orakei ward, especially the St Johns changes because the community is being split.</p>
810	Dawn Trenberth	Support	<p>Seems reasonable and still keeping communities of interest together.</p>
811	STUART STEVENSON	Support	<p>it is supposed to give a fair representation</p>
812	Barbara Lynch	Support	<p>At long last! Ellerslie was formely in Maungakiekie-Tamaki but since the move to Orakei, all the projects/feedback /info has had very little to do with us in Ellerslie. We sit better in Maungakiekie-Tamaki.</p>
822	Lesley Maipi	Oppose	<p>Our population is larger</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
823	Chillion Sanenvi	Oppose	There is nothing wrong with it
854	Wayne Baird - Grey Lynn Returned Services and Social club	Oppose	<p>The proposed change to the Waitemata local board boundary will have an adverse impact on the West Lynn / Grey Lynn community.</p> <p>The proposed new boundary will divide West Lynn shopping centre, split the associated Grey Lynn residential community and isolate local schools.</p> <p>West Lynn was recently subject to a failed Auckland Transport streetscape project, with major design flaws, that destroyed the integrity of the shopping centre during and after construction.</p> <p>The boundary change as proposed will have a similar destructive impact on the culture of the local business and residential community.</p> <p>We suggest the Waitemata ward boundary should instead continue from Surrey Crescent along Old Mill Road, Garnet Road and West End Road.</p> <p>This boundary would enable continued coherence of West Lynn shopping centre and its associated residential community while retaining Cox's Bay Reserve within Waitemata ward.</p>
858	James Hita	Oppose	There's no need to make these changes as this would split communities of interest or join dissimilar communities of interest.
875	Megan Darrow - Ellerslie Business Association	Oppose	Please see attached submission
878	John Hall	Support	I live in the Waitemata Ward and the Ward as it currently is encompasses communities that are not really part of the feel for the Waitemata Ward generally. In particular, Westmere and Parnell could better be accommodated in the other wards to which they are proposed to be moved.
879	Glenice Hursthouse	Support	Better distribution of the population.
881	Kim Palmer	Oppose	Map 1d only the houses should move, Colin Maiden Park and Ngahue Reserve should stay in Orakei as these have no voters living in them and it services Orakei community 95%

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
882	Gerard Hill	Oppose	<p>Please delete earlier comments in paragraph two, as there are some typos that I didn't pick up.</p> <p>I have added these additional comments a bit of my background, and have added Mike's submission in total in the load file. I have submitted my personal capacity.</p> <p>I have read the proposed submissions, and also Councillor Michael Lees review. After reading them both, I support Councillor Lees Review, I have re-submitted Councillor Lees submission below.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Ponsonby since 1973 and permanently since 1978, I have been actively involved in the local community in the following organisations. In the 1980s and 90s I was member of the Ponsonby/Herne Bay Community Committee. I chaired the Ponsonby Community Centre Board 2004-2010, I was a founding member and treasurer of the Western Bays from 2011-2017, I was a member of the Ponsonby Business Association from 2004 and served as treasurer of this organisation from 2012-2017. On behalf of the above named organisations and as an individual of the old Auckland City and Western Bays Community Board and the new super city and the Waitemata Local Board established in 2010, I have a long association with the existing Waitemata Ward. I believe that Councillor Lee's submission reflects the community of interest that exists in the Waitemata Ward today. If you are interested in what I have submitted before, much of this is available in my now inactive blog, Gerryoponsonby@wordpress.com Gerard Hill.</p>
893	Basil Matana	No opinion	Doesn't affect me
894	Ross Barnes	Support	Better cohesion across Waitakere
907	Muhammad Sohail	Support	I think that will be fine
908	Hope Munro	Oppose	What becomes of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward. I think you are playing around with decile. I also note that the changes are where there were once a high number of StateHomes which have now been sold.
909	Kylee Dale	Oppose	As a St. John's road resident in close proximity to Meadowbank and Orakei and we are well integrated with services and community groups within the ward. The split seems too broad. The Stonefields suburb is a new area with high density and new residents moving in who can establish networks in a new ward. I recommend if you wish to change wards to redistribute population you focus on the high growth areas rather than splitting boundaries within areas where there is minimal change to housing types, density and resident numbers which are quite stable meaning the residents are existing and well established community groups.
933	Leigh Christensen	Oppose	Because of population increases I will become part of Albert-Eden Roskill ! In six years time can I expect to be living in Rodney ? Nonsense ! Change the 10 per cent rule.
942	John Rennell - Ellerslie Jewellers	Oppose	Ellerslie Jewellers and Engravers (EJE) does not support the proposed boundary changes affecting the Ellerslie ward. This change splits Community (Comm) interest in many ways & in addition there's concern that the proposal will cause Ellerslie to be poorly represented due to the number of projects occurring

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
	and Engravers		<p>in the Maungakiekie area.</p> <p>EJE are the exclusive contractual suppliers of awards &amp; engraving to the Auckland Racing Club (ARC) at Ellerslie Racecourse (ER). ARC is the largest engraving account on our books with decades of association. EJE are regular sponsors of race days at ARC. The membership of ARC has a 20% discount at EJE &amp; this generates a considerable volume of business.</p> <p>Ellerslie as a Comm has a long &amp; rich history closely tied to the ER. Its creation &amp; growth were overwhelmingly catalysed by development of the ER &amp; the effects are continuing today. Ellerslie is synonymous with Racing &amp; it's inconceivable that we are not considered a Comm of interest. The Comm has a huge sense of belonging with the ARC &amp; this needs to continue.</p> <p>The village itself was fundamentally changed after implementations of the motorway which effectively split Ellerslie in two &amp; remains today as a boundary for many organisations. Most organisations &amp; sports clubs define their boundaries from the motorway east &amp; Eastern Zone.</p> <p>Primarily all sports that Ellerslie residents participate in are in the Orakei Ward, including students attending sports at facilities used by Ellerslie AFC (Michaels Park, Ngahue Reserve, Liston Park) &amp; whose teams participate in the Eastern Suburbs competition, Auckland University Cricket (Colin Maiden Park, Glover Park) College Rifles Rugby Club, University Rugby Club (Colin Maiden Park), Auckland Netball Centre.</p> <p>The Ellerslie village has much in common with the Comm of Remuera, St Heliers &amp; Mission Bay in being a "village" style shopping experience &amp; exclude commercial areas. This is in great contrast to business areas in Maungakiekie Ward that are large &amp; highly industrial, Ellerslie has very little in common.</p> <p>Ellerslie Marketview data shows a similar pattern. 33% spent in Ellerslie comes from the immediate neighbouring Orakei Ward. 11% comes from Mt Wellington North, One Tree Hill East, Ferndale, &amp; Hamlin of the Maugakiekie ward. This demonstrates Ellerslie people shop &amp; spend much more in Orakei with smaller numbers of people visiting Ellerslie from Maungakiekie suburbs.</p> <p>Another fundamental concern that EJE has with this proposal concerns effective representation. The number of projects underway or about to commence in the Maungakiekie ward.</p> <p>The Onehunga Framework plan; (Onehunga Town Centre redevelopment, East-West Link, connecting State Highway 1 &amp; State Highway 20. Redevelopment of Onehunga Wharf (retention of commercial fishing operations) Light rail (city centre &amp; the Airport), Oranga Housing development)</p> <p>Plus these projects of major significance; (East-West Link Project, Auckland Manukau Eastern Transport Initiative (AMETI) eg Panmure being named in Panuku's plan, Tamaki Redevelopment Company projects )</p> <p>All these projects taking place in the Maungakiekie ward are huge &amp; of importance for the Maungakiekie councillor to oversee. EJE is concerned that with all these projects Ellerslie will not have effective representation due to the workload. EJE is concerned that projects in &amp; around our area will be forced to the periphery &amp; not receive fair representation.</p> <p>Our preferred approach would be to address the disparity in Waitemata by the Governing Body seeking legislative change to allow it to review the number of Governing body members. A second member for Waitemata &amp; Gulf wards could be appointed, meaning minimal changes elsewhere.</p> <p>EJE &amp; other Ellerslie Village businesses have long-standing relationships with the Ellerslie Comm &amp; Eastern Subs. The majority of our customers being from the Orakei Ward.</p> <p>EJE strongly opposes the proposed Boundary change from Orakei to Maungakiekie.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
944	Lisa Mein	Oppose	While I do not strongly oppose the change, I have always considered Westmere to be strongly affiliated with the inner western bays area. These suburbs from Freemans Bay through to Westmere and including St Marys Bay, Ponsonby, Herne Bay and Grey Lynn reflect their location firmly on the Waitemata Harbouar, with a different historic landscape and identity to the maunga based suburbs of Mt Albert (Owairaka), Mt Eden and Mt Roskill. Representation on Council also reflects this and acknowledges that the inner western bays communities have some commonalities.
945	Trevor Wilson	Oppose	This survey could have been better designed. I have no opinion on the changes being made in Map 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e and 1f.  BUT I am happy that in Map 1g Ball Place is moving to Whau LB as it is in the New Lynn parliamentary electorate.  I believe that boundaries should align with natural geographical features or major roads therefore I would like to see White Swan Road as the eastern boundary.
946	Mariee Hayes	Oppose	I oppose the splitting of St Johns areas and excluding the one from Orakei Ward. A better solution would be to exclude Stonefields as they are a new suburb and have no historical association with Orakei and are a community of interest with Orakei and surrounds and have nothing in commmon with Stonefields.
949	Dirk Hudig	Oppose	The Waitemata ward serves the inner city. This area has its own specific issues in a number of areas such as port access, very high traffic volumes, inner city beach assets, Combined Sewer System (except CBD). To remove Parnell, Newmarket, and Westmere would dissipate this community of interest.  With the CBD and the very high levels of vehicle movements through the area it is under-represented.  Better to add some extra inner city to Waitemata and provide two councillors for this importantpart of Auckland
950	Cheryl Adamson - Parnell Business Association	Support	Please see attached submission
951	Elke Chilwell	Oppose	It makes no sense to move half of Grey Lynn from one ward to another. Grey Lynn has a strong community. Please keep Grey Lynn together as one suburb in either Waitemata or move the whole suburb into Albert-Eden-Roskill. Splitting the shopping centre, and the school away half of the members in the community is ridiculous. We need to all be able to have one board where our community issues are considered.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
952	Rollend Rackley	Support	<p>1 I agree with moving communities of Parnell and Newmarket from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Orakei Ward for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 Newmarket, especially when the 277 development is completed next year will become a hub for Parnell and Newmarket residents.</p> <p>2 Imbalance of number of residents between wards dilutes Auckland's democracy and this helps reduce this problem</p>
954	Gopal Krishnan Raju	Support	Easy and more attention required for better service
955	Elizabeth Rackley	Support	<p>I support moving the communities of Parnell And Newmarket from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Orakei Ward for the following reasons :</p> <p>1 It improves Auckland's democracy by endeavouring to have the same number of residents in each ward.</p> <p>2 When the development of 277 is completed next year it will be a magnet for the residents of Parnell and Newmarket</p>
957	Sarah Byron-Wood	Support	<p>I support the proposal to move Parnell and Newmarket from Waitemata to Orakei. I would like to further suggest, that Grafton be included in the Orakei Ward. As a Grafton resident, I feel my community shares several genuine interests with the communities of Parnell and Newmarket. These three suburbs should not be split unnecessarily for the following reasons:</p> <p>Grafton as a shared community of interest with Parnell and Newmarket One of the biggest features that connects our three communities is the Auckland Domain. We all surround and share the park as our local green space and have common interests when it comes to the park's care. Similarly, my suburb shares with Parnell and Newmarket local primary and college school zones that have contributed to an already established shared identity. Like Newmarket and Parnell, Grafton is bisected by major roads and arterial routes. These transport networks equally define our three communities. I, like many others in Grafton, regularly shop, eat and play in Newmarket. The variety of activities offered there only enhances the connectivity between my suburb, Newmarket and Parnell. I see several similarities in the character of all three suburbs. Grafton, Newmarket and Parnell have existing heritage, apartment dwellings, small businesses and light industry that collectively shape our suburbs' identity.</p> <p>There is already an established relationship between residents of the current Orakei Ward and residents in Grafton, New Market and Parnell. Sports clubs, schooling, and the use of entertainment, shopping and food facilities are only a few examples. Suburbs that are part of the current Orakei Ward were historically linked with Grafton, Newmarket, and Parnell through the old Hobson Ward</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
			As Auckland grows, it is important that Ward boundary changes are reflected in the effective representation of communities. While I live in Grafton, I have strong and longstanding connections and links with New Market and Parnell. We have genuine communities of interest that will only thrive if we are part of the same ward with the same representation that shares and understands our wants and needs.
958	Michael Bartlett	Support	<p>I support the Council's option of moving Nemarket and Parnell into the Orakei Ward. I also believe it makes sense to include Grafton in the Orakei Ward.</p> <p>As a resident of Grafton and managing a business based in Newmarket the connections with the wider Orakei Ward are evident across business, social, cultural. Transport and economic links. The communities are a logical fit.</p>
962	Brett Clark	Support	<p>More specifically I support all 3 changes to Maungakiekie-Tamaki which follow some historic communities of interest.</p> <p>I am concerned that Map 1f failed to fully show the long since completed restoration and development of Taumanu Reserve.</p>
963	Geoff W Campbell	Oppose	I dont agree with the rationale used to change the Rodney Subdivision Boundary and to not change the Rodney Ward Boundary.
964	thom gill	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have high ' community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way</p>
965	Janice Finn	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have high ' community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
966	Elizabeth Brown	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD have high 'community of interest' similarities -- right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed appears to be a very unfortunate proposal. Its basis is clearly expedient and mathematics-based. However well intentioned it has been, it is most unfortunately devoid of proper intelligent consideration of the non-mathematical social and cultural factors that are at play here. These are what make a city and a community what it is. These factors can so easily have severe impact on the unique nature of communities for the long term. Once damaged or lost, those can never be got back. The outcome is a proposal that is contradictory, confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way. Not only is it ultimately not intelligent, it simply does not make common sense.</p>
968	Sanya Baker	Support	<p>I support to the extent that the extra large population growth in the Waitemata (CBD) and Gulf Ward requires moving people out of this ward to even up representation between wards. However, this has led to 182,400 people in Albert Eden Roskill Ward making this one the most populated ward in the city by 6000 people.</p> <p>This results in a constituency which is 1) far too big for two councillors to serve - especially with far fewer resources than electorate MPs who represent around 70,000 people each; and 2) very costly for election campaigning which is likely to limit the number of people willing to stand.</p>
969	Catherine Perry	Oppose	<p>I cannot see any good reason to split an existing cohesive and vibrant community such as Waitemata. Auckland Council needs to look after its strong communities, not divide them. A super city is not comprised of fractured neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It appears that the changes are required because of population growth in Central Auckland (with a significant proportion of residents non-New Zealanders) so presumably, as the population increases, the boundaries will continue to need to change. The law needs to change.</p> <p>I gather that the Coalition Government is unlikely to consider changing the law this term, but despite this I shall be writing to my MP (Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern) to ask her to review this matter.</p>
970	Philip Clarke	Oppose	<p>The proposal would damage the sense of community in the Grey Lynn/Westmere area.</p> <p>I believe a change is not required under the Local Electoral Act 2001 which places a primacy on community as the 10% threshold is not an absolutely mandatory requirement.</p> <p>I heard Warwick McNaughton speak today at St Columba's in Grey Lynn and his address on this consultation I found inept and disrespectful of democracy</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
972	Gael Baldock	Oppose	<p>Under the law there is allowance for the status quo with Local Board boundaries (this is a physical area) to align with Ward boundaries (this is a population area) as it states "the boundaries of communities of interest should not be split". So splitting Grey Lynn from Westmere down the centre of Richmond Rd through the West Lynn Village would split a community with similar interests.</p> <p>Also, the centre city will continue to increase in population so in no time the boundary will get changed again.....what next? Splitting it down the centre of Ponsonby Road? Such notations are just silly as continued population growth in the centre as high rises are built will continue to disrupt and disenfranchise communities. Besides population and voting population are not the same thing. The centre of Auckland is full of foreign students and visitors who do not vote. This document says that you do not propose to split Rodney "as this would split communities of interest" so why would you attempt to split Westmere from Grey Lynn and Ponsonby? Representationreview@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</p> <p>Further to my previous submission.</p> <p>I OPPOSE the changes because they split areas of interest. Westmere is part of the Ponsonby area along with Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. If the solution is to take Parnell and Newmarket from the other side then they belong with Grafton and there is some sense of including them with Remuera. And in this picture, does Great Barrier align more with Thames, Coromandel as their lifestyles are similar.</p> <p>BUT in the bigger picture these suburbs that ring the city fit the same criteria of being of interest with each other. It's almost like the centre is the core of the donut and that the ring with the areas previously mentioned and Herne Bay, St Mary's Bay and Waiheke for like interests together. But if you separated the core from the ring then the councillor would have no one to govern because most of those in the centre are less likely to vote. So.....it seems that a 2 stage split/join is necessary. Split off Parnell, Newmarket, Grafton while keeping Westmere, Grey Lynn, Ponsonby, Herne Bay, Waiheke, etc together. Apply for a new rule of either 20% population difference or make the population be voters or add another councillor to the Waitemata Ward centre so that the ring suburbs can be brought back together with Ward and Board aligning. This alignment is ideal. Maybe the rule needs to be that the physical map boundary of the Board is the boundary of the Ward but population disparity means that another councillor is required....God forbid! The next problem is that councillors from other wards can't know enough about this to vote on it.</p> <p>The big problems here are that public was never consulted on the Supercity and its rules, and that the Unitary Plan means that the Centre Will continue to grow disproportionately to the other Wards.</p> <p>Glad to speak further on this two stage suggestion of split now, and rejoin after a law change suggestion</p>
973	Jennifer Stuart	Oppose	<p>Loosing the special character of our Waitemata Local Area - rather than change the boundaries - change the 2001 Law and support 2 elected council reps to support the population growth due to the Auckland City's aspirations to have intensification</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
974	Raymond and Carol Peak	Oppose	<p>We oppose the changes and wish for the status quo to remain as is represented at the present time, with Desley Simpson as Chair/Councillor for the Orakei Board, inclusive of the Ellerslie suburb. We DO NOT WANT Ellerslie to be included in the Maungakiekie representation.</p> <p>We have, and should always be our own identity and have the connection to the Orakei Board.</p>
975	Christina Bengtson	Oppose	<p>Westmere is much more aligned (geographically, infrastructure ...) with the CBD/inner suburbs than with the Albert/Eden/Roskill area. In my view it makes very little sense to alter the alignment in the proposed direction.</p>
976	Callum Nicholls	Support	<p>The rules were created for a reason.</p>
977	Bruce Burton	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD have high 'community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way.</p> <p>Merging Parnell into the Eastern suburbs with residential/suburban issues rather than the city which Parnell has much more in common does not make sense.</p>
978	Marina Purdon	Oppose	<p>Oppose the move of the communities of Westmere, and west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward. Want to keep Grey Lynn Shops, Schools and Churches in Grey Lynn. Proposed boundary changes will affect all the businesses and schools West of Great North Road. These must stay in the vibrant, amazing and local Grey Lynn community.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
979	Philippa Binney	Oppose	<p>I oppose moving Parnell and Newmarket communities from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Orakei Ward because it would split a community of interest. Both Parnell and Newmarket are city fringe suburbs and to split them off would mean separating them from other city fringe suburbs, thereby reducing their ability to advocate to elected representatives on the particular issues that are of concern to those living on the city fringe. The major issues would be potentially: loss of on-street parking (either by design or because of commuters parking all day in city fringe streets), congestion, environmental pollution (carbon emissions), implementation of walking and cycling connections, stormwater run-off and stormwater/wastewater separation, protection of green spaces, preservation of built heritage, development of shared spaces/urban place-making initiatives. If Parnell and Newmarket were to be split off it would reduce their ability to collectively advocate for issues affecting the city fringe due to proximity to the CBD. These issues do not affect the existing suburbs of Orakei and it would be difficult for residents of Parnell and Newmarket to get any traction with elected representatives in a ward that is overwhelmingly suburban rather than city fringe. The reality is that Parnell and Newmarket are becoming more, not less, urbanised as time goes by and it is inconsistent and unfair for them to be lumped in with the likes of Remuera which does not face the same pressures.</p>
982	Roger Hawkins	Oppose	<p>The proposed changes do not add any value to ratepayers and residents of Waitemata Ward - NONE at all.</p> <p>This proposed realignment in my view is totally unnecessary and will cause needless cost as well as confusion and inconvenience, especially at election time.</p> <p>The level of community engagement that has been apparent over the last 8 years has tried to contain Auckland Transport and Auckland Council and restrict some of their dumber ideas. (ie the totally unnecessary and incredibly badly done Richmond Road debacle - A quick question while we are on this subject - Are the people who managed this "project" still employed by AT or Auckland Council?).</p> <p>I believe that this proposal is designed purely to move the ward boundaries around so that established groups that oppose the various stupid proposals and actions of AT and Council can be "divided and conquered".</p> <p>This is not how democracy is supposed to work - not even close!.</p> <p>The community groups with specific interests that have been established between Grey Lynn, and Westmere, and Parnell, Grafton and Newmarket, as well as the Western Bays, Ponsonby, City Centre and the islands of the Gulf over the last 8 years are still perfectly suited for the representation that they offer.</p> <p>The only thing that needs to change are the personnel representing those wards, Some of them are so out of touch and so hell bent on their own agenda - that they need to be removed. The elections will hopefully address that issue - and for that reason we need to keep the current ward allocation and boundaries as they are.</p> <p>I do NOT support any changes and I much prefer that they stay as they are!</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
			Roger Hawkins
983	Caroline Dunlea	Oppose	West Lynn has shared interests. It's insane to propose splitting it in 2.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
984	Soala Wilson	Oppose	<p>The proposed changes to the ward boundary will be disruptive and likely to exacerbate this distortion and therefore do more harm than good. An alternative approach enabled within the legislation of retaining the existing ward boundaries and preserving existing community of Grey Lynn and Westmere is recommended along with a request, additional to those the Council has already made, to amend anomalies and inconsistencies in the legislation relating to Auckland Council under the Local Electoral Matters Bill currently before parliament. This is a more pragmatic approach and one much more likely to achieve a durable solution to this unusual problem.</p> <p>The City Centre is flanked to the west by what the City Centre Master Plan calls the 'urban villages' Grey Lynn &amp; Westmere. Reinforced by the identical boundaries of the Waitemata Local Board Area and Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward, a strong community of Grey Lynn and Westmere based on a common historical and geographic identity and has built up, especially over the last 8 years.</p> <p>However, the option preferred by the Joint Working Group will slice through all this -on both eastern and western sides. This will disrupt rather than preserve long-standing communities Grey Lynn and Westmere with mesh blocks of electors to be moved about like pieces on a board.</p> <p>What appears to been overlooked by the Joint Working Group is that stripping away these historical suburbs where registered elector presence is relatively high (in line with the rest of Auckland), but leaving the CBD untouched, is that the consequence is likely to exacerbate the very low ratio between 'population' and 'electors'. As a result the ratio of electors to population in what is left of the ward is almost certain to fall even lower, well below 50%.</p> <p>Changing the Ward boundaries to achieve what appears to be in the case of Waitemata &amp; Gulf ward to be a less than meaningful mathematical formula will not provide a robust nor sustainable solution to a problem not foreseen by the drafters of the legislation. Nor will it achieve more effective or fair representation (NZ Bill Of Rights) by any dictionary meaning of those words. In fact, in terms of cost benefit it will do more harm than good.</p> <p>Therefore, I recommend that the Council advises the Local Government Commission that it is unconvinced of the merit of dismantling the carefully balanced structures erected by the Commission itself in 2010. Instead citing 19V (3) (a) of the Local Electoral Act, and that compliance with the 10% formula in this situation would actually reduce effective representation by dividing communities of Grey Lynn and Westmere between wards and local boards and drive the proportion of electors to population even lower. Instead the Council should offer to work with the Commission to review those parts of the legislation that are not currently fit-for-purpose with the objective of formulating a more durable solution, taking into account central Auckland's non-permanent resident population. This should also be considered in terms Council's current applications to the government for minor changes in the Local Electoral Bill presently before parliament.</p>
985	Ariki Padlie	Oppose	<p>The obvious one of breaking up a close net community. Straight down the middle of Surrey Cres and Richmond Rd would not a community make. I have lived in the area for 40 years and would be disappointed if this did come to fruition.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
986	Nathaniel Matai'a-Davidson	Oppose	The inner central suburbs definitely share similar interests with plenty of community crossover. Changes to the Ward borders should not be made for the sake of statistics, as it is the intangible facts of people and personalities that make up the population they aim to split must also be taken into account. The representation for the particular groups that are being split off may not necessarily match those of the incumbent Councillors either, as there will be particular issues that may only pertain to a certain suburb but not the wider community. The council would find itself in a much better position to act if the communities of similar interests were to exist under the same ward. With all due respect, this seems very much like a divide and conquer move by the council.
989	Martin Taylor - Stonefields Residents Association Inc	Support	<p>Our submission is in support of the proposed changes to the Ākerā kei ward boundaries.</p> <p>While we would have preferred to see the former boundaries remain, in particular common boundaries with the Ākerā kei Local Board, we accept the reasons for the proposed changes.</p> <p>We are aware that alternative boundary options might be considered that would affect Stonefields, in particular options that would involve moving all of Stonefields out of Ākerā kei ward into the Maungakiekie-Tā maki subdivision. We would oppose such a change to the proposal.</p> <p>See our attached detailed submission.</p>
991	Courtney Letica	Oppose	Ponsonby, westmere, grey Lynn are all the same are. What the hell is wrong with you people? Leave our god damn city alone.
992	Siniua Lilo - St Columba Church and Community Centre	Oppose	Boundary changes may have an impact on the Parish boundaries associated with this Church and the future viability of this Church.
993	Sue Lyons	Oppose	It's fully functional as it is. If we change each time there's a population growth due to more apartments being built or infill housing and subdivision of current properties, we'll be changing every couple of years. Do not change the Waitemata board. Thanks
994	Jane Wild	Oppose	This change would divide my local community - Grey Lynn
995	Leonie Morris	Oppose	One side of Richmond Road will be in one Board and the other side will be in another splitting communities in half.
998	Debbie Haysom	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have high 'community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1005	Martin Dickson	Oppose	The communities on the city centre fringes - Parnell, Newmarket, Grafton, Ponsonby should be represented together. As the city centre population is growing rapidly, to keep chopping bits off will not make sense. I live in Grafton and we need to be strongly connected to the city centre where all our issues originate - the same is for Newmarket and Parnell and Ponsonby
1007	William Gruar	Oppose	Act of Parliament: When deciding the size of wards and their boundaries communities of interest should not be split. Comment. A demarcation along the middle of Richmond Rd through the West Lynn Village is by the above definition unlawful.
1010	Tanah Dowdle	Oppose	It is ridiculous to chop a community and half like this this is my local shopping area and has been for the last 20 years itâ€™s our community and we donâ€™t want it chopped in half - you have heard of Berlin right? That didnâ€™t work & nor will this. Please Donâ€™t move the communities of Westmere, and west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward
1012	Sarah Welch	Support	I think it is reasonable to ensure each ward has essentially the same population, however I think there are some communities of interest that will be split with some of the changes. The new boundary for the Waitemata ward will be along Richmond Rd and this will split the West Lynn shops which is clearly a single community and it would be a shame to split this area.
1013	Suzan White	Support	I support Ellerslie being moved into the Maungakiekie Tamaki Ward. I am currently in the Orakei ward but have no connection with this ward at all. All of my daily living and recreational activities take part in what is now the Maungakiekie Tamaki Ward. I am also in the Maungakiekie electorate and its confusing being in different council and parliamentary areas. I want some consistency in this. Itâ€™s ridiculous having such different boundaries!!!
1014	Marg Slater	Oppose	Leave our neighborhood alone, we are all connected and should stay this way

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1015	Paul O'Connor	Oppose	<p>Hi</p> <p>We live in Parnell and our house is in a Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>The proposal to move our area into the Orakei ward seems like a knee-jerk, not well thought through and not widely consulted.</p> <p>I have looked through the proposed boundary changes and have noted four things that do not seem to be in your analysis of changes as it relates to Parnell and Newmarket:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the demographics of the above areas closely match the demographics (2013 census figures) of the Waitemata and are markedly different to the Orakei ward</li> <li>- the housing types of the above areas closely match the demographics (2013 census) of the Waitemata and are markedly different to the Orakei ward</li> <li>- There are very few dwellings in the Orakei ward that are in Mixed Use Zone (and other Business Zones) and thus do not match the underlying need for the local board to deal with the matters arising from the interface between residential near business zones, as well as (in our case) heritage houses in Mixed Use Zones</li> <li>- Obviously, the Waitemata boundary is such that it does not fit within the 10% rule, however when analysing other areas that have a closer match in demographics, housing types and zone, that other areas (eg Grey Lynn) within the current Waitemata ward we closer in fit to other wards eg Albert-Eden-Roskill ward.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above findings, it seems that this consultation has been rushed and not widespread. These types of changes need to be well consulted so as not to be seen as gerrymandering or just ticking a box.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Paul O'Connor</p>
1016	L C Rive	Oppose	<p>As a Westmere resident I emphatically reject this proposal to change the boundary as it will interfere with community connections. In our daily lives we function as a part of Grey Lynn and Ponsonby and it is not acceptable to make these changes.</p>
1018	Martin Cahnbley	Oppose	<p>To split Grey Lynn/West Lynn down the middle is crazy! There is a community that cannot be split running from Westmere to Grey Lynn, Ponsonby, across to Kingsland and Sandringham even. We are one, do not split us because of some arbitrary number that was enshrined in law some time ago.</p> <p>See below: Rodney Ward Boundary</p> <p>The Rodney Ward population differs from the average by 22 per cent. We do not propose changing the Rodney Ward boundary, as this would split communities of interest or join dissimilar communities of interest. This is exactly why our ward should not be altered.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1019	wendy gray	Oppose	The results of the proposed changes to the ward will result in breaking up communities of interests. If half of Grey Lynn & Westmere moves to the Albert-Eden Local Board this will divide a cohesive community. Although there is no proposal to change the local boards now there is no guarantee that this will not happen in the future. This proposal is not good news for the local communities which are affected. Furthermore politically it feels like an agenda driven proposal to divide these communities for local government political reasons.
1020	Puneet Dhall	Oppose	The proposal proposes major changes to the Waitemata & Gulf Ward boundaries "carving off Parnell and Newmarket to the east and Westmere to the west" but does not propose to alter the present Waitemata Local Board boundary. Such misalignment in my personal view is unnecessary and will cause needless cost as well as confusion and inconvenience, especially at election time
1021	kelly johnson	Oppose	<p>1. You are effectively splitting a suburb in two. Westmere /Grey Lynn/Ponsonby/Herne bay have natural boundaries by the motorway and meola reef. These suburbs operate as one large suburb.</p> <p>2. The splitting of westmere/greylynn splits in two a contiguous area of Auckland. Westmere has nothing in common with Mt Albert / Mt Eden and as such I see Westmere would become that "poor cousin" to the main suburbs that it would join.</p> <p>3. I am concerned about Westmere is starting to be treated as an outer city suburb. This move would cement this. Westmere is less than 5km to the CBD, yes I would need to leave work at 2.15pm to catch a BUS that took me to my childs school by the 3pm bell!!! I would love to catch public transport but at that rate, I am forced to continue in my car which can have me leaving work at 2.40pm to get there in time.</p>
1022	Amanda Martin	Oppose	The boundary change proposes to split Grey Lynn west Lynn shop area in 2. This is nonsense . It is like cutting a person in 2. How can we have effective representation on important community issues when we have half the voice . Please reconsider !
1023	leigh featherstone	Oppose	I absolutely oppose your plan to split Westemere, West Lynn and Grey Lynn from the Waitemata board area. Have any of you ever actually been to our suburb and talked to people or did you just make marks on a map in the best traditions of colonial administrators. You plan to split Westmere from West Lynn and Grey Lynn with a boundary down the middle of Richmond Road! Westmere, West Lynn and Grey Lynn are culturally connected through the geography, transportation, and the demographics and psychographics of the population. We move socially and for business across all three. There is a sense of community that the Board understands and your proposal would wreck. We are distinct from Parnell which is not part of the same culture, I have no objection to having that area off. Plus are you not aware of how Auckland Transport despoiled our suburbs? What would have happened if the split you propose had been in place then - AT would have got away with it.We do not identify with Mount Eden or St Lukes. Think again please.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1029	Andrew Plowman	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have high ' community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way</p>
1032	Tristan Harvey-Smith	Oppose	<p>Westmere is very connected to the rest of the Waitemata area. This is a special area.</p>
1033	Jennifer Northover	Oppose	<p>The proposed change completely cuts the main communities of Grey Lynn in half.</p> <p>These are tight communities and it is ridiculous to suggest we go to different local bodies for issues affecting us.</p> <p>The population of Auckland is increasing anyway, I suggest electing a second councillor and maybe reducing the size of another ward to cut their councillor numbers by one.</p>
1034	Pauline Stacey	Oppose	<p>Westmere has always been inner city, has special character, leave the boundaries as is.</p>
1035	Bruce Ly - Grey Lynn Business Assosiation	Oppose	<p>Our members have businesses that run down both side of Richmond Road this would break up our unique business community.</p> <p>With the proposed changes our members would have to be split from our current business community with some member attending mutiple meetings.</p> <p>If issues arise from decisions made on one side of the ward affecting the other side this would mean our current members would have to attend twice the amount of meeting to address any issues.</p> <p>The would create a devide not only with the businesses but our community as a whole.</p> <p>We have had enough issues in our community arising from AT's cockup with our cycleways and the looming decision around rectifying their cockup, to add this on top of all the issues our community has had to deal with would dishearten alot of people.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1036	Carol Gunn	Oppose	<p>I am EXTREMELY OPPOSED to the proposed split.</p> <p>This proposal would result in the needs and views of the Grey Lynn and Western Bays community being split across different Wards. It is important that boundaries are not drawn through the middle of communities because it would result in their needs not being diluted - in each Ward, they would be a minor component. As a paper/numerical exercise this change is intended to improve representation but will actually have the reverse effect for the Grey Lynn / Western Bays area.</p> <p>It is also important that the Local Board Areas do not straddle different Wards so that they can come together with a logical way of feeding community needs and views up through the layers of council governance.</p> <p>The Proposal would create a split through the middle of Richmond Road. Is this a deliberate ploy to silence vocal community groups? While I don't always agree with all community groups, it is important that a paper-based population exercise fails to recognise the actual social "geography" of the area. This exercise reminds me of the original street planning for Wellington that was done in England, devoid of any understanding of the topography, that has resulted in "quaint", illogical streets.</p> <p>Given the significance of this change, I am also concerned about the lack of profile for this consultation process. I am well-connected in the community but have only heard about this peripherally. I suspect most residents are unaware of this proposed change to the important question of representation in Council.</p> <p>I would support a legislative change to enable the creation of a new Ward so that a cleaner, more sensible split might be created.</p>
1037	Gael Orr	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have high 'community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way</p>
1038	Samantha Blackley	Oppose	<p>This proposal would result in the needs and views of the Grey Lynn and Western Bays community being split across different Wards. It is important that boundaries are not drawn through the middle of communities because this could result in their needs being diluted - in each Ward, they would be a minor component. As a paper/numerical exercise this change is intended to improve representation but will actually have the reverse effect for the Grey Lynn / Western Bays area.</p> <p>The Proposal would create a split through the middle of Richmond Road. It is important that any changes recognise the actual social "geography" of the area. I would support a legislative change to enable the creation of a new Ward so that a cleaner, more sensible split might be created.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1040	Adam Baines	Oppose	I would like to support councillor Mike Lee's letter and position on changing the boundaries of the Waitamata board. Also the Waitamata boards proposal to not have an 8th member on financial grounds. The level of representation is a social and democratic right not an economic position. As a Westmere resident, we are being asked to abandon our own Civic facilities that we have a vested interest in. We will also be geographically isolated from our local community as well as being isolated from the proposed boundary change
1041	Irene King - Grey Lynn Business Association	Oppose	The Grey Lynn Business Association represents all businesses in post code 1021. The proposal to separate and divide our business community effectively right down the middle would exponentially increase our interactions at local government level which are many and frequent. As an entirely voluntary organisation and not bid funded we are already using significant amounts of voluntary time and this is on the basis of interacting with one ubiquitous group. The proposed boundary through the heart of the Grey Lynn village along Surrey Crescent has the potential to compromise one of our key strategies of creating a brand distinctly Grey Lynn covering the district post code 1021 area
1042	Vivienne Wtight	Oppose	Please do not alter the boundary in the Grey Lynn area - we are an homogenous neighbourhood with common views and values and accommodation can surely be made to effect best possible input for Council
1044	Ralph Coulter	Oppose	<p>The western city fringe extending from say Queen Street in the CBD to Westmere is better suited for the Waitemata Ward as opposed to the proposed hiving off of Westmere and Western Springs (north of the NW motorway). Westmere, Western Springs and Pt Chev are populated by residents who share similar issues as the remainder of the western city fringe.</p> <p>If the resulting ward would have too few residents then it makes more sense to extend the ward slightly westwards to encompass Western Springs (north of the NW motorway) and Pt Chev.</p> <p>If it is necessary to retain the CBD in one ward, then I propose that the eastern boundary of Waitemata be bounded by SH16 / Grafton Gully.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1045	Sarah Murray	Oppose	<p>I can only speak as a Westmere/Waitemata resident in respect of the current boundaries:</p> <p>It would make no sense to ignore the current( and long time) defined community of interest purely for compliance with an inappropriate, out of date guideline/rule and further disturb the community by using roads as boundaries to divide neighbours.</p> <p>To what short sighted purpose apart from wielding bureaucratic licence? When the preference of locals is for alignment of ward and local board boundaries (i.e. defined communities of interest) these proposals go against residents' wishes. The Local Electoral Act, as I understand it, requires the review but not absolute compliance with the 10% variation "rule". Fair representation is covered by the comments above. I would be doubtful about the veracity of population data, for the CBD area especially, if it is based on the Census .e.g. How are the residents of highrise apartment buildings surveyed and what was the rate of verified occupancy? Decisions should also take into account likely changes in the next 6 years; to population growth and composition, and amendments to the Act to improve acceptable (to the electorate) representation e.g. increase in Ward reps ratio, to avoid a repeat of this very unsatisfactory, and poorly understood process in a few years. Not good for community spirit or perception of fair representation by local government especially when our communities are being split from each other and pitted against each other.</p>
1046	Jennifer Keymer	Oppose	<p>I totally oppose moving Parnell out of the Waitemata board we have nothing in common with the Orakei board our historic suburb is more in common with Ponsonby ,Herne Bay area ,our problems are the same ,narrow streets ,entertainment areas ,poor parking,hertiage areas etc ,in fact if any thing were to change I suggest Waiheke Island join Orakei as I think they have more in common.As I battle with parking issues outside a property of mine I find the council is really redundant,they seem to have no power over,Auckland Transport and Panuku which is elected by the council .</p>
1047	David Roos	Oppose	<p>The City Centre is unique in Auckland and New Zealand and should indeed have a better and more concentrated ward. This proposal goes some way to addressing this, but fails by persisting in including the least urbanised parts of the city (great barrier, waiheke) with the most urbanised (the central city).</p> <p>it's hard to fathom how someone with a good understanding of the needs of the city centre could be well placed to understand and represent the unqiue needs of waiheke and great barrier islands. Morso vice-versa. Each island would do better to be represented by similar (in population/logistical aspects) wards such as Franklin or Rodney respectively, and this would allow a ward to focus on the unique needs of the city centre and its burgeoning residential population.</p> <p>This should be the first step in improving representation for both groups, and leaving them together is a failure of representation and as such I do not support the proposal.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1048	John Pendreigh	Oppose	I am against splitting off Westmere and its surrounds from other areas of common interest from Waitemata and Gulf, and sticking them in Albert-Mt Eden. Maybe it adds up in terms of balancing figures, but it absolutely lacks logic when viewed against matters of common sense and common interest.
1049	Peter Onneweer	Oppose	Parnell and Newmarket have a natural community of interest with Grafton and all three areas should be in the same ward. All three border the Domain and are often referred to locally as the "Domain suburbs". The Parnell Trust also serves all three areas and as a Grafton resident, for example, I go to the Parnell Farmers Market every weekend and am a regular user of the Parnell Library. These three areas have much more in common with each other than any other part of Auckland and it's very important that whatever changes are made, they stay in the same ward.
1050	Richard Braseil	Oppose	It will cause a division within this protected Waitemata ward
1051	Luke Niue - Parnell Community Committee (Inc)	Oppose	Some would call what is proposed lazy, others have said it is purely politically motivated, but we think it was just too easy for the boundary folk to slice Parnell (excluding the Auckland Domain) and Newmarket off, with no actual thought about the all important "communities of interest". The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have significant similarities right back to when Auckland City was formed and resident/business aspirations are intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed. Aside from removing the longstanding community of interest, the proposal also makes voting in next year's Local Government election far more confusing for voters and far more expensive for Council. What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary way We are aware the resident associations of the majority of inner city suburbs on both the west and east have deep concerns with what is proposed. Best to adopt Option 2 map, as attached, as it better reflects the urban environment for all suburbs adjacent to the CBD. Or, if time is insufficient, we would favour maintain the current status quo for the 2019 elections. The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD are have high 'community of interest' similarities since Auckland was formed and are also intertwined with the residents of the CBD.
1052	Darryl OJaon	Oppose	It will divide like-minded community - protected by 2001 law
1053	James Barnes	Oppose	Grey Lynn should keep its identity as a single place
1054	Wayne Rogers	Oppose	Not necessary Waste of money
1055	Kevin Pearson	Oppose	Westmere should stay as part of Waitemata - certainly as far as Old Mill Rd - Garnet Rd
1056	Rebekah Hay	Oppose	Do not move Westmere west of Surrey etc it's breaking up the community
1057	Katrina Laan	Oppose	Will split local commerce
1058	Graham Langley	Oppose	As a past Westmere resident (28 years) I feel more connected to the Central Auckland area

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1060	Yamin Tun	Oppose	Westmere should remain intact as one suburb in the board of Waitemata
1061	Warwick Mahon	Oppose	Splits up community/businesses/RSC/churches
1062	Kaye Connor	Oppose	<p>The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD have high 'community of interest' similarities right back to before Auckland City Council was established in 1870 and our community resident/business aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.</p> <p>What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits inner Auckland in an unnecessary, unhelpful way.</p>
1064	Jacqueline Walker	Oppose	<p>Parnell, the suburb where I live, is an old inner suburb which, like Grafton, Grey Lynn, Herne Bay etc, identifies as a close-knit inner city area with a strong cultural - and academic - heritage. Together these inner city areas encompass the CBD, the university of Auckland campuses, the taonga museums, art galleries, and, along with other such examples of our cultural heritage, strong commercial and business ties. i.e. there is long established cohesion.</p> <p>The proposed boundary changes hack away at this cohesion in an arbitrary, illogical and negative way. There is no point in it at all. I therefore strongly oppose the proposal.</p>
1065	Michael Bannerman	Oppose	<p>The proposal for the change of ward boundary at Map 1a, to move the communities of Westmere, and west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward is not appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It creates a really illogical split of common business areas and common use land/amenities along Richmond Road - for example, the West Lynn Shopping and Grey Lynn Shopping areas as well as splitting out Grey Lynn Park from the neighbourhood</li> <li>2. People in the area proposed to be split identify more with the Ponsonby/Herne Bay, St Mary's Bay area than with the Eden, Albert, Mt Roskill area for local amenity, shopping, recreating and general living. The current proposal therefore splits a community of interest, and joins dissimilar communities of interest in terms of the definition proposed by the Local Government Commission in it's Guidelines.</li> <li>3. In terms of general communities of interest, it makes more sense to keep the current boundary and, potentially, to create a separation along the North Western and Northern Motorways. This would preserve the current communities, where people live in similar housing and share interest in parks and transport etc., and create a separation for the more commercial CBD area where apartments and office buildings predominate.</li> <li>4. The proposal above (3) preserves the definition of Communities of Interest as suggested by the Local Government Commission:          "One definition of "community of interest" describes it as a three-dimensional concept:          "perceptual" a sense of belonging to a clearly defined area or locality          "functional" the ability to meet with reasonable economy the community's</li> </ol>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
			requirements for comprehensive physical and human services "the ability of the elected body to represent the interests and reconcile the conflicts of all its members."
1066	Lloyd Walker	Oppose	The inner ring of suburbs around the CBD have high 'community of interest' similarities dating back from before Auckland City Council was established in 1870. Our community aspirations were intertwined with those of the CBD. This is clearly identified in the City Centre Masterplan that is presently being refreshed.  What is proposed is confusing, ad-hoc and splits Auckland in an unnecessary and unhelpful way.
1067	Eleanor Whyte	Oppose	Breaks up the community/schools/church's/RSA/centres
1068	Kim Hegan	Oppose	Dividing a long established community
1069	Roger King	Oppose	Leave boundary same

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1070	John Batty	Oppose	I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Waitemata ward boundary that would result in splitting off part of Grey Lynn and all of Westmere and transfer them to the Roskill ward. There is a currently available discretion to vary the 10% rule under existing legislation and I believe such discretion should be used to avoid putting a carving knife straight through the heart of West Lynn village in particular. It would be an unnecessary and ridiculous complication to have citizens on one side of Richmond Road in one ward and those on the other part of some other ward. Could you please ensure that this particular ward boundary redistribution is reconsidered in the name of ongoing community coherence and harmony. That would be much appreciated. With kind regards. John Batty
1071	Judith Berman	Oppose	It will split my local shops - West Kynn in two boards
1072	Mark Shanahan	Oppose	Do not split a main road (dumb USA idea)
1073	Mary Manoah	Oppose	Divides community Lose funding for present community activities
1074	Patricia Prchal	Oppose	Waitemata proposal to put the boundary DOWN Richmond Rd dividing the road in 2 is stupid nth on the motorway
1075	Frances Lucca	Oppose	I oppose splitting Richmond Rd into two wards
1076	Don Faurley	Oppose	Splitting the Grey Lynn community
1077	Jan Hooker	Oppose	Splitting a well-functioning existing community not a good idea
1080	Jill Newall	Oppose	Splitting a very old community around GL RSC. Do not divide Grey Lynn up
1081	Adele Kennedy	Oppose	Dividing up a very strong historical community where we all have a strong committment to
1089	C E Joseph	Oppose	I oppose this because it does not follow the natural separation of the suburbs and this matters to the residents. We in Grey Lynn and Westmere and Ponsonby share the same issues and concerns and the large land mass of Western Springs Park serves as a physical and psychological boundary between us and Mt Albert. Please do not do this!

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1090	Troy Elliott - Ellerslie Residents Association	Support	<p>The ERA support the changes as we think this will be good for the Ellerslie Community. Ellerslie was cut in the past by the motorway, but we also currently represent residents on both sides so this will work well.</p> <p>Currently Ellerslie is in the Maungakiekie electorate for central government but Orakei for local body so this alignment would work well.</p> <p>We do respectfully ask that the Ellerslie Racecourse be included in this change to boundaries.</p> <p>Ellerslie is known for its racecourse and many people when hearing the word Ellerslie relate this to the ARC. Therefore we feel it is important that the change is inclusive of the racecourse. There is mooted future development of the racecourse with a retirement village, these residents will be using Ellerslie Village as their local shopping precinct as well as will relate to the village as part of their community.</p> <p>We are surprised at Stonefields being excluded from this change, given the geographics of Stonefields being between both changed areas.</p> <p>We are open for further discussion on the boundary changes.</p>
1094	Lisa Shearer	Oppose	Expensive & unnecessary.
1095	Christine TEESDALE	Support	I believe all of Ellerslie should be in the Maungakiekie Tamaki ward but i also believe that Stonefields should also be included. People in Ellerslie and Stonefields are very connected to that community with shared shopping and recreational facilities. We have little to do with Orakei
1097	Jacqui Wilkinson	Oppose	<p>I do not support the proposed ward boundary changes in Auckland Central for three key reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neighbouring communities with a history of collaboration and support since Auckland was first founded in 1840 will be separated.</li> <li>2. Grafton will become the only residential community on the eastern side of Grafton Bridge.</li> <li>3. The proposed changes are unnecessary given the unique character of the inner city. Many residents are short stay students and many do not have the ability to vote or work in NZ.</li> </ol> <p>I do not support the recommended ward boundary change in Auckland Central primarily because it means one small residential community, Grafton, will become the only suburb on the Eastern side of the Grafton Gully to remain in the Waitemata Local Board catchment.</p> <p>This change means our residential community runs a significant risk of being reclassified to suit to demands of our political powerful neighbours, which include the University of Auckland and the ADHB.</p>
1098	Simon Ansell	Oppose	I think that the West Lynn 'village' should be kept within a single ward, rather than split down the middle. Likewise with the Grey Lynn shopping centre.

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1099	Christiane Pracht	Oppose	Separating Grafton from Newmarket and Parnell would split communities of interest. The three suburbs are linked by the Domain and are all served by Parnell Trust and community assets such as Parnell Library. Moving Parnell and Newmarket from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Orakei Ward would join together dissimilar communities. There are other ways to solve the problem of the Waitemata and Gulf ward population differing from the average per member by 43 per cent which don't involve arbitrarily splitting communities.
1100	Louise Millar	Support	<p>As an Ellerslie resident I support this change. My two boy, Joshua and William went to Ellerslie School and have both been educated through One Tree Hill College.</p> <p>We do live in Ellerslie Park Road, part of Orakei Ward, which we dont relate to.</p> <p>We see these schools as an integral part of out Ellerslie Community, so we appreciate the change in boundaries to reflect this.</p> <p>I apoligise about the late response to my submission as I have been overseas on work.</p>
1101	Sanchia Yonge	Oppose	Does not make sense to split grey Lynn and westmere. They are areas of shared interest.
1102	Adam Parkinson - Auckland City Centre Residents' Group	Oppose	<p>We note the information provided in the report to the Governing Body of 26 July (File No.: CP2018/12159) that explains in some details the required process for this review. We note also the report prepared by the Waitemata Ward member, Cr. Mike Lee on the same subject.</p> <p>The evidence clearly shows that the Waitemata Ward is the only Ward that suggests an existing anomaly of any magnitude in relation to the expected level of representation per population.</p> <p>From the information available to us we believe council has two options to deal with this issue.</p> <p>The first is accept the recommendations of the above report involving boundary changes across a number of wards, many of which will impact on the communities of interest that the current boundaries were designed to support. Of particular interest is that the changes proposed move two wards into the +10% ward based on current population numbers and these are likely to be exceeded in the short term rather than the long term.</p> <p>The second is to accept Cr. Lee's proposition that the Waitemata Ward has a very high population compared to the number of qualified electors, and this does matter.</p> <p>The preference for the City Centre Residents' Group would be to leave the Waitemata Ward boundaries as they are now, and present a case to the Local Government Commission based on Cr. Lee's research based on the process below.</p> <p>The concept of fairness means that the ratio of population to elected member for wards, in the case of the governing body, and subdivisions, in the case of local boards, should not vary significantly across the region or local board area</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
			<p>respectively. The legislation allows for a variance of up to 10 per cent. This is referred to in this report as the “10 percent rule”. The legislation further allows the council to not comply if compliance would result in splitting communities of interest or joining disparate communities of interest. The final decision on a proposal to not comply is made by the Local Government Commission.</p> <p>Our reasons for this are that we believe Auckland is only a few years away from needing to create a City Centre Ward based on the current boundaries. We see the city centre as a unique place with the most distinctive community of interest, with unique conditions not seen elsewhere in Auckland. We see the city centre being directly represented by its own city centre ward councillor as an eventual inevitability based on current city centre growth trajectories, and its unique community of interest. This suggests that the best course of action is for council to seek a change to the Auckland specific Local Government legislation to provide for one more member “ making a total of 21 councillors.</p> <p>Assuming the current population growth across Auckland, we believe that there is a very strong argument for an increase in councillor representation for Auckland, so following our suggestions above would result in minimum change for the 2019 elections and a new ward for the city centre in the 2022 elections.</p>
1103	Cecele Fleming	Support	<p>I support the proposal to move Ellerslie from Orakei to Maungakiekie-Tamaki. Ellerslie as a whole is a tight-knit community and should not be split unnecessarily between two wards. Ellerslie residents share the same interests and should share the same representation.</p> <p>I was extremely disappointed to find out that I was part of Orakei and not Maungakiekie-Tamaki. Not only do I vote in the Maungakiekie electorate, which shares common issues with the Maunagkiekie-Tamaki Ward, but I also identify with the residents of Ellerslie, Mt Wellington and One Tree Hill. If my shopping is not done in the Ellerslie Village, it is done at New World on Lunn Ave, or at Sylvia Park. Sylvia Park, in particular, provides the shopping and entertainment facilities that connects me with Maungakiekie-Tamaki. As a result, I cannot identify with Orakei’s interests and priority issues.</p> <p>Additionally, I share with Maungakiekie-Tamaki residents the joy of regularly using Cornwall Park and Mt Wellington as my local green space. It also makes complete sense to me that the Ellerslie racecourse be included in Maungakiekie-Tamaki, as the name alone speaks of this area as opposed to Orakei.</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1104	Peter Greville	Oppose	<p>1. It would appear that the Auckland Council are prepared to move boundaries just to suit the 10% rule without taking into consideration a series of other considerations some of which include the following.</p> <p>2. The Local Government Commission's 2010 balancing of the alignment of wards and local board area boundaries appears to date to have worked very successfully.</p> <p>3. Ignoring 2. above the fact is that Council's proposed suggestions only provide a temporary solution which will have to be readdressed on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>4. The "fair and effective representations for individuals and communities" being one of the principles of The Local Electoral Act 2001 appears to be overlooked by Council when it does not take cognizance of the statistics.. These statistics show that the composition of the Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward is so very different in terms of electors to population than the other wards and therefore this unique ward requires special consideration which Council prefers to ignore.</p> <p>5. The Council appears to move large sections of the Ward which will disrupt rather than preserve "longstanding communities of interest with large blocks of electors being moved about like pieces on a board."</p> <p>6. With the confusion that will result in the minds of voters as to where they stand over the differences that will as a result of ward boundary changes appears to be of serious debatable benefit to Auckland.</p> <p>7. The cost of the implementation of Council's proposal and the confusion that will result is a further consideration which Council appears to ignore.</p> <p>8. The Council proposal regarding The Rodney Ward decision "not to change the boundary, as this would split communities of interest of join dissimilar communities of interest" would also seem to apply in the case of The Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward so why the different treatment?</p> <p>9. My assessment of Council's proposal for The Waitemata &amp; Gulf Ward appears to have not been properly researched so it is hoped that at this late stage that Council will move to support a position where the focus on the 10% rule is not used to in effect prevent a lessening of "effective representation."</p> <p>10. I firmly reject the stance that the Council are taking and reject its move to change the boundaries as it suggests.</p> <p>.</p>
1105	Tracey Elliott	Support	<p>I am in approval for changes to the above areas of Map 1e and 1d.</p> <p>I live in Ellerslie and our community stretches over the motorway so therefore this would work well for us. Especially for those that are effected by schooling etc.</p> <p>It has always surprised me that we are in Maungakiekie for central government but Orakei for local government?</p>
1106	Cath Lockhart	Oppose	<p>Why change what is not broken. Where is the logical sense to split a community in half.</p> <p>(Probably the same "sense" to destroy hard working small businesses with silly not used cycle lanes and remove their customers car parks from outside their business doors).</p> <p>Dear Lord - save us!!</p>

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1107	Dora Tokoma	Oppose	I'd like to see the areas of Royal Oak and Onehunga Mall remain in the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward. It seem illogical to place these areas in the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward when they are some distance from it.
1108	Kathleen Guerin	Oppose	prefer the unity of present community
1109	Charlotte Fisher	Oppose	Westmere relates to the Waitemata harbour and needs continuation with Herne Bay and Freemans Bay in order to solve our sewage problems ASAP. This proposal splits the Westmere community in two, against the law.
1116	Many Trott	Oppose	Please do not divide the community
1119	Diane Ward	Oppose	Unecessary expense
1123	Dorothy Stephens	Oppose	If ain't broke don't fix it. Unecessay costs caused.
1124	Ian Miller	Oppose	The changes will affect the Anzac Day celebrations.
1125	Truda Chadwich	Oppose	This is splitting our community in half. Unacceptable.
1126	John Davies	Oppose	It will divide my local community
1127	Dennis Colling	Oppose	Splitting Grey Lynn from West Lynn
1128	Jill Elvines	Oppose	Splitting the community. I do not like the division.
1130	Jacqui LaTiobe	Oppose	It's splitting the community
1131	Dave Johnson	Oppose	The splitting up of the local community
1132	Lynne Skeen	Oppose	This is dividing the community
1133	Doug Hood	Oppose	Because I oppose splitting West Lynn from the rest of Grey Lynn
1134	Graeme Wilson	Oppose	Cause it's bloody stupid playing with boundaries all the time
1135	Sean Doyle	Oppose	Grey Lynn should stay Grey Lynn should not be split
1136	Jessica Le Marie	Oppose	it will affect ANZAC funing for Grey Lynn RSA. It will divide the community and "split communities of interest or join dissimilar communities of interest"
1137	Greg Linton	Oppose	Westmere community of interest is closer to Ponsonby Herne Bay and Grey Lynn
1138	Don Mathewson	Oppose	Unecessay expense and unfair to local residents and businesses
1139	Christina Gerard	Oppose	It will divide the Grey Lynn community
1140	Elizabeth Ramsay	Oppose	It's hard enough to nurture community spirit without dividing them in this way
1141	Carole Ann Withey	Oppose	Ridiculous, been real estate agent location 46 years does not make sense
1230	Moxst Haitoua	Oppose	Another "Mickey Mouse" idea...change -whatever you want to call whatever y'all think you're doing! And some groups will not be represented well if at all. Too many groups (wards) somebodies will miss out - as they do

Sub#	Full name	Response	Comments
1240	Maarametua Taringa	Oppose	Needs more consultation
1257	Lena Maiva		Purpose
1265	Charlotte Fisher	Oppose	Westmere relates to the Waitemata harbour and needs continuation with Herne Bay and Freeman's Bay in order to solve our stormwater/sewage problems ASAP. This proposal splits the Westmere community in tow, against the law.