

REPRESENTATION REVIEW

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

PROPOSAL 1: No changes to the Rodney ward boundaries

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
3	Alistair Kendrick	Unclear	<p>I think wards and boards should be decoupled so that boards can continue to represent communities of interest while wards can change their boundaries periodically to remain in the correct population range. Obviously that would require a legislation change so is more of a long term option.</p> <p>In the short term I see the challenge in balancing fair representation on council and keeping communities of interest under the same board. I would personally prefer changing the ward boundaries to keep populations even though.</p>
8	Swanie Nelson	Unclear	I only have interest in the split that affects my ward.
9	Lotu Fuli	Support	22% is quite a large variance and this may open this up for review by the LG Commission. However, the first principle in the Act is about the effective representation of 'communities of interest', so I support the status quo as this ensures that communities of interest are not split etc.
11	Damien Spurdle	Unclear	North Auckland will have its associated issues in the years to come with many more housing developments which may mean a creation of a New Ward in the future to better represent what is a diverse part of Auckland compared to the mainly other Urban Wards.
15	Emily B	Oppose	<p>Any changes need to be consistent, exemptions cause additional confusion.</p> <p>Rodney Ward encompasses an incredibly large area, similar to the Helensville electorate, which causes many practical issues, in terms of adequately servicing the area, campaigning effectively across such a vast area and ensuring needs are met.</p>
18	carrie ashworth	Support	Ditto!!
29	Will Brydon	Support	Agreed.
30	Elizabeth Turner	Unclear	I agree that changing the Rodney Ward boundary would negatively impact communities of interest. However, it is still unconscionable that residents in the Rodney Ward, many of whom tend to be of higher socio-economic status than many other Auckland residents, are disproportionately represented at the Governing Body level. I request that in the interests of social equity for all Aucklanders that the votes of the elected members from the Rodney Ward (and Local Board, when Auckland-wide decisions are made by Local Boards in concert) are slightly devalued in proportion to the relative underpopulation of this ward.
32	Pam Morris	Support	I fully support NOT to change the ward boundary for Rodney.
36	Jonathan Chua	Support	Keep Rodney ward the same.
40	Melissa Giles	Support	Agree with no change
44	Rita Unasa	Support	If that is what the law requires then that's fine - but a 22% difference seems a lot
52	Willie Tiuli	Unclear	No Interest.

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
57	Mary O'Connell	Support	I agree the boundary should stay the same as it is at the present.
58	Julian Gonzalez	Support	Looks great!
61	Reece Moody	Oppose	This should be addressed. Expand Rodney to the west and south towards Waitakere. Don't let Rodney be advantaged or disadvantaged.
65	Kev Carter	Support	Sounds good
88	Kiri McCutcheon	Unclear	Rodney is quite different to Auckland communities really. I think it's a shame they are a part of our council and would work better not being a part of it. The same rules and regulations don't work for all citizens in our region.
206	David Holm	Unclear	<p>The proposal suggests that communities like Orewa are very different to the Rodney communities. It allows communities of interest to override fair representation in a way very different from how Parliamentary boundaries are determined. To accommodate this, the concentration of the adjustments for population growth is on the isthmus, especially Albert Eden Roskill.</p> <p>Albert Eden Roskill has clear dissimilar communities of interest, exaggerated by the addition of 9,000 people , many in \$2 million properties in Westmere. These people, and those in the Epsom Grammar Zone have different interests from many people in Owairaka and Puketapapa who are the focus of major Housing New Zealand projects.</p> <p>It is conceded that allowances for distances to serve rural residents are part of communities of interest but these should be focused on Local Boards rather than wards. This is already catered for. My Local Board, Puketapapa has a population for this review of 63,000 and six local board members whose salaries now cost ratepayers \$291,525. Rodney with 64,300 people (2% more) has nine local board members costing \$408,530.</p>
224	Denis Itauaneai	Oppose	No!
240	Raewyn Alexander	Unclear	<p>I hope the people of this area are properly consulted, and listened to, along with others in other areas.</p> <p>The practise of not listening to people who live here, needs to cease, immediately.</p>
293	Faafeiai Luiana.Afele	Support	No need to change
335	Natalie Nand	Unclear	<p>My feedback relates more to Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. If Rodney needs to be limited to 64,300 people to preserve its communities of interest, why should communities in Mt. Roskill and Owairaka have to share councillors with areas like Westmere and Epsom?</p> <p>In particular, I note that Owairaka and Mt. Roskill are the locations for major Housing New Zealand projects and need a councillor who understands the needs that arise from this.</p>
345	Lai Yeen Tham	Support	Agree.

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
346	Sue Perkins	Unclear	My feedback relates more to Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. If Rodney needs to be limited to 64,300 people to preserve its communities of interest, why should communities in Mt. Roskill and Owairaka have to share councillors with areas like Westmere and Epsom? In particular, I note that Owairaka and Mt. Roskill are the locations for major Housing New Zealand projects and need a councillor who understands the needs that arise from this.
361	Matthew Vaa	Unclear	Not be clarified
373	Terry Samuels	Unclear	not yet
402	Kate Stanton	Unclear	Rodney ward should not be part of Auckland. The Super City does not treat it as such, eg Rodney does not have all roads sealed, and still has one-way bridges on comparatively busy roads (eg Matakana to Leigh), yet Council is putting priority on treats in the Central city. If you are not prepared to look after it, then let it look after itself.
418	Tememane Naga	Unclear	It's all about the money and not about the people
517	Diane Davis	Unclear	My request is that Albert Eden Roskill be split into two to enable fairer representation, more accessible councillors and scope for separate representation to give voice to very different communities of interest. Whau, Waitemata, Orakei and Maungakiekie- Tamaki are one member wards. Recently the councillors in Roskill have sorted out quite a few local issues which has been extremely helpful. This would happen less in a larger ward
520	Alec van Helsdingen	Oppose	I do not agree that a 22% deviation is acceptable in these circumstances. I would increase the ward's population to about 15% under quota, which will hopefully mean that by the next review of the boundaries population growth in this area will cause the ward to be compliant with the 10% rule. The areas I would suggest transferring to the Rodney Ward are Whenuapai, Paremoremo and the part of the Wainui-Waiwera statistical area east of SH1.
724	Jennifer Gill	Oppose	See above. Rodney boundaries should be increased to accommodate more equal representation.
733	colin cattanach	Unclear	Unsure of current boundaries
737	Rodd Eddy	Oppose	Rodney is quite wide from west to north, communities in both are not that similar, albeit the majority is rural, however, quite different needs and opinions in both areas -and especially as denser housing is arising further out parts of these could be re aligned...
746	Julia Damrow	Support	I also agree with the reasoning for not making changes here
749	Issy Cheng	Support	Yes, agree with not changing it due to community belonging
754	Penny Buckley	Unclear	See above
763	David Levin	Support	Happy to leave as is.
767	James Cooper	Support	I'm assuming that Rodney is smaller in population than other Wards. If so, then yes it probably makes sense to leave it as is. I can't think of any northern part of

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
			the city that isn't currently in Rodney where it would make much sense to transfer it to Rodney.
771	Keith Stone	Oppose	The Rodney ward is too large an area at present and should be split into 2 wards that would result in the population variance being closer to the average.
773	Jennifer Goldsack	Support	Sounds reasonable
798	S Wood	Unclear	Improve all of the infrastructure here NOW based on the current & upcoming excessive dumping of people into the area, which is creating an intense urban centre; rather than pretending it's still mostly rural and only needs a couple of roads & rubbish collections a few times a year.
804	Lance Wiggs	Oppose	<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 assumptions that will be 7 years old.</p> <p>This discriminates against the population of Waitemata, in particular the inner-city, and for Rodney, a slow-growing wealthy, high participation area.</p> <p>Central Auckland (combined Central West and Central East) grew by 13.7% from 2016 to 2017 (arguably there is measurement error that underreports this). At that growth rate the population of Central Auckland will increase by 145% over 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 the same growth rate, will in 6 years be at 200% of what I estimate to be the then average size of a ward, given the same number of councillors.</p> <p>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. To reiterate this is for 3 reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Waitemata, in September 2018, is already well over the 10% limit 2: The forecast population will drive greater and greater limit excession over the next 6 years 3: The result after 6 years will be that votes in Central Auckland/Waitemata account for under half of the average vote in Auckland. <p>If this proposal is required to be bound by its tight rules then the Waitemata Ward population should be set as close as possible to the 90% lower limit. Ideally this process would also consider the effect of vast differences in population growth, and the Ward size reduced further to compensate for that.</p> <p>3: Auckland inner city has a very high percentage of less wealthy and non-white people, who, as pointed out elsewhere, are very low participants in the elections. As a result the surrounding suburbs and Waiheke Island (wealthy, white, older) dominate the elections.</p> <p>It is easy to argue that the Ward could have been, despite our neutral system, been constructed to remove the voices of these inner city residents. I agree with the reduction in size to the East and West, but it remains very difficult to argue that including a remote island community of older, almost all white, Waiheke Island residents who vote in very high percentages with downtown Auckland isn't Gerrymandering.</p> <p>It's unfair to Waiheke Island (and Great Barrier) residents, and unfair to</p>

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
			<p>downtown Auckland residents.</p> <p>With the poor growth and low population of Rodney well outside the boundaries of reasonableness, and the similarity between the residents of and issues from Rodney and Waiheke Island/ Great barrier Island (e.g each live a 40+m morning commute away from downtown) it seems clear that the right thing to do is to move boundaries so that Waiheke Island and Great Barrier Island form part of the Rodney Ward.</p> <p>The impact would be to reduce the Waitemata Ward Population by 9,630 to 80,870 and to increase the Rodney Ward population from 64,300 to 73,930. This would put Waitemata at 97.6% of the average Ward population, and Rodney at 89.2% of the average Ward population. It's a relatively simple change, and address much of the issues outline above.</p> <p>(1): Uses data from http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLECODE7541#</p>
805	Nick Hodgson	Oppose	This should include Waiheke as above as this creates more alignment between the wards.
807	Theresa smith	Unclear	Why are our rates being spent on this sort of stuff? What a waste of rate payers money. How about sticking to core business. Council debt is already high enough without unnecessary spending on bureaucratic bs
810	Dawn Trenberth	Oppose	I feel that it is unfair that the people of Rodney effectively get more representation than everyone else and there should be boundary changes to make representation fairer.
811	STUART STEVENSON	Support	no, I think that is a reasonable conclusion
852	M. Anderson	Support	I support not changing Rodney Ward Boundary.
858	James Hita	Support	Perfect
876	Richard Elliott	Support	Strongly support no change
878	John Hall	Support	The Rodney Ward has a distinct character and this should be treasured by retaining it's Ward
879	Glenice Hursthouse	Oppose	Rodney boundary should be changed because the south part Rodney is Auckland which is very different from the rural needs if Rodney.
882	Gerard Hill	Unclear	<p>I have read both the proposed changes to the Ward and Councillor Lees review. Councillor Lees review and population figures of the respected Wards, I believe is correct. The Waitemata Ward happened because of the Super City, as it became known as 2010. Over the last eight years it has emerged as a vibrant cohesive electoral unit, the communities of interests which has extensive networks and associations throughout the Ward.</p> <p>I have walked my dogs for thirty years from Westmere through the city to Parnell, and over the summer months onto Waiheke Island. The true vibrancy of Auckland is celebrated within this Ward which merges Tangata Whenua, Pacifika peoples, the various Asian communities and also people from Persia, all these communities are represented in the Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender (LGBT) communities. The tolerance and acceptance of this multi-racial and diverse community is well represented, comfortable and at home in this Ward as they are, and no other Ward within our city.</p>

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
946	Mariee Hayes	Unclear	Obviously St Johns falls into this category as well.
954	Gopal Krishnan Raju	Unclear	better attention
963	Geoff W Campbell	Support	Yes, The claim that a change would split communities of interest and join dissimilar communities of interest doesn't stand close scrutiny. The communities on the East Coast are all of similar makeup and have similar interests. I propose you decide on a suitable strip of land width and go up the Coast as far as you need to to satisfy the plus or minus 10 percent rule. ie by varying the coastal strip width and the northern limit of the Ward boundary it would be possible to conform. Just what are these differences that are so great that you can't do the normal thing? I suspect the fear of more resident unrest reappearing is behind this reluctance to acknowledge what is happening to the region demographics and does not reflect recent population changes or feelings towards the Council policies which are impacting the region.
968	Sanya Baker	Unclear	My feedback relates to the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. If Rodney Ward needs to be limited to 64,300 people to preserve its communities of interest, why should communities in Mt. Roskill and Owairaka have to share councillors with areas like Epsom and Westmere with such different interests? In particular, with Owairaka and Mt. Roskill poised to see major Housing New Zealand projects, these areas should have a councillor who understands the needs that arise from this.
972	Gael Baldock	Support	Yip. Leave it be
990	Richard Gardner - Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Federated Farmers agrees that expanding the boundaries of the Rodney Ward would limit effective representation of communities of interest by communities of interest being split and by dissimilar communities of interest being included. Further, it would seem that the representation in the Waitakere Ward and wards adjacent to it is likely to fall outside the stipulated range at the time of the next representation review, which could be addressed at that time by adjustments to the Rodney / Waitakere Ward boundaries. This lessens the appropriateness of the Rodney Ward boundaries being addressed as part of this review.
1007	William Gruar	Unclear	Re zone to make the high density non-electoral 'inner city' one ward
1035	Bruce Ly - Grey Lynn Business Association	Unclear	Apply this thinking to the Map1a and leave our community as it is !!!
1037	Gael Orr	Unclear	We are aware the resident associations of the majority of inner city suburbs on both the west and have deep concerns with what is proposed. Best to adopt Option 2 as it better reflects the urban environment for all suburbs adjacent to the CBD.

Sub #	Full name	Stance	Comments
1042	Vivienne Wtight	Support	Please do not split homogenous communities
1047	David Roos	Oppose	Great Barrier island should be included in this ward, not the WaitematÄ and Gulf Ward
1048	John Pendreigh	Unclear	If you can recognise the improprieties of splitting off areas of common interest within the Rodney Ward, notwithstanding some tabled percentages, then you should be able to apply the same considerations to the current makeup of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward. Westmere etc should stay where they are.
1056	Rebekah Hay	Unclear	Precisely the reason you have to leave Westmere in Waitemata
1134	Graeme Wilson	Support	Leave it as it is
1136	Jessica Le Marie	Support	This makes sense
1218	Teiturea Teio	Unclear	Maybe when you finished the meeting
1230	Moxst Haitoua	Support	No, leave as is