



AUT: Super City? Stakeholder Survey

Mid-August 2013 Report of Results

The AUT team designed a Survey Monkey questionnaire to tap Stakeholders views on Auckland governance just before the 2013 Local Elections. The Questionnaire sought to measure several indicators specified in the DIA indicator framework but was developed to provide a more comprehensive assessment. Most of the Questions are Statements which you can Agree or Disagree with on a 10-point Scale (where 10=Strongly Agree and 0=Strongly Disagree) together with a few other questions and room for open-ended comments to be added. It is designed in 12 Sections:

- (1) Expected outcomes from the local government reforms in Auckland
- (2) The quality of governance at the local level in Auckland
- (3) The quality of governance for the whole of Auckland
- (4) The local and regional levels of governance in the Auckland Council working together.
- (5) The diversity of elected representation.
- (6) The Auckland Council being accountable to citizens.
- (7) Council services and activities
- (8) The Mayor, executive powers and governance issues for Auckland
- (9) The effectiveness of Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs)
- (10) The Auckland Plan and the Draft Unitary Plan
- (11) What could be improved in Auckland's governance and the issues Auckland has and will face
- (12) Demographics

Email invitations to participate were sent to all local representatives on the Auckland Council, MPs located in Auckland and a listing of further stakeholders. (Further stakeholders were asked to distribute the invitation around their board if they wished.)

Some 40 respondents had responded by mid-August. The survey remains open and so the results will be updated once the election period is entered. Because of the highly voluntary nature of the study the results provide an indication of the range of views rather than the viewpoints of particular sectors of stakeholders.

The midpoint for the scales is 5.5 so that any number greater than this indicates an average of Agreement rather than disagreement.

Key Findings:

The data obtained is notable for the extent to which responses tended to be spread across the full range of options available. This summary below picks out areas where agreement or disagreement with a statement was strong.

Local Government Reforms, Council and Mayor

On average respondents agreed that:

- The local government reforms in Auckland have been beneficial for Auckland (6.61)
- The new system of local government in Auckland is better than the old system (6.36)

- The role of Auckland councillors is clear to Auckland council staff (6.10)
- The local government reforms in Auckland have enabled better decisions to be made at a regional level for Auckland (6.72)
- Having one council has improved Auckland's ability to negotiate with central Government on major decisions that affect Auckland (7.08)
- The Mayor is a strong leader for Auckland (6.55)
- The Mayoral Office provides good quality advice to the Mayor (6.16)
- Having one Mayor has improved Auckland's ability to negotiate with central government on major decisions that affect Auckland (7.13).
- On average respondents disagreed that the Auckland Council and Central government work in partnership in the governance of Auckland. (4.28)

Local Boards

On average respondents agreed that:

- The role of Local Boards is clear to local board elected members (6.36)
- The role of Local Boards is clear to citizens (6.64)

On average respondents disagreed that:

- Local boards have improved democracy in Auckland (4.39)
- Local boards have sufficient control over council decisions at the local level (4.73)
- Local boards have sufficient input into region-wide decisions (4.65)
- Local boards have sufficient funding (5.00)
- Local boards have sufficient staff support (4.35).

Representation on Local Boards

On average respondents agreed that older people have sufficient representation on Local Boards (6.51)

On average respondents disagreed that:

- Maori have sufficient representation on Local Boards (4.75)
- Pacific Peoples have sufficient representation on Local Boards (4.44)
- Ethnic Minorities have sufficient representation on Local Boards (4.39)
- Younger people have sufficient representation on Local Boards (4.43).

Representation on the Auckland Council

On average respondents agreed that older people have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council (6.95)

On average respondents disagreed that:

- Pacific Peoples have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council (4.55)
- Ethnic Minorities have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council (4.41)
- Younger people have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council (4.38)
- There is sufficient diversity in our elected representatives across the Auckland Council (4.50).

Taking account of Advice

On average respondents agreed that:

- The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from the Business Advisory Panel (6.27)
- The Independent Maori Statutory Board ensures the Auckland Council complies with statutory provisions that refer to the Treaty of Waitangi (6.41).

On average respondents disagreed that:

- The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from the Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel (4.64)
- The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from the Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel (4.58).

Social Policy Forum not seen as effective in addressing social issues

On average respondents disagreed that the Social Policy forum is effective in addressing social issues in Auckland (3.58).

Powers of Mayor, Chief Executive and Council

On average respondents thought:

- Executive powers for the Mayor should stay the same (56.8 %)
- Executive powers for the Chief Executive of the Auckland Council should stay the same (65.8%)
- Decision-making powers of the Auckland Council in matters affecting Auckland should be increased (43.2%).

Most Council Controlled Organisations (CCO) have effective governance

On the statement “governance of CCOs is effective”, all CCOs except ATEED and Auckland Transport rated 5.81 or above (meaning, on average, governance is considered effective). ATEED and Auckland Transport rated 5.35 and 5.36 respectively (meaning, on average, their governance is not considered effective).

CCOs have effective working relationships with Auckland Council

On average respondents agreed that all CCOs have an effective working relationship with the Auckland Council (all CCO’s rated 5.86 and above)

Council oversight of CCOs not effective

On average respondent disagreed that Council oversight of CCOs is effective (all CCOs rated below 5)

CCO’s are not accountable to citizens

On average respondents disagreed that CCOs are accountable to citizens (all CCOs rated 3.97 or below)

CCOs are not effective

On average respondents disagreed that CCOs are effective (all CCO’s rated 5.12 or below)

The Auckland Plan and the Draft Unitary Plan

On average, respondents agreed that:

- The Auckland Plan is the right plan for Auckland (6.57)
- The Auckland Council has consulted widely on the Auckland Plan” (7.17)
- The Auckland Council will be able to implement the Auckland Plan” (5.54)
- The Auckland Council has consulted widely on the Unitary Plan” (6.62).

12: Demographics

		Column N %
Were you involved in designing or implementing the Super-city reforms?	NA	7.5%
	No	52.5%
	Yes	40.0%
What gender are you?	F	51.4%
	M	48.6%
Which age group do you fall into?	30-39	16.7%
	40-49	5.6%
	50-59	30.6%
	60-69	33.3%
	70	13.9%
With which ethnic group(s) do you identify?	European	91.7%
	Other	5.6%
	Pacific Peoples	2.8%
		7.1%
Which organisation/s are you a member of, or do you work for? (Please tick all that apply)	Advisory Board Member	3.6%
	Central Government	3.6%
	Elected Representative	
	Local Government Elected Representative	53.6%
	Non-Government	
	Stakeholder Organisation	28.6%
	Public servant	3.6%

1: Expected outcomes from the local government reforms in Auckland

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The local government reforms in Auckland have been beneficial for Auckland	41	1	10	6.61	2.538
The new system of local government in Auckland is better than the old system	42	1	10	6.36	2.748
Ratepayers are getting value-for-money from the Auckland Council	41	1	8	5.15	1.982
The Auckland Council and Central Government work in partnership in the governance of Auckland	43	1	10	4.28	2.649
I am clear about what Local Boards do	41	2	10	7.32	2.514
Valid N (listwise)	39				

Expected outcomes from the local government reforms in Auckland

Auckland speaking with one voice is positive as to formulating one plan. Rates remain a big issue both in terms of high rises for many yet reduction in services.

Central government bulldozes Auckland. Central government has obstructed Auckland Council over many issues and has a 1960's view of modern cities. eg the MUL RUB is essential, the electrified and completed rail link is essential to Auckland...plus future extensions. A second under harbour crossing is essential and it should be for public transport rail and bus. The Ports of Auckland cannot grow into the harbour too far it needs re-organising and must have and underground direct access route through the CBD. Housing and prices are NOT the fault of A C they are market pressure; only intensification of nodes and centres will work not sprawl...the central govt has too many 'pushy' land speculators trying to push the MUL Rub out too far.

Central Govt do not realise the problems Auckland has to deal with compared to other parts of the country. too much legislation not only from Central Govt but local govt and involving many other groups. Even problems with HNZ properties are dealt with in Wellington. Ratepayers paying for all the social problems etc. pushed on to local ratepayers who are already paying taxes and petrol taxes for many of these problems. With HNZ properties come a load of problems which it seems Govt do not come up with any solutions. There should at least be property managers on site in blocks of HNZ properties to deal with the problems straight away so other residents feel safe. Central Govt having legislated the Ak Council into existence is struggling to partner with rather than attempt to bluntly control the new organisation.

Central Govt ignores the mandate Auckland Council has been given for intensification / public transport & seems intent on pursuing a failed urban form of converting paddocks to houses

Communication with Council in its various split divisions of Mayors Office, Council, Local Boards and CCO is very difficult for ordinary public.

Distinction made between benefits of reform, but questions remain around the design of the system.

Govt not open-minded

I think the Local Board structure has the potential to bring huge benefits in the area of better value locally and better governance, but the Governing body and Mayoral portion isn't.

I think we have lost considerable benefits that we had as Waitakere City - and I think Central govt did this to have control of our assets - which they are still trying to wrest from us.

It seems a bit early to pass judgement based on experience.

Of course there are things that could be identified as beneficial to Aucklanders, but there are many examples where members of the community, individually or as a group are feeling let down. The "equalisation" of rates rises have caused huge dissatisfaction, and frankly are not fair. Governance at 2 levels saw some Governing Body members take strenuous efforts to keep governance at their level, making it harder for informal public input to be made, and for the impact at a local level to be recognised.

Probably too early to tell as the picture is coloured too strongly by the amalgamation effects (i.e. the organisations that were disestablished turning into new organisations is still going now with realignments across Auckland Council still happening due to the ATA stuffing up the new structure in the first place). Auckland Council tries to work in partnership with Central Government but as the political hues are different colours and the National-ACT government disagree with Auckland's vision and priorities and how we will deliver them, working in partnership was probably always impossible anyway.

The new system is a two tier one. The local board tier is not yet being effectively embraced by the organisation.

The Super City was created so that Central Government could have over-riding control over the largest population area of NZ with the biggest economic centre.

There are benefits from better regional co-ordination, but this blunted by the fragmented and un-democratic structure of CCO's.

There are too many local boards. The number of local boards recommended by the Royal Commission would have produced a better outcome. 13A of LGACA allows local boards to be the subject of a reorganisation proposal. This should be undertaken after in the next term. While rate increases have been kept relatively low, debt has increased significantly. A proper legal/statutory framework must be established to set out the 'partnership' between Auckland Council and Central Government.

We had more access to community advisors. People at the top table make decisions.

The recommendations of the Royal Commission more clearly set out what Local Boards did. The current statutory framework in LGACA is muddled. There are too many Local Boards to provide an effective local level of governance.

2: The quality of governance at the local level in Auckland

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The role of Local Boards is clear to local board elected members	36	2	9	6.36	2.045
The role of Local Boards is clear to citizens	39	2	10	6.64	2.194
Local Boards have improved local democracy in Auckland	41	1	8	4.39	1.948
The right balance has been struck between the role of Local Boards and the role of the Auckland Council	41	2	10	5.54	2.647
Local Boards have sufficient control over council decisions at the local level	41	1	10	4.73	2.450
Local Boards have sufficient input into region-wide decisions	40	1	9	4.65	2.248
Local Boards have sufficient funding	40	1	10	5.00	2.501
Local Boards have sufficient staff support	37	1	10	4.35	2.371
Local Boards have advice available to them from Council to inform their decisions	34	1	10	5.29	2.493
Local Boards have external advice available to them to inform their decisions	34	1	10	5.76	2.147

"The right balance has been struck between the role of Local Boards and the role of the Auckland Council" well, clearly not as Local Boards are part of Auckland Council. The difference lies between Local Boards and Governing Body...

Again, these answers are probably based more on wishful thinking than on clear perception on realities.

Board members are kept out of the loop a lot of the time with behind the doors meetings with Board Chairs and Portfolio holders who do not give updates. When Board members go to Local Govt conferences or seminars nobody gives a verbal update never mind a written update. Very poor

I just don't know enough about Local Boards, their role, funding, support & achievements to date

Local Board info is usually late and legal answers are hard to get. Information on financial matters such as where the legacy councils Reserve Contributions and RMA development contributions are held is unanswered after nearly 3 years. It is improving in some areas. Consultation with LB are relegated to back of the information by most officers reporting back to governing body. Officers do not like working with the 21 Boards as it takes so much time. A v v large organisation incl. CCO's and hard to get answers on many issues.

Local boards are not well understood by general public. Power perceived in mayor and councillors, with many not fully comprehending LBs.

Local Boards have less say in local matters than prior to the Super City being established.

Local Boards have only minimal roles in the new structure.

Question 11 rather makes the point. Local Boards are Auckland Council when they make decisions - but are genuinely referred acknowledged in practice as a sub-ordinate tier.

Question 11 reflects the survey writer's confusion with the system. Local Boards are an integral part of the Auckland Council, not a separate entity. Referring to the Governing Body as the Auckland Council does not do the system justice.

Right hand, do you know what the left hand is doing? Mayoral Panel seems to just be a PR exercise. It would be good to have a Seniors Panel.

Still a work in progress - we have come a long way since Nov 2010, but still have a long way to go. Re question 9, it would be interesting to compare this to citizens' clarity about local government, councils, community boards, CCOs, etc. across the country as I don't believe most NZ citizens understand local government's purpose, roles and responsibilities!

The dividing line between Boards and Governing Body is still emergent, and more work is required to entrench the role of Boards at a local level. CCO's tend to take a high handed approach to Boards and treat them simply as stakeholders to be managed. The overall funding for Boards is slightly undercooked but the bigger issue is an equitable allocation - at the moment it is all based on legacy funding, leading to large discrepancies.

The local board model is still evolving. Some experienced Board members are holding the Ak Council to account

The recommendations of the Royal Commission more clearly set out what Local Boards did. The current statutory framework in LGACA is muddled. There are too many Local Boards to provide an effective local level of governance.

There is still poor understanding at Governing Body level as to the concept of "shared governance" and also in some cases amongst officers of Council (staff 0

3: The quality of governance for the whole of Auckland

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The role of the Auckland Council is clear to its citizens	43	0	9	5.33	2.265
The role of Auckland Councillors is clear to Auckland Council staff	41	1	9	6.10	1.960
The local government reforms in Auckland have enabled better decisions to be made at a regional level for Auckland	39	1	10	6.72	2.460
Auckland Councillors make decisions that benefit the region (rather than their ward)	39	2	9	5.51	1.805
Auckland Councillors have sufficient control over decisions of regional significance in Auckland	41	1	10	5.90	2.211
Auckland Councillors have quality advice available to them from Council to inform their decisions	37	1	10	5.89	2.354
Auckland Councillors have quality external advice available to them to inform their decisions	33	1	10	5.88	2.459
The role of Auckland Councillors is clear to the councillors themselves	39	2	9	5.87	1.838
Local Board members and Auckland Councillors are working together	40	0	8	5.35	1.902
I have confidence in the system of regional and local governance in Auckland	43	0	10	5.58	2.612
Valid N (listwise)	29				

Auckland councillors don't really seem to have a leadership role that belongs to the Mayor.

Auckland staff are frequently highly politicised and pursuing their own agenda. This is evident in the planning and regulatory staff and especially obvious in senior staff in the CCOs

CCOs have significant influence which can side-line councillors to a degree.

Council officers have too much power and seem to have more say/power than the Councillors. Too many secret meetings behind closed doors. Independent Maori Advisory Board can use their votes to outvote Councillors at Committee level with casting votes

Councillors are quite well supported. Most understand the bigger picture. The west population is the most under-represented at the council table and another Waitakere Ward Councillor, taking it to 3, is needed. Deprivation and needs of the community are not well known by most councillors..

Decision making is often a little too rushed. The main issue remains a lack of influence over CCO direction and activities.

Don't get to see our councillor very often. When I first got on the board we used to have meetings together with other board members. Now we are pushed out west for some group meetings although most of the decisions are made amongst the Chairs.

I am neutral on a number of these statements because it depends! Some governing body members are clear about their role and responsibilities and some aren't - it comes down to the individual.

I think that the legislation is deliberately designed to ensure Governing Body has little to do other than tick off big regional items; once done, what's left?

I think they have advice but I don't feel they listen to it always

It's difficult any more to know what the decisions and advice is - we have lost touch with the governance - it used to feel local and democratic - I no longer feel a part of the process (and I have no idea what goes on)

Regional decisions are being heavily influenced by local political impact and "pork barrelling"

Some councillors still want to meddle in local decisions while holding regional decisions close to themselves

Some of the members of the Governing Body understand that their role involves strategic thinking at the regional level. Others, however, have been a bit slow on the uptake and still think and act locally. Their job is to focus on policy-making but some still 11 how to do this and waste their time with...

This survey is flawed in its confusion about the structure. Members of the governing body are generally flawed in the same way, unable to transition into the new system of governance.

While the Mayoral Office, Local Boards and CCOs are well resourced in terms of quality independent advice (should they require it), the Councillors are not resourced at all. They would benefit from a budget of \$100,000 per year to obtain quality independent advice (perhaps utilising this to have the

5: The diversity of elected representation.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Women have sufficient representation on Local Boards	33	1	10	5.85	2.320
Maori have sufficient representation on Local Boards	36	1	10	4.75	2.454
Pacific Peoples have sufficient representation on Local Boards	36	1	10	4.44	2.210
Ethnic minorities have sufficient representation on Local Boards	36	1	10	4.39	2.181
Younger people have sufficient representation on Local Boards	37	1	10	4.43	2.154
Older people have sufficient representation on Local Boards	37	1	10	6.51	2.181
Women have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council	38	1	10	5.89	2.458
Maori have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council	38	1	10	5.42	2.900
Pacific Peoples have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council	38	1	10	4.55	2.214
Ethnic minorities have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council	37	1	10	4.41	2.242
Younger people have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council	39	1	10	4.38	2.290
Older people have sufficient representation on the Auckland Council	40	1	10	6.95	2.552
There is sufficient diversity in our elected representatives across the Auckland Council (on both Local Boards and the Auckland Council)	38	1	10	4.50	2.334
Valid N (listwise)	30				

5: The diversity of elected representation

Difficult to answer these questions without introducing the concept of reserved seats etc. which I do NOT agree with, not for women or any ethnic sector of our community. Merit based only!

FPP and Ward structures do not allow for diversity of representation. An MMP-type model would promote better representation. Councillors are also underpaid, for what is a full time role. The Independent Maori Statutory Board appears to be providing better Maori representation than 3 elected members would have. By contrast, the Pacific Peoples and Ethnic Panels do not appear to be resulting in better outcomes.

Getting people to put their hands up to stand is hard enough as there is a cost not only in money terms but in Family and work commitments. Others get in because of their name but if they also do volunteer work in the community and are known they are usually asked to stand by a political party as are ethnic groups. It is again up to the ratepayers to vote as to whom they want to represent them. Others can still put forward ideas to the board as to what they would like in their community.

Governing Body is very white and middle-aged. Gender balance not too bad.

Local Boards are part of the Auckland Council. Using Auckland Council to mean Governing Body is incorrect and makes the questions misleading. Elected members of the Auckland Council include Governing Body Members and Members of the Local Boards

Maori representation through the IMSB is a poor substitute for elected Maori representatives. The mandate of unelected reps will always be in question.

Once again, GLBTI citizens are shut out.

People should be elected to Council on merit not on ethnicity or age. Ethnicity and age-based panels should be established for consultation on matters pertinent to each.

Quality, not quantity is what is required, across the Board

Representation begins by Aucklanders voting in Aucklanders. Identity politics is simply a fragmentary dynamic and ignores that people can represent more than just the labels assigned to them.

So called diversity is important but core competencies and ability is more critical - we do not want "wall paper" people of a particular group who don't contribute.

Some local boards are better than others. Some are mostly Pakeha older males. This is an issue for local government across NZ - it is not just Auckland that looks like this.

The problem is at the point of selection as well as the culture that people encounter once they are elected which is not good for those who aren't older straight white men from middle and upper income, basically.

These answers are basically satisfaction with the status quo.

Westies have insufficient representation. I think we should have Maori seats. Women's needs are not well represented - without Casey Casey and Sandra - who is stepping down - where would we be?

Younger people, Maori and Pacific and other ethnicities need to be more involved, coming through Local Boards to council would provide a good grounding. It is very very expensive to stand for councillors roles and this excludes people. I do not support political parties from central government controlling council positions. Often councils have to fight central government over issues. The local board process for standing for election should be made easier for people not so bureaucratic. People need to get out and vote and support the minority candidates and it should be funded by central government for other ethnicities to be educated and encouraged. Councillors are very busy and they do not have enough time to keep in touch with their Ward areas and issues. Watch out of officers will control decisions instead of elected members....we fight this often in the west due to the Auckland based culture of the new AC.

Total

(6) The Auckland Council being accountable to citizens.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The new Auckland Council has improved consultation processes	38	1	10	5.42	2.596
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Independent Maori Statutory Board	27	1	9	5.22	2.242
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel	25	1	9	4.64	2.079
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Ethnic Peoples Advisory Panel	24	1	9	4.58	2.041
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Disability Strategic Advisory Group	27	1	9	5.00	2.353
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Business Advisory Panel	26	2	10	6.27	2.308
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Rural Advisory Panel	20	3	9	5.80	2.067
The Auckland Council takes sufficient account of advice it receives from The Youth Advisory Panel	24	2	9	5.21	1.744
The Auckland Council is accountable to its citizens	38	1	10	6.03	2.918
The Auckland Council is customer-focussed	39	1	10	5.05	2.176
Valid N (listwise)	18				

Again - I am satisfied with the status quo.

Auckland Council does take account of the advice provided by the Panels but in the case of the Ethnic panel, in particular, this advice has not been forthcoming with the Panel ignoring its advisory role and focusing on operational actions beyond its statutory scope.

Council do not seem to have a lot of accountability and residents would probably be horrified if a breakdown of costs was presented for each project and shown every 6 months.

Don't agree with the status & role of the Maori Statutory Board

I used to be involved in consultation processes with Waitakere City - we heard about them and we participated. What process is there now? I don't hear about any consultation and I have no idea who the boards are and what advice they give. (except for the disability board)

Taking advice is quite different from decision-making. Accountability to citizens is difficult when most of Auckland Council's expenditure is through CCOs which only have to answer to the governing body at particular times throughout the financial year. Having those bodies at arm's length from elected member's means they are less accountable to Auckland's citizens.

The Council is now a corporation of very large size and the consultation processes are very difficult to effectively contribute to even though the Council is trying hard. The volume swamps the process and prevents meaningful dialogue on key issues.

The Independent Maori Advisory Board is unelected by ratepayers and has too much influence on Committee level outcomes. I do not know how much account of advice it takes from the other panels. There is no Seniors (+65s) Advisory Panel and this section of the community will be greater than those 14 & under by 2031. Not enough notice is being taken of issues for older citizens.

The Unitary plan has been a more example of consultation: numerous, angry, concerned meetings isn't a sign of success.

These panels need to remain representative of their communities to be the true view of their peoples. Some of the places need to rotate but depth of knowledge should not be lost. If they do keep up to date they need to commit at least as much time to the panel job as the Local Board members do to their elected jobs.

Too many Council meetings are held 'in committee' - to keep to business and curb radicals attendance I presume - so I'm unaware how much advice is taken

7: Council services and activities

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The Auckland Council provides cost-effective planning and regulatory services	37	1	10	4.92	2.165
The Auckland Council provides value-for-money in its community, arts and recreation services	36	1	9	5.56	2.021
The Auckland Council provides cost-effective infrastructure	37	1	10	5.30	2.012
The Auckland Council provides sound asset management	38	1	10	5.53	2.298
The Auckland Council provides value-for-money in its economic development activities	36	1	10	5.00	2.191
The Auckland Council provides cost-effective democracy services	36	1	10	5.72	2.237
Under the new Auckland Council services are better than before 2010	37	1	10	5.43	2.398
The local government reforms in Auckland are providing value-for-money for the citizens of Auckland	38	1	10	5.37	2.487
Valid N (listwise)	29				

Borrowing money to cover wages and operating expenses has and is placing a huge debt burden on all Auckland's citizens. 25% of every dollar goes to service debt and the debt is increasing. Unless this is curbed the city will bankrupt itself (like Detroit).

Economic development a problem area - functions split between ATEED and Council. Poor co-ordination and lack of support for local ec-dev.

Hygiene factors have been managed, but there is little sign of transformation for ratepayers

I simply do not have sufficient information or experience to answer these questions but I am making some assumptions based on my general knowledge

I'm a resident and a citizen not a customer. We have had only bad experiences with the Arts team - community art rather than an arts strategy to develop the culture and professional artists. Value for money? We had that in our city before the change.

Issues that are local and close to community are not given sufficient consideration e.g. the west has only ONE swimming pool at Westwave (it is also our only national pool as Christchurch lost it in the quake) for the whole area and it is under-funded and we need planning and land purchases for new pools in the west, but cannot get this into the annual plans.

Once again, I'm unable to comment because too many meetings aren't publicised in the Herald or suburban papers

Some services are better, some are worse. That was always going to happen as services became regionalised.

The Mayor's Office provides a convenient alternative when customer services fall down.

The model will provide greater value for money, but over time once the system is properly bedded in.

The overhead costs are starting to choke the ability to provide front end funding in key areas.

Too much money wasted and changes all the times mean that everyone has to go over everything time and time again.

(8) The Mayor, executive powers and governance issues for Auckland

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The independent Maori Statutory Board is effective in promoting the cultural, economic, environmental and social issues that are significant to Maori	30	1	10	5.47	2.209
The independent Maori Statutory Board ensures the Auckland Council complies with statutory provisions that refer to the Treaty of Waitangi	29	3	10	6.41	1.570
The Social Policy Forum is effective in addressing social issues in Auckland	26	1	7	3.58	2.120
The Mayor is a strong leader for Auckland	38	1	10	6.55	2.845
The Mayoral Office provides good quality advice to the Mayor	31	1	10	6.16	2.544
Having one Council has improved Auckland's ability to negotiate with central government on major decisions that affect Auckland	39	1	10	7.08	3.003
Having one Mayor has improved Auckland's ability to negotiate with central government on major decisions that affect Auckland	39	1	10	7.13	2.867
The new executive powers for the Mayor work well	34	1	10	5.82	2.736
Valid N (listwise)	14				

	Decreased	Stay the same	Increase
	Row N %	Row N %	Row N %
Executive powers for the Mayor should be:	35.1%	56.8%	8.1%
The executive powers of the Chief Executive of the Auckland Council should be:	26.3%	65.8%	7.9%
Decision-making powers of the Auckland Council in matters affecting Auckland should be:	5.4%	51.4%	43.2%

CCOs need to be controlled much more strongly. Bringing all of their responsibilities out of the CCO model would be preferable. Plans would be better if they are built by all governing body members like all other councils do it and like Auckland's legacy council together will staff across the organisation on these processes - there was nothing wrong with the previous system, why change it

Central government want our assets. Having them all under one council makes them more vulnerable not less. Four councils provide less democracy. This is a disaster for local communities. Waitakere will lose its strong sense of identity - and be ignored as Auckland. Central Govt should butt out & accept that we don't want Auckland to spread out any further & that we want efficient, effective & good Council officers should not have more power than the elected representatives.

I do not know too much about what powers have and why they want more and in what way but Auckland Ratepayers should be better than Govt policies.

Local government is an integral part of our constitutional democracy. Central government must not ride rough-shod over decision-making (bank-rupted that council). There has been a huge workload and this was set by statute and that is why Auckland Council has struggled to get on

Some more responsibilities and local budgets need to go down to L B level; some of the changes this year have been good as it has reduced Boards need more support for planning and getting new (often population/ growth) projects into the annual plan and long term plan

One council is a good thing, but there is not enough balance between new structures

The delegation of specific functions to the CCO's away from Council control was a mistake and should be returned to more direct

The Mayoral Office should take on an even greater policy role, leading policy development. The Chief Executive's role in policy making and resourcing of Councillors to take on an even greater role in scrutiny of Mayoral policy-making.

The Social Policy Forum has basically not met since inception. Lack of central government buy-in a key issue. Mayoral executive should be better to simply recognise this.

The Social Policy Forum has not met for ages and the government's involvement in it has waned. A major difficulty for Auckland Council undermined the ability for the mayor and the council to achieve their priorities, Examples include the City Rail Link, The Housing Act and the RMA amendment that allows the government to choose the hearings commissioners for the Auckland Unitary Plan to

This is a new governance model and should be assessed over a 2-3 Council term before any changes are made.

9: The effectiveness of Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs)

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CCO governance is effective					
Auckland Council Investments Ltd	37	1	11	6.27	3.906
Auckland Council Property Ltd	37	1	11	6.51	3.783
Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development	37	1	11	5.35	3.147
Auckland Transport	36	1	11	5.36	2.779
Auckland Waterfront Development Agency	37	1	11	5.81	3.256
Regional Facilities Auckland	35	1	11	6.17	3.148
Watercare Services Ltd	37	1	11	5.81	3.315
CCOs have an effective working relationship with the Auckland Council					
:ACI	37	1	11	6.73	3.656
Auckland Council Property Ltd	37	1	11	7.03	3.508
Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development	37	1	11	6.35	3.318
Auckland Transport	37	1	11	5.86	2.790
Auckland Waterfront Development Agency	36	1	11	6.89	3.196
Regional Facilities Auckland	36	1	11	6.69	2.994
Watercare Services Ltd	36	1	11	6.19	2.955
Council oversight of CCOs is effective					
:ACI	36	1	10	4.81	2.745
Auckland Council Property Ltd	36	1	10	4.86	2.779
Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development	36	1	10	4.58	2.500
Auckland Transport	36	1	10	4.56	2.720
Auckland Waterfront Development Agency	36	1	10	4.83	2.699
Regional Facilities Auckland	36	1	10	4.89	2.482
Watercare Services Ltd	34	1	10	4.91	2.586
CCOs are accountable to citizens					
:ACI	36	1	10	3.33	2.541
Auckland Council Property Ltd	36	1	10	3.44	2.501
Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development	36	1	10	3.61	2.533
Auckland Transport	36	1	10	3.86	2.520
Auckland Waterfront Development Agency	36	1	10	3.75	2.698
Regional Facilities Auckland	35	1	10	3.74	2.605
Watercare Services Ltd	36	1	10	3.97	2.741
CCOs are effective					
:ACI	34	1	10	4.38	2.697
Auckland Council Property Ltd	34	1	10	4.62	2.818
Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development	35	1	9	4.23	2.438

Auckland Transport	35	1	10	4.57	2.682
Auckland Waterfront Development Agency	34	1	10	4.71	2.866
Regional Facilities Auckland	34	1	9	4.62	2.387
Watercare Services Ltd	33	1	10	5.12	2.859
Valid N (listwise)	27				

10: The Auckland Plan and the Draft Unitary Plan

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The Auckland Plan is the right plan for Auckland	37	1	10	6.57	2.255
The Auckland Council has consulted widely on the Auckland Plan	36	1	10	7.17	2.432
The Auckland Council will be able to implement the Auckland Plan	37	1	9	5.54	2.317
The Unitary Plan is the right plan for Auckland	35	1	10	5.46	2.704
The Auckland Council has consulted widely on the Unitary Plan	37	1	10	6.62	2.919
Valid N (listwise)	34				

A proper legal/statutory framework for the relationship between Auckland Council and Central Government needs to be established for all strategy and planning. The current framework is ad-hoc.

Auckland Council MUST have the final say on the Auckland Unitary Plan. Any disputes go through the courts. 23,000 submitted even on the v tight timeframes; central government was part of the tight timeframes being set. Components of the Unitary plan rest with Council, others require central government approval - yet they both need to be held to account

Govt have got to realise that Ratepayers cannot pay for all the policies they want to see happen. A lot of Govt policies lead to social problems (law, mental health, drugs, gambling liquor, housing (HNZ) so many different nationalities and language problems). With no one on the doorstep or on site managers to handle the security and safety problems.

It is a tad premature to ask if the Unitary Plan Consultation has been appropriate given that it hasn't even been notified yet

Re question 86: The Unitary Plan will be the right plan for Auckland, once the process has run its course. We are closer the beginning of this journey than the end currently! Re question 87: The Auckland Council has consulted widely on the draft Unitary Plan

The Auckland Plan is a high quality document. Council is struggling with the scope of the Unitary Plan to achieve completion. Government interference is hobbling the endeavour

The broad strategic direction is good, and the community has had unprecedented input and involvement.

The city needs plans but the Auckland Plan was to specifically definitive in social areas outside Council control, and the Unitary Plan process and communication was an absolute shambles.

The Unitary Plan process was flawed by the fact that Council went to self-interested stakeholders first (Property Union (Council), supermarket operators, rest-home builders etc.), and not the stakeholder with the most to lose in this game; the general public.

Too little time is allowed for submissions from the public for specific areas of the Unitary Plan. The Unitary Plan is too large for lay people to understand. There are too many fine details 'buried' in the Plan which lay people find it difficult to locate. Too little weight is given to pre-existing regulations, such as view shafts and heritage buildings. The wording has been 'softened' so that it will be easier for developers to 'buy' their way into getting what they want where they want and what height and intensification they want without having to consult neighbouring residents. Too little notice is being given to previous Council's district plan overlays relating to parks, open spaces, heritage areas, etc.

why the repeated questions

With q 86 - we only have a pre-draft to go off so far so far too early to be asking this question.

(11) What could be improved in Auckland's governance and the issues Auckland has and will face

A consistent and standardized approach across the region with improved processes.

ability to negotiate with gov as one city

An embryo transport strategy

Cost effectiveness, consistency, quality of decision-making

Fewer regional politicians who couldn't work together.

Focus on one approach to infrastructure

Good question

Library - integrated across them all. Local democracy - this has probably played out differently in different local board areas, but the principle of subsidiarity means that this could see a lot of decisions really being made by communities, along with the flexibility for Local Boards to involve their communities in a variety of ways.

Local boards

Local Boards do have more delegated authority than the old community boards.

Local government. I think local boards are better for local communities than the legacy community boards and city/district councils were.

Local representation

Nothing

one vision, one leadership, one plan and one agency to execute the plan

Public transport

Public transport is improving.

Regional mentality

Regional planning

Some regional projects have progressed

Strategic decision-making

The authority of the Auckland Council with regard to Central Government. New Zealand would be better off establishing 12 Unitary Authorities to drive this relationship.

The CBD, metropolitan transport planning, identification of region wide key issues, integrated asset management planning

The last 18 months have seen many improvements. Local Boards co-govern with the councillors: it's sunk in

The wider sense of Council across the region, more networking amongst Boards.

Unity of vision and purpose

unity of vision, long term focus, influence with central govt, single plan, pro-business

We now have a regional focus and Government is compelled to listen and participate

amount spent on glossy advertising rather than infrastructure

Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy, CCO individual 'fifedoms' poor commitment to effective internal communication. Defined priorities that they all commit to. Help each other!!

Bureaucracy has increased with the CCO structure. Auckland Transport is a quagmire

CCO's

Central government

Communication capacity and the ability of local communities to have effective input.

communication, top management salaries - ratepayers expense - are too high and not value for that money either

Democratic accountability.

District planning preparation and process

housing affordability, a lack of quality of the environment monitoring

Loss of community, loss of identity, loss of democracy, less contact and understanding of what's going on, loss of contact with people - relationships much harder to develop

nothing could be worse than what existed pre amalgamation

Nothing. It's evolving and growing and learning.

Rates & water rates have increased; Council expenditure and debt has increased substantially.

Rates, debt levels: slowness of process

Relationship with Central Government because they don't like who won the Mayoralty, and governing body/local board roles.

Roads, transport, facilities, events, water have been moved away from democratic control

Slow to make big decisions

The community has lost it's voice.

the monopolistic type behaviour from Council and its Officers - it has become large and carries a lot of clout... e.g. Council is a large client of ours and therefore we will not submit on this issue

The rating system legislated has made Auckland less affordable

The tight time-frames for community consultation and Board consultation. Very tight budgets.

Too much executive mayor power, limited councillor empowerment, little local board empowerment via resourcing.

Unnecessary fragmentation of communities of interest (through establishing too many local boards) and regional consolidation of operations. If the recommendations of the Royal Commission regarding 'Local Councils' had been heeded, the sub-regional structure would have performed much better.

Key Issues Facing Auckland

all public transport, congestion, affordable housing. danger of losing the green belt

Competency, professionalism and representation of Councillors

Cost of funding Mayors dream

Effective public transport; consistent public service across the region; youth engagement and support; rural/urban balance; positive diverse communities (how to avoid ethnic minorities isolating themselves, etc.).

funding the future of the city - this is critical - as this will lead to discussion around autonomy and self determination

Funding transport and optimising transport investment and land use intensification

Getting the governance balance right. Fixing the Unitary plan and gaining public buy in. Boosting low level of engagement in most, but not all, areas

Growth

Growth and creating a wonderful liveable city that provides equitable access for all people.

house prices , transport and employment

housing affordability, transport infrastructure capacity

Housing shortage (not enough houses being built); transportation; debt burden; retaining heritage areas; retaining existing view shafts of the whole City; curbing expenditure on non-core activities;

Housing, jobs, public transport

Inequality, Housing, Efficient and Affordable Transport, cost of living too high

Infrastructure

Leadership

Making sure the monolith doesn't choke of local communities, and the social and financial cost of uncontrolled rapid growth and ethnic change.

Managing population growth, most of which is being generated by Aucklanders having families. Housing affordability. Social and community cohesion.

Our key issue is the wellbeing of the bush - and no one seems to have a plan that has resources attached. Even when mentioned in the plans, the resources are invisible or non-existent. The bush will degenerate under this plan. A region wide policy for everything will not meet the diverse needs of people who live here.

Saving (retaining our assets. Not spreading further into rural areas. Retaining identity.

Planning and taking the communities with them versus against them: Debt levels

Public transport, social infrastructure provision (including parks and open space, cultural facilities), environmental sustainability, housing affordability, quality public realm

Raising enough money in a sustainable way for the infrastructure needed and desired.

Reorganisation of the Local Board structure.

Still the amalgamation of previous councils, unitary plan

transport funding and optimising transport investment and land use integration

Transport congestion. Rates are too high and not fairly allocated

Transport, economic development especially local jobs, living wage, connecting people in and between neighbourhoods,

Transport, inequality, democratic engagement, housing

U Plan, transport

Unitary Plan, the problem of what to do with central government hostile to everyone and everything.

What improvements could be made to the governance arrangements in Auckland? (Please list up to 5 suggestions)

Big problem with ER egos, particularly those who are novices - these need to be tamed

Co-governance respected better

Constrain the mayor's powers, while retaining central leadership role

Councillors to act at a truly regional level

Councillors would cease to be related to a specific ward; while wards ensure all regions are represented, they confuse some councillors in their regional role, so reduce its significance.

Fewer CCOs and direct control by Governing Body

Get rid of the CCOs and bring everything back in-house rather than putting service and infrastructure provision at arm's length.

Give more power to Local Boards in local decision-making

Have a separate city for the west.

Hold a population policy discussion to determine desirable size and ethnicity balance

Improve quality of Councillors

Less interference from central government

less spent on consultants

Make the CCO's align to Council aspirations

More delegated authority and funding to local boards

Nationwide petrol tax component for local govt. costs.

Not so many rules and regulations

not sure

Number of CCO's reduced and clearer democratic control

Re-organisation of the Local Board structure

Reduce executive powers of Mayor

Reduce top down controls

Replace the IMSB with an Advisory Committee

Slow down change to policies and unitary plan

Strong leadership

Waterfront Development Agency should be a CBD Development Agency

Improvements 2

Abolish or seriously review the CCO activities to have more effective accountability and Council control.

agreement on key issues and plans to tackle them

Better transport land use integration informed by detailed analysis

Boost councillor leadership

CCO's to work with Local Boards

CCO's working together

Change the Local Board Agreement process - currently Local boards basically have to be to Governing Body

Consolidating Property and Investment CCOs

Decrease the power of the Independent Maori Advisory Authority

devolve more decision making to 3rd tier manager

Fewer committees

Focus on key deliverables of local government

GST component for local govt. costs.

Have mandatory Maori seats

Local Boards able to make regulatory decisions

more clarity on local board/governing body role

More cohesive governance - CCO fragmentary and unaccountable

More funding for local boards

Number of Ward Councillors and boards increased

Officers who understand and respect co-governance

Proper resourcing for Councillors (e.g. \$100,000 annual budget)

Realise that the region is made up of different communities so one size does not fit all.

Staff that stay for the whole term instead of moving all the time

Transport, Facilities, Events and Water to be done by Council rather than CCOs

Improvements 3

Appropriate financial mechanisms - large cities can't be supported by property taxes alone

Better mechanisms for the governing body and local boards to work together more effectively

better relationships with central government

Compel GB members to attend regularly, particularly when Local Boards are presenting.

Devolve greater resourcing to local boards

Elected Maori representation vs. IMSB

Ensure the Hauraki Gulf Forum/Board has more representation by elected representatives

Give local boards more delegations

Increasing the policy role of the Mayoral Office

Joint meetings with local board members at different venues instead of having to travel out west

Keep GST on rates as it is.

Lose social agenda

Make workshops and events that are for local board members and/or public participation more flexible and able to be attended in the evenings and on weekends

Progressive reduction in current staffing levels in the overhead areas. It currently appears over staffed now that the transition elements should have settled.

Related to above less polarisation of decision making and more robust analysis

Role of Boards made clearer

Strengthen and respect panels-Maori, Pacific, Ethnic, Youth

Strong customer service accountability for Auckland Transport

Unambiguous local powers for local boards

Youth/Maori reps to be able to be co-opted to local boards if none elected

Total

Improvements 4

A change in government in Wellington in 2014

A legal/statutory framework for Auckland Council and Central Government

Accountability to citizens from social policy group - what are they doing?

Application of the Better Business Case methodology for major investments

Auckland transport should have to negotiate projects with local boards rather than dictate priorities

Change waterfront development into waterfront and CBD development

Ensure that Council controls the CCOs and not the other way round

Equitable funding arrangement for Boards established

Formulate a workable communication strategy and get rid of current agency

Mayor's powers more similar to other Mayors

Policy staging - unitary plan developed too quickly

Reconsider Maori representation

Right of Boards to negotiate new CAPEX and OPEX local projects with governing body

Serious restraint on rate increases.
Staff not changing meeting times all the time
Stop trying to pick winners

Improvements 5

A review of funding mechanisms so that Council doesn't get bogged down every year in a scrap about rates increases.
Better respect for partners, NGO's NFP and relationships in building communities
Bi-monthly meeting of chairs and CEOs of Council and CCOs chaired by the mayor to ensure integration of effort across the CCOs and Council
Keep out of property development
MMP-type electoral/representation model
Outsource to overseas - cheaper and just as effective.
Portfolio holders and chairs keeping everyone up to date not just behind closed doors.
Requirement to integrate regional planning and infrastructure investment
Roads and the roading corridor back to council
Stronger citizen engagement in local affairs

What will be the key issues facing Auckland in the next 20 years?

aging population , housing , employment , transport
Climate change is the only issue worth focussing/worrying about.
decaying infrastructure
Environmental resilience, employment, housing, quality public realm and cultural infrastructure
Funding of the Future City - we also need to think about the infrastructure requirements needed to support a poor performing Auckland Port company. Why spend public money to support a business that is continually struggling to compete with Tauranga. NZ Inc perspective would determine that Auckland should seek alternative options for managing freight in and out of Auckland.
Funding transport and optimising transport investment and land use intensification
Growth- fair and equitable access to amenities for all people: affordable housing: embracing bi-culturalism and understanding what it really means.
Growth, Housing and transport
Growth; population change

Housing affordability, youth employment, health income and educational inequality

housing affordability, a sustainable urban form, sufficient capital to upgrade transport infrastructure, managing the negative effects of Govt interference

Housing, jobs, public transport, cultural diversity, environmental pollution, climate change

Housing, transportation; support services for elderly citizens; increasing debt burden on ratepayers; replacement of old infrastructure (sewerage and water pipes); sufficient infrastructure to support increased housing intensification; sufficient green space/play areas/sports fields to support increased housing intensification

How to manage its growing population and its extensive man-made and natural resources; where to create revenue from (sources of income); public transport and housing.

Intensifying well and building greater public engagement

Leadership

Managing population growth, most of which is being generated by Aucklanders having families. Housing affordability. Social and community cohesion.

Planning, debt, governance, transport

Population expansion overtaking service demands and housing

Population growth and providing enough jobs. (Older age group will be very large, so jobs not for them makes it more important to provide proper employment for younger residents.) Provision of enough green areas (parks and reserves, sports fields, swimming pools, etc.) to provide adequately for needs of people living on smaller land area per person. Protection of the Waitakere Ranges, our harbours, our islands, and the environment generally. Public Transport.

Population increase, housing, jobs and environmental degradation

Providing suitable employment for many of new Aucklanders

Rates increases

Same as at # 92 - raising enough money for services & infrastructure contemplated.

Slumification due to intensification.

Technology change, population growth, climate change/peak oil resilience

The impact of climate change, poverty

The rapid and uncontrolled growth and ethnicity changes will create unintended and unanticipated community isolation and adverse change from the current norm. There will be layered and siloed community structures with an increasing rigidity to our social patterns.

Transport and housing. building of new schools

Transport funding and investment and affordable housing

Transport, inequality, democratic engagement, housing