

LIVING TOGETHER:

**A review of local literature on building strong communities in
Auckland City**

21 April 2006

Prepared for Auckland City Council by
CityScope Consultants and Rachael Trotman

CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction	4
1.1 Scope	4
1.2 Method	4
2.0 The Literature	5
2.1 Categorisation.....	5
2.2 Limitations	6
2.3 Present and absent voices.....	7
3.0 Context.....	9
3.1 Legislative and policy context.....	9
3.2 Political and conceptual context.....	10
3.3 Global to local context	10
4.0 How Community is Constructed	13
4.1 Local residents.....	13
4.2 Stakeholders	14
4.3 Political constituencies.....	14
4.4 Communities of interest	15
4.5 Customers.....	15
4.6 Users and non-users (of facilities).....	15
4.7 By demography	16
4.8 Summary	16
5.0 What Builds Strong Communities?	17
5.1 Income and employment	17
5.2 Basic infrastructure	18
5.3 Sense of belonging and connection.....	18
5.4 High levels of participation.....	19
5.5 Biculturalism versus multiculturalism	19
5.6 Newcomers are welcome and successfully settled.....	20
5.7 Leadership and partnership	20

6.0 Impediments to Strong Communities	21
6.1 Transport and traffic issues	21
6.2 Lack of affordable, high quality housing stock.....	21
6.3 Issues for the CBD	22
6.4 Issues for Suburban Auckland.....	23
6.5 Challenges facing some young people	23
6.6 Managing cultural diversity	24
6.7 Summary	24
7.0 Implications for Council	25
7.1 Role based approach to building strong communities	26
7.2 Resource sustained community leadership	26
7.3 Governance and leadership	27
7.4 Foster local participation.....	28
7.5 Focus on the big city-wide levers.....	28
8.0 Further Work Needed	29
Appendix One: Documents Reviewed.....	32
Appendix Two: Review Template	40

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Auckland City Council is developing a policy framework for building strong communities in Auckland City. To contribute to this framework, this report reviews Auckland City focused information on concepts of ‘community’ and on what helps to build strong communities.

1.1 Scope

Virtually every activity of Council impacts in some way on individuals and communities. This review addresses the following questions:

- ♦ What notions of ‘community’ exist in community development related literature on Auckland City?
- ♦ What are the things that help to build ‘strong communities’? In particular, how can Auckland City be more welcoming to newcomers, enjoy its diversity and cope well with growth¹?
- ♦ What are the impediments to building strong communities?
- ♦ Whose voices are present and absent in the literature?
- ♦ What are the gaps and limitations of the literature overall and what further research is required?
- ♦ What are the implications of the above for Auckland City Council?
- ♦ How might success in building strong communities be measured?
- ♦ What further work is required?

Most of the literature reviewed involves research, information or policy documents undertaken by or on behalf of Auckland City Council, and is supplemented by relevant information from other agencies. The documents were supplied on the grounds that they all deal in some way with building strong communities. Almost all of the documents reviewed dated from 2002 onwards.

1.2 Method

A total of 132 documents were reviewed (see Appendix One). The literature was categorised under the key headings of context, place based material, facilities and groups. A template was used to analyse each document against key criteria (see Appendix Two). A background report providing more detailed analysis was prepared for discussion with the client. Three consultants with diverse backgrounds were involved in reviewing and interpreting the information emerging from this process, providing for independent review of the material and interdisciplinary exchange as the basis for the current report.

¹ Auckland City Council’s *Future Auckland* document containing 26 community outcomes places an emphasis on communities being able to respond well to change, enjoy diversity and welcome newcomers. Consequently, the brief for this review emphasised these aspects of strong communities.

2.0 THE LITERATURE

2.1 Categorisation

Key criteria for the literature reviewed were that it had a local focus on Auckland City and had relevance to the scope of this review. Table One below describes the literature and number of reports reviewed under each key category. References in this report relate to the documents listed under these categories (Appendix One).

Table One: Description

Category	Comment	Number of reports reviewed
Context – Issues & Framework	Includes Auckland City community development, strategic planning and policy documents, university research, Ministry of Social Development and Auckland Sustainable Cities research.	32
Place based	While strongly focused on the Central Business District (CBD), other place based material involved Newmarket, Avondale, Panmure, Eastern Bays and Tamaki Wards and Glen Innes. These documents rely heavily on primary research, using interviews with community leaders and other key informants, workshops and meetings, focus groups, resident surveys, or combinations of these.	26
Facilities	This material was dominated by reports on library services, but included wider community and recreation facilities, plus web and digital strategies. This research focuses on facility use and users, and their views and expectations.	47
Groups	This material focused mainly on communities defined by ethnicity (with a bias towards Asian and Pacific peoples). In the migrant research there is an almost complete reliance on qualitative research, literature reviews and academic commentary.	27
TOTAL		132

2.2 Limitations

None of the information directly focused on the questions of “What does community mean in Auckland City?” or “What builds strong communities in Auckland City?” Most reports focus on specific aspects of community wellbeing or issues for particular places, rather than the bigger picture. For the purposes of this report, relevant points have been extracted from the documents to form a coherent response to these questions. Taken together, limitations of the documents reviewed are as follows.

There are methodological shortcomings in some reports. These include:

- ♦ A failure to fully record method and coverage.
- ♦ No indication of how many people participated in the research.
- ♦ Absence of response rate information, survey period, or comment regarding possible response bias.

Two consequences arise from this. First, it makes quantifying attitudes and motivation within communities difficult and second, it leaves question marks over precisely whose views are being omitted, whose are being documented, and how representative documented views are.

Offsetting this is some consistency across reports on key issues. Also, metadata analyses among the documents seek out common themes and assess their consistency and credibility as a basis for forming conclusions (e.g. C4, P7, P8, P24 and F48). The views represented are clearer where local people are strongly involved in doing the research and reporting (e.g. P24 and P21).

For all place based research, it is difficult to establish how representative the feedback of the residents of particular areas is, and how effective any individual survey has been in giving voice to the different communities residing in a particular place.

The methodological issues imply a need to be clearer when commissioning research, in terms of who is the focus of the research, how representative it needs to be, who is forming the questions and what methods will be most effective in engaging people around those questions.

The consultation undertaken tends to be issues based and of an “extractive” or one-way nature, whereby the questions are formed outside of the community in question, someone “goes in” to that community and asks those questions and then leaves, rarely to be seen again. This reflects an “arms length” approach to consultation, rather than a community empowerment approach. This latter approach involves research subjects more actively in the research process, from forming the questions to collating and reporting the information arising. Empowerment approaches also seek to use research and consultation processes to support community learning and action, and to encourage people to participate in issues of interest and local affairs.

“Underweighting” in the literature reviewed appears to be as follows. Note that this may reflect the literature supplied for review rather than actual research or information gaps.

- ♦ Literature to support understanding of how communities work in suburbs. Less work appears to have been done on suburban Auckland City than on the Central Business District (CBD), although Avondale, Tamaki, Mt Wellington and Glen Innes are exceptions.
- ♦ Literature on the contribution of the community and voluntary sectors to building strong communities.
- ♦ The link between economic wellbeing and strong communities, although employment is acknowledged as a key need in the migrant research.
- ♦ Information on the Council’s approach to consultation and community engagement, and on its democratic processes.
- ♦ Information on sustainable development issues for Auckland City, including what is being done to promote sustainable development principles and connections between these and building strong communities.
- ♦ Detailed housing research relevant to community building, including issues of density, planning and design.
- ♦ Research on perceptions and impact of immigration on the host communities (from their perspectives).
- ♦ The impact on communities of traditional Council service delivery, for example waste, water, roading and planning regulations.

One report suggests that much of the research on migrant issues may be based on interviews and focus groups with the same people (G22). There is a degree of repetition in the migrant research conducted. (However, in March 2006, the Council adopted a migrant strategy).

Finally, research evaluating Auckland City’s Council contribution to building strong communities and how its success in this area might be measured were lacking. Further work in the latter area in particular is required to demonstrate the value and impact of Council activities in building strong communities.

2.3 Present and absent voices

Community voices rarely come through clearly in the literature; the Glen Innes Visioning Project (2005, P21) is an exception. Another exception is the Open Decks video (G28), sponsored in part by the Auckland City Council. Through this, Avondale youth state what they think would make Avondale a better place to live.

As mentioned above, questions and issues tend to be framed elsewhere, asked by outsiders, and written up by Council staff or consultants. Professionals, analysts, researchers or community advisors act as intermediaries in the synthesis, appraisal and reporting process. This tends to mute community voices and lose nuances or context in translation.

Voices that appeared less present or identifiable in the literature surveyed were:

- ♦ Iwi/Maori, especially in terms of self-conducted or controlled research (although this is an issue across the board).
- ♦ Children and young people (the latter to a lesser degree, and their needs are regularly expressed in survey material and via adults).
- ♦ Non-users of facilities.
- ♦ People in paid employment.
- ♦ Older residents.
- ♦ Marginalised groups such as homeless people.
- ♦ Resident community views on migration issues.

There was no sense in the literature overall of the balance between male and female views and voices.

More identification of the characteristics of mainstream groups is needed in the research. There is a tendency to remove references to ethnicity if the people concerned are pakeha or from European origin. This reflects a bias in defining ethnicity in terms of deviation from the pakeha mainstream.

3.0 CONTEXT

This section sets the scene for the issues raised in this review.

3.1 Legislative and policy context

Under the 2002 Local Government Act, the purpose of local government is to enable democratic local decision-making and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future. This contains a number of assumptions as to what strong communities entail:

- ♦ Participation in decision-making and in democratic processes.
- ♦ The need to consider and promote all aspects of wellbeing in decision-making.
- ♦ The need to think long term and provide for future communities.

These assumptions also underpin notions of sustainable development, as set out in the government's Sustainable Development Programme of Action (2003) and the Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme (2004). In the latter, sustainable cities are "healthy, safe and attractive places where business, social and cultural life can flourish".

The Auckland City Growth Strategy advances both the sustainable cities programme ("strengthening people and organisations to support change") and the liveable communities concept ("planning with communities for change and growth in their local area") as two principal policy components.

Auckland City Council's Future Auckland document (2005) sets out 26 community outcomes organised under the four wellbeings above and a fifth category of leadership. "Strong communities" comprise one of the community outcomes under the social wellbeing category, although it has clear links with virtually every other outcome identified. Future Auckland describes the strong communities vision as "...strong, friendly, inclusive and flexible. Being happy and inspired, communities respond well to changes in our city and welcome new people from other places and cultures..."

More recently the policy framework for community development has been extended by emphasising urban design. The Citywide Urban Design Strategy (W8) was developed by a team of stakeholders assembled by the Mayor (developers, planners, designers, local politicians and academics), and incorporates a range of principles relevant to strong communities. It seeks to balance the physical appearance of the city with the constantly changing needs of people, and has been translated into a set of principles for the Central Business District (P23) and specific projects (P19).

Auckland City Council has numerous planning and policy documents relevant to building strong communities, for example the Community Assistance Policy, which "favour[s] groups and activities that build on community initiatives and lift community participation". Overall, the Council tends to approach community development through

two broad policy strands: development of the physical environment and social development (place and people).

3.2 Political and conceptual context

Discussion and action around building strong communities is:

- ♦ **Politicised and contestable.** For example the Birch report in 2002 recommended cutting \$500,000 from Auckland City's community development budget on the grounds that most of the functions were duplicating services already provided by central government or the voluntary sector (W6). While the Local Government Act 2002 provides a crystal clear mandate for Council involvement in social wellbeing, the type and extent of this involvement is up to each local authority.
- ♦ **Complex and far-reaching.** Social conditions are in constant flux and change, affected by multiple and subtle forces.
- ♦ **Unfamiliar and fuzzy.** Local authorities have a traditional focus on physical infrastructure and can be less comfortable with more intangible aspects of social and community development, such as a strong and well networked community sector, social services that match changing needs and high levels of tolerance among people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.
- ♦ **Difficult to measure.** Traditional Council activities have a quantitative focus for which changes can be measured over a relatively short timeframe. Strengthening communities has a qualitative focus, involves many interrelated factors and it can be hard to prove cause and effect. Examples include the links between poor housing and health and educational outcomes for children, the multiple causes of crime and the reasons why a portion of the population is homeless or highly transient.
- ♦ **Full of jargon.** The plethora of terms related to strong communities can act as a barrier to communication, clarity and the conveyance of ideas and policy. Terms include social capital, social cohesion, social inclusion/exclusion, belonging, resilience and diversity.

3.3 Global to local context

Local government strategies are set within wider forces of national and global social change. The Department of Internal Affairs (2002) outlines some of the forces affecting government support for building strong communities²:

² "A Framework for Developing Sustainable Communities – A Discussion Paper", 2002, Department of Internal Affairs.

- ♦ The globalisation of flows of economic capital, people and information creates forces that affect the wellbeing of people around the world, both positively and negatively. These forces tend to marginalise particular nation states and groups of people within them.
- ♦ Communities, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities are expecting and seeking greater access to resources and decision-making.
- ♦ Treaty of Waitangi settlements within New Zealand, and international recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples.
- ♦ Recognition that government is not able to achieve the desired levels of social wellbeing on its own. This requires governments to consider and work with potential partners, both global and local.
- ♦ The need to include local people and the community and voluntary sectors in policy development and service planning.
- ♦ Interrelated problems in health, housing, education, employment, economic development and environmental protection increasingly demand the development of holistic local solutions to local problems.
- ♦ Individuals, families and communities are increasingly demonstrating their wish to do more for themselves.

At the same time, Auckland City is facing a set of specific issues that impact on building strong communities. The Future Auckland community outcomes research (2004) identified these as follows.

- ♦ Population growth in the Auckland region was almost double the national average between 1991 and 2001 (20.1% compared to 10.8%).
- ♦ The costs of living are higher in Auckland City than other parts of New Zealand, especially for housing, which may result over time in a less diverse population as older people, families and people on low incomes are pushed out of the city. High living costs may also prompt a rise in homeless people in the city.
- ♦ Ethnic diversity, perceptions of increasing crime and pressure on services and transport infrastructure are key issues. Increasing diversity is welcomed by many but requires adequate settlement services and facilities that respond to a wide range of needs.
- ♦ Increasing ethnic and cultural diversity spark perceptions of increased inter-racial tension and the development of cultural 'enclaves' in the city.
- ♦ Safety from criminals and cars is an issue, which reduces the independence and freedom of children in particular in Auckland City, and can impact negatively on children's sense of belonging.
- ♦ There was a strong consensus on the need for greater political participation by the people of Auckland, and a desire for genuine consultation with the variety of communities in the city.

- ♦ Auckland City is perceived by some to be lacking a sense of identity, especially in the CBD, due in part to a lack of public spaces and activities.
- ♦ A perception was voiced of a fundamental difference between Maori value systems and those of bureaucracies charged with leadership of the city, and a need for greater Maori representation in governance of the city.
- ♦ Auckland City is perceived to be constrained by skill shortages, lack of support for small business and a highly regulated business environment.
- ♦ Commercial and residential development is not always to a high standard (e.g. leaky homes), especially in the CBD.
- ♦ Higher density housing without transport and amenity development potentially destroys the identity of some suburbs and creates future slums in poorer areas, which can reduce community cohesiveness, encourage overcrowding and potentially create crime and public health issues.
- ♦ The pace of growth is putting pressure on old and sometimes failing infrastructure, especially drainage, public transport and roading.
- ♦ The beauty and health of the Auckland City environment, and access to this environment, are perceived to be threatened by population growth. Many felt that greater respect and care for the environment is needed, especially in terms of the pollution of air, waterways and harbours, plus weed eradication and education about the environment, particularly for new migrants. Preserving heritage areas, protecting volcanic cones and green open spaces, supporting biodiversity and the use of renewable energy resources were also seen as important. Also, the role of Ngati Whatua and other Maori in environmental protection was seen as needing further discussion in Auckland.

Inequitable access to resources and services still persists in Auckland City. Also, as Friesen notes (C16), intensification of the built environment is no guarantee of conviviality and civic participation. This is reflected in a review of Auckland-based and international research (C4), which suggests that demographics are more important than intensification for creating a sense of community. The research is inconclusive on whether high densities contribute to social problems, but it does indicate that social problems can be influenced by the quality of design.

Local needs may conflict with those at a city or regional level. Hence, city-wide or regional growth projects, including transport infrastructure, can dislocate or displace local communities. A three-pronged focus is needed to:

1. Identify and meet the needs of local places and the people that live there. This requires a focus on local neighbourhoods within a wider city and regional vision.
2. Ensure the broader conditions that support quality of life are provided, especially for those most in need (e.g. health care, education, income and employment, housing quality and affordability, arts and creativity, successful settlement of new migrants), via national policies as well as city, regional and national planning.
3. Position Auckland City as a world-class city in the Pacific (a global focus).

Action is needed on all three levels simultaneously, but different policy choices exist and resources will be allocated differently depending on where priorities lie.

4.0 HOW COMMUNITY IS CONSTRUCTED

At a basic level a community is a network of people linked together by various factors³. Notions of community are implicit rather than explicit in the literature, and this section highlights what is revealed. In some instances (P10, P14), the term “community” is treated as indistinguishable from “social”. This implies that the interest is on social organisation, and not on the presence and character of distinctive communities. Elsewhere the focus is strongly on specific neighbourhoods, facilities, demographics or ethnic groups.

Community is tied to belonging and some of the papers question the usefulness of the term “community” (W7):

- ♦ “Can there be a coherent community policy when it rests on an unclear and contested, sometimes romantic, view of the concept of community?”
- ♦ “Can community policies where territorially defined, respond to the realities of community life which often extend along lines of ethnic and special interest groups over a whole area?”
- ♦ “Can community policy initiatives originating in a top-down manner from the state ever genuinely engage with concerns of local communities and overcome the imbalances of social capital?”

Few reports provide an encompassing view of what “community” involves. The Glen Innes Visioning Project (P21) is one exception, which links place, demographic groups and interested parties. The document articulates a view of community values, giving them visibility and credibility, and develops actions that reflect the ideas of groups within the community.

A key issue for this review is the paucity of research and information that explores ideas of community in-depth, and the absence of documenting and reporting what residents think community means, or what building strong communities entails. An exception is P11b, but that relates to a single community board area. A key point is that all the categories below represent communities of interest, which may overlap depending on the context. Our involvement in a community of interest on one issue may change as the issue changes.

While explicit definitions are absent, the following categories and concepts of community emerge from the literature. Each category reveals the various foci of the reports and reflects the underlying assumptions relating to what “community” means in the way they have been commissioned, researched or written.

³ See for example “A Framework for Developing Sustainable Communities – A Discussion Paper”, 2002, Department of Internal Affairs.

4.1 Local residents

The majority of place based documents treat communities as groups of local residents. These groups are assumed to have a **shared** interest in a particular area, but not necessarily a **common** interest, where members want more or less the same outcome.

For place-based literature a focus on the idea of community may be mediated by an agency with a particular interest in land use, transport, and/or built form. Planning documents, including those focusing on liveable communities, structure plans and strategic growth management plans, tend to treat community in this manner.

The way in which geographical and local authority boundaries are drawn or a project's boundaries are defined can affect perceptions of diversity, communities and community needs. The notion of community as a distinctive and dynamic group with social, cultural, economic, leisure or kinship ties and active relationships among members tends to be secondary. In place-based reports, the focus is on stakeholders in areas, precincts and places. The documents largely address issues of environment, activity, and attitudes rather than community, as such.

People tend to participate in place-based research as informants, members of focus groups, participants in workshops, or survey respondents.

4.2 Stakeholders

When a number of distinct groups seek different outcomes in an area, the notion of “stakeholders” may be more appropriate than the notion of community. “Stakeholders” refer to people with an interest in particular issues and outcomes. For example, Allen and Kilvington (Landcare Research) define stakeholders as:

“persons, groups or institutions with interests in a policy, programme or project. Primary stakeholders are immediate communities of interest. Secondary stakeholders are the intermediaries in the process and may include government agencies and other institutional bodies” (www.landcaresearch.co.nz/research/social.stakeholder.asp, Nov. 2001).

Consultative exercises that revolve around stakeholders in an area may include representatives of residents, businesses, and owners and may seek a resolution of contentious issues among them. The rationale and process of engagement is not based on a sense of community, although one effect may be to strengthen that sense as people recognise common interests and forge linkages. Indeed, engagement in such processes may be one means by which residents become involved, thereby contributing to strong communities (P11b).

4.3 Political constituencies

There were a number of references in the literature to the importance of the process of participation and its role in creating social cohesion (e.g. G16, G22). The emphasis is on the need for communities to have confidence in the process of decision-making and their ability to influence decision-making. The processes of reconciling differences between sub-groups within the community are therefore as important as the final decisions themselves. This draws attention to the effectiveness of the current governance structures in Auckland City, including Council Committees and Community Boards.

At the same time, the literature points to the limited interest of many people in taking on the responsibility of participating to a high level in local democratic processes or for becoming more self sufficient or self-determining as local communities (P11b). This can mean that the loudest voices or most organised, motivated or affluent groups capture democratic processes, or inaccurately profess to or are assumed to represent the wider community. Supporting active participation by a wide range of community representatives is a key challenge for building strong communities. Part of this involves identifying and acting to reconcile the interests of different sub-groups.

4.4 Customers

Facility operators, and some commissioners of research and researchers, can fluctuate between market and public good paradigms. The former can ultimately deny community on the assumption that all decisions can be taken rationally by individuals in response to market signals. The latter is about collectivity and filling in the gaps.

It can be a problem when councils treat residents or users of a particular facility as customers, perhaps in the interests of refining services or service performance monitoring (sometimes inadvertently). This transactional view reduces the relationship between Council and its residents to one defined in narrow, economic terms. It replaces the notion of a community of citizens with rights, responsibilities and expectations with an economically defined view of them as individualistic, self-interested agents.

In some cases community facilities may be run as a combination of commercial services and public goods. The use of fee-paying clubs in recreation centres to pay for subsidised child-care services is one such example. In these cases the fee-payers may legitimately be considered as customers but not the childcare facility users. This is a complex area and there is a need for greater clarity in the distinction of roles.

4.5 Users and non-users (of facilities)

In the Council's facility needs analyses, usage and market penetration tend to drive the definition of community, rather than the needs of different groups. Needs analyses focus on user patterns, facilities supply and capacity shortfalls or surpluses, rather than on defining community needs. An attempt is being made to alter this facilities orientation (P11, F40), but the risk is still that increased patronage remains the end, not the means.

At a more fundamental level, a community development vision underlies the provision of public facilities for recreation, learning, arts, culture and relaxation. The complex of facilities, services and programmes offered by the Council is intended to encourage participation and social inclusion, both elements of strong communities. Growing attention to the quality of the built and natural environment is associated with creating a better environment for the communities that have a stake in them, as well as visitors and residents.

4.6 By demography

A more functional approach to defining local community is through addressing socio-demographic character, typically through reference to Census data (P11a). Research based on groups tends to reveal a wide range of concepts of community such as demographic groups, groups based on ethnicity or country of origin, familial and special interest groups, such as those forming around religious affiliations. Communities of interest form depending on the context or issue involved.

However, contrasts among communities within a given area (Census Area Unit, neighbourhood, ward) are often as significant as contrasts between them. As with statistical averages derived from surveys, Census-based summary statistics can hide deviations and extremes that are significant both in defining communities and denoting their cohesiveness (or lack thereof). The usefulness of summary statistics to describe geographical communities depends on the scale at which they are presented, how the data is qualified, the extent to which aggregation hides differences, and whether they are supported by further research.

4.7 Summary

It is unlikely that rigid definitions of community are helpful, given that we are all part of multiple communities that shift as we move along the life cycle, and as our tastes, values and interests shift. What is more important is being aware of the way community is constructed in research and policy and taking care not to oversimplify or to “box” people too narrowly. Narrow constructions of community mask differences and can homogenise or oversimplify communities and their various needs.

Multiple memberships of communities are a strength in that it gives individuals the opportunity to belong in many different ways (families, sports teams, workplace, geographical community, religious groups etc). Interestingly, no suggestion was found in the literature of a problem with belonging in Auckland City, except in some instances for migrant and refugee groups.

From the literature, a key means for building strong communities is to facilitate membership of networks based on common interests, often (but not always) grounded in or around a particular locality or facility.

5.0 WHAT BUILDS STRONG COMMUNITIES?

“Much of what Asian people need rests upon what all people need” (G25).

At a fundamental level all human beings need the same things. Much of the material reviewed on the dynamics of strong communities related to migrant and refugee communities. Social cohesion however is relevant to all communities and is extended to all people in the Auckland City Council’s own Community Governance model (1999, ACC website).

The key components of a socially cohesive society (G22) are:

- A sense of belonging.
- Opportunities for participation in politics and activities.
- Social inclusion.
- Recognition.
- Celebration of diversity, for example through local festivals, arts and events.

All of the elements above involve community engagement and participation, which are fundamental to many of the building blocks outlined in this section. Strong communities are active, proactive and engaged, not just via individual lives but also in the wider society of which we are each a part.

Children’s perspectives of strong communities included safety, being able to walk to friends and family and the need for good quality housing (G15).

Underlying the concept of strong communities in the literature is that of “social capital”, which refers to the outcomes from relationships between people that help communities to operate effectively. These relationships are based on trust and reciprocity between individuals. Social capital “...develops from the core building blocks of...trust, tolerance, value of life and proactivity. Connections are formed first within the family and neighbourhood and later within wider communities” (Bullen & Onyx, 1998).

As with constructs of community, the documents do not directly ask the question “What builds strong communities?” However, drawing upon them, the key elements that build strong communities are described below. All of these elements are the subject worldwide of intense enquiry and endeavour, and are merely sketched here. They are not in any order of priority.

5.1 Income and employment

Information on the connections between social and economic development is a significant gap in the literature reviewed. Building successful communities relies on adequate income and the availability of paid employment, which among other things offers a means for inclusion, self-development, choices and meeting basic needs. Paid employment is a critical component of strong communities and a potential outcome of local community development initiatives.

5.2 Built and natural environments

The built environment needs to be of a high quality, and contain spaces where people with common interests can come together and where people of different backgrounds can interact (P7, P8).

Most of the place based literature focuses on how residents (and others) use or relate to a particular place. Building strong communities is equated largely with people's appreciation of places and how the quality of the built environment may be improved (P22). Documents focus on experiences, expectations and suggestions for improving a sense of place, economic viability, and the quality of the environment.

The importance of the natural environment and physical access was highlighted with respect to Mt Wellington and Panmure (P20, P4), and forms the framework for moving forward on community development in Avondale (P20).

Places and facilities provide a means for expressing identity and culture. People from different backgrounds being able to see aspects of their identity mirrored in public space is key to a sense of connection and belonging. For example, in Avondale there was a perceived need to reflect a sense of Māori identity, and to accommodate the needs of Māori youth in the area. Lack of Pacific identity reflected in public spaces is an issue in the CBD (P14).

5.3 Sense of belonging and connection

Sense of belonging relates intimately to a sense of place, which in Fidler's review relating to Asian groups in the CBD related to three issues (G25):

- ♦ I have a role here.
- ♦ I meet people here and they recognise me for who I am.
- ♦ There are places in Auckland City that are 'my' places.

A sense of belonging and connection with others is supported by opportunities for interaction within and across communities, provided in part by flexible facilities, festivals and events.

Implicit in community needs assessment is the assumption that utilising community facilities will help to build strong communities, especially for needy groups, or groups without other opportunities who can benefit from coming together in a public facility (F29). Community facilities provide settings for inclusion and social interaction, as well as providing programmes and services (F8-28). Young people, for example in Avondale, tend to identify needs for specific facilities: a swimming pool, recreation or youth centre, or more parks and reserves (F7).

Psychological concepts of strong communities are implicit in the Sense of Community Index used in some of the small area research (G17). The index is constructed from

dimensions of: *community membership, influence, integration and emotional connection*. Psychological issues are also reflected in concerns about migrant health issues, particularly for women and for those who do not settle well in the first 12 months (G10 and G23).

Strong ethnic communities are seen to have a strong sense of culture, identity and belonging. Also, ethnic communities are considered strong when their members are able to make a meaningful contribution to social and economic activities (G1-9). Self-determination, self-sufficiency, and intercultural integration are all seen as contributing to strong communities (G8, G6, W12).

5.4 High levels of participation

Focus group research undertaken in the Eastern Bays Ward (P11) led to a view of strong communities based on a typology of participation, as follows.

1. At the lowest level, a “safe community” is marked by a well-maintained, non-threatening physical environment and familiarity with neighbours.
2. At the next level a “belonging community” is based on knowing and interacting with other locals on deeper levels than that necessary for a sense of security. Communities were seen to get stronger with higher levels of social interaction and greater understanding of neighbours (especially of different ethnicity), developed in part through local events (including street parties).
3. At the highest level is the “involved community”, based on sustained participation, including service activity (volunteerism, neighbourhood improvement) through to activism – taking a stand on local issues.

The strongest local communities were viewed as those in which a significant number of local people choose to participate in local issues, or at least feel they can do so. This notion of strong communities developed by residents of a relatively prosperous area aligns with the community building initiatives associated with the Glen Innes Visioning project in an area far more deprived of private resources. This project developed a local Action Plan, as a way of developing a stronger community by working together on issues of local importance. The Plan emphasises the importance of enhancing community leadership in this process, and harnessing local pride.

5.5 Biculturalism versus multiculturalism

The literature highlighted a tendency towards passive cultural coexistence in Auckland City, rather than more proactive interaction and cross-cultural understanding. Biculturalism is a necessary starting point for discussions and action around cross-cultural cohesion in Aotearoa/New Zealand. There was also a high level of concern by Maori regarding perceived appropriation of their culture and a lack of economic benefit flowing to their communities. The Future Auckland consultation revealed a perceived need for greater representation of Maori values in the running of Auckland City. At the local level, resolving issues around access to facilities and resources was seen to be

linked with Treaty issues, and a concern that Council should clarify its Treaty policy (P7).

Immigrants' aspirations to be accepted as New Zealanders were perceived by some to be frustrated by the policy of biculturalism, which many feel to include Maori and pakeha to the exclusion of other cultures and ethnicities. Acceptance of new migrants can also be hampered by attitudes of some New Zealand born people towards those from other places, and by dichotomous 'them' and 'us' distinctions (G27).

5.6 Newcomers are welcome and successfully settled

A welcoming attitude, mutual tolerance and successful settlement of migrants are key to ongoing social cohesion in Auckland City, especially in times of economic recession. There is also a city-wide need to support migrants to find culturally familiar spaces where they may feel at home, and to encourage awareness and retention of their cultures, which can then be shared with host communities (G22, G23, W12).

Successful settlement involves social, economic and political participation in the wider society on merit, without preference or discrimination. Holistic settlement support is needed (G27). The importance of strong English language skills for migrants was emphasised in the recommendations from the NZ Asia Foundation report (G22). There were several examples provided of programmes to assist with migrant settlement (G22), but few were Auckland City based.

5.7 Leadership and partnership

The importance of leadership and partnership was emphasised in Council's role as Community Advisor (W6). This report presented a strategy based on:

- ♦ Leadership and coordination.
- ♦ Strategic management.
- ♦ Research and information.
- ♦ Process and project management.

Among the critical success factors for strong communities are the commitment of community leaders and external champions to achieving concrete outcomes and involving diverse stakeholder interests. Whole-of-community and whole-of-government approaches are needed to make efficient use of resources and to achieve both knowledge transfer and continuity.

The development of partnerships is also seen as important, with government, social agencies and community groups, to focus efforts and resources. Partnerships can help support local leadership and empower locals to get things done. This implies transferring resources to the communities concerned, which would be subject to the usual strictures of transparency and accountability associated with public resources.

6.0 IMPEDIMENTS TO STRONG COMMUNITIES

The elements of building strong communities in Section 5.0 all reflect a response to particular impediments, including apathy, uncontrolled development and the need for a holistic and collaborative approach to issues (see also Section 3.3 on key issues facing Auckland City). A lack of strong intersecting networks in Auckland City, and a segmented and fragmented approach to government are also impediments. According to the documents, some specific impediments to building strong communities in Auckland City are as follows.

6.1 Traffic and transport issues

Many of the place-based documents indicate that traffic and associated noise and air pollution undermine quality of life, especially in the CBD (P16). A compact city generates a lot of local traffic and congestion, especially on key transport corridors and around town centres, where medium density is being concentrated. This contributes to severance of communities by roads and danger associated with heavily trafficked areas, both of which are barriers to strong communities (P2, P14).

Lack of flexible transport options can exclude people from some forms of participation. Some areas (e.g. Meadowbank) use minibuses to get people to and from Council supported or provided activities and outings, and in Riverside community volunteers pool cars to get children to and from activities (P11).

Accessibility can be a barrier to the use of council facilities, and the opportunities for inclusion associated with these. This can be addressed directly, as in the case of mobile libraries and books in homes catering for the needs of the immobile, and especially elderly people (F5, F6, F42). Access to public transport can also be improved markedly in Auckland City.

Those without ready access to transport are less likely to be able to meet the needs of family members (e.g. children's activities), participate in employment or sustain cross-sector commuting. When people are less mobile, social isolation is a risk, and for significant numbers of people connections to their local neighbourhood are minimal, as they shop, work, study, or take their children elsewhere to school.

6.2 Lack of affordable, high quality housing stock

Increased population poses major challenges in developing and maintaining a flexible, affordable and high quality housing stock. There is also concern about gentrification and rising house prices forcing people on lower incomes out of Auckland City. These issues are present but not well covered in the documents reviewed.

6.3 Issues for the CBD

There is a bias in the documents towards the CBD and the images and lifestyles associated with it. The CBD is marked by diversity of use and users, intensity of use and by rapid change. These things give the CBD distinctive character, but can also act against a sense of community (P9).

Research has been undertaken across CBD stakeholders in general, including groups from across the Region, elsewhere in New Zealand and overseas, to determine their different associations with and expectations of the CBD. The focus of this work has been on the development and integration of different quarters within the CBD, and on how stakeholders use and interact with the physical environment. Recommended actions focus on social and cultural programmes and changing the physical environment.

No Doubt Research (P8) highlighted desirable outcomes that would contribute to the quality of the CBD, but which are currently subject to tensions:

- ♦ Easy to get around - tension between pedestrians and traffic.
- ♦ A unique, high quality retail mix - tension between congestion and good streets, and among land uses.
- ♦ A large resident population - tension between living there and visitors and associated noise.
- ♦ Alive and vibrant around the clock - tension again between noise and residents.
- ♦ Thriving business - tension with crowding and capacity issues, the volatility of business sectors and conflicting uses.
- ♦ Inclusive and diverse, with a desire for a more Pacific feel - tensions exist with youth congregating, homelessness and disadvantaged groups alongside wealthy areas.
- ♦ A great built environment – tension with unplanned and random building developments, lack of amenity, a sense of place not reflected in architecture and a need for good connections among precincts.

In short, there are difficulties in creating a resilient residential community in a commercial, heavily trafficked CBD environment, in which accommodation favours transient groups. Given the multiple roles and multiple stake-holders in the CBD, one challenge is simply defining and identifying communities there, let alone elevating their presence in planning the built environment.

Resolving the tensions evident raises the following questions:

- ♦ Who is the CBD for?
- ♦ Who are the winners and losers?
- ♦ What sort of projects will deliver renewal?
- ♦ Do we have the right mix of accommodation types?
- ♦ Where is the job growth?
- ♦ Who should do the planning?

The emphasis in the CBD at present is upon the physical environment, with an attempt to recognise diverse needs through a precinct approach. The importance of the relationship that people have with the public realm in the CBD is also being recognised through provision of public artwork (P22), creating people friendly open spaces (P32) and urban design (W8). These latter approaches support community building in the CBD.

6.4 Issues for Suburban Auckland

There are also major challenges in the suburbs. This is highlighted by a focus in much of the work on lower decile suburbs– Tamaki, Glen Innes, Panmure, and Avondale. In these areas, a range of agencies, the council included, are working together to support communities across lines of difference and often in the face of financial and educational shortcomings. These tend to be the multi-cultural centres of Auckland City, also.

In these suburbs the key issues appear to relate to inclusion and material support for communities in need. Even in more prosperous or higher decile suburbs, exclusion is a growing issue, especially for the ageing “independent” cohort, but also for members of migrant groups.

Some of the more notable initiatives are those that aim to evoke a strong sense of place and mobilise local leadership, energy and ideas (P20, P21). Partnerships are a promising way forward, both with other governmental and non-governmental agencies and with community groups. A diverse and flexible approach to council facilities, libraries, community centres and halls, and recreational centres can support communities as they develop programmes, resources, and networks in accord with their particular needs (P11).

As in the CBD, the built and natural environments are important in terms of public art and amenity, good linkages and people friendly public space, and in terms of creating a sense of place that residents can identify with. In areas that are physically coherent, in which edges can be broadly defined, and in which town centres and community facilities provide meeting spaces, the prospects for building strong communities are sound.

6.5 Challenges facing some young people

There was considerable discussion in the literature about the tensions young immigrants in particular experience, caught between a desire to maintain an interest in their language and culture and the natural desire to fit into the host community (G22 and G24). The Hula Haka report (G18) painted a picture of Pacific youth who are caught between two cultures that do not fit easily together. Building strong communities will need to address these concerns.

6.6 Managing cultural diversity

Combating segregation and ghettoisation of ethnic communities (through wealth or poverty), while supporting the need for members of particular ethnic groups to be together geographically, is a challenge for planners and government agencies. Isolation of members of one ethnic group from another generates understandings based more on caricature than affinity and can support stereotyping (C16). While compact city approaches may be advanced in the interests of environmental benefits compared to alternatives, entrenched ethnic segregation is likely to weaken social cohesion.

If new immigration laws focus on attracting skilled workers who are more mobile, their expectations from the host country may be higher and if disappointed they may simply move on. Recent migration figures suggest this may be already happening, with a decline of 28% in immigration to Auckland City in 2004 and a further decline of 50% in 2005.

There is an apparent absence of debate with host communities on the rationale for immigration and on appropriate immigration policies. This is surprising given concerns about racial tensions and the politicisation of the issue. In terms of “welcoming newcomers” the following issues were raised in the literature.

- ♦ There is a need for increased and more holistic settlement services.
- ♦ There are perceptions of increasing racial tensions.
- ♦ Perceived development of “cultural enclaves” is a concern.
- ♦ Some were concerned that an increasingly multicultural society will compromise the bicultural relationship between Maori and Pakeha as expressed in the Treaty of Waitangi.

There is a presumption that successful settlement of migrants will tackle cross-cultural issues, but more work is needed on a wider strategic approach to the increasing cultural diversity in Auckland City. Minority identity and social and economic integration is being tackled through the Intercultural Cities project. This is part of an international initiative by UK based Comedia, working with Brecknock Associates of Australia (W12).

6.7 Summary

The impediments to strong communities are physical and social. Significant physical barriers are those that enforce separation, the most obvious being major transport corridors. Lack of personal mobility among some groups may compound the difficulties created by physical impediments. Land use can also be an impediment as suggested by the CBD research, which highlights the diversity of uses and stakeholders in the area.

Social impediments relate to demographic differences, particularly ethnic and ethnically-based cultural differences. The failure to meet the needs of particular demographic groups – young people, for example – may also act against building strong communities.

7.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL

Just as there is no simple or exclusive definition of community, there is no single prescription for building strong communities. While all of the Council's activities contribute in some way to strengthening communities, the documents reviewed made many suggestions as to how the Council can do its job better. A framework emerges which is best captured (in this literature) by the Council's existing Community Governance Model, which is implemented in the Glen Innes project (P21). It is founded in theories of social capital and reflects a move towards greater community self-determination.

The model of community practices below allows for some staging or experimental approaches within the resources available to Council. It is adapted from Bearing Point's work (W7). It distinguishes on the left hand side from a more community-oriented approach to providing top down services, moving to more community empowerment approaches on the right hand side. All three are needed to build strong communities.

	Community Services	Forms of Community Development	Community Action
Aims	Develop community oriented services and organisations	Promote self-defined community	Campaign for community interests
Participants	Organisations/service users as partners	Community defining and meeting its own needs	Give voice to all groups
Methods	Maximising community and user involvement and inter-agency links	Cooperative processes for capacity building and action research (communities supported to do their own research)	Support communities to develop ways to participate
Support Roles	Service managers providing services and interacting with users	Professional facilitators working in a non-directive way	Communities mobilising for action

In line with the approaches above, it is important to recognise the complex nature of communities and to avoid homogenising in policy and practice. The focus should be on building from what people have in common (convergence), rather than focusing on differences. In this way, communities may build their own capacity to resolve implicit and explicit differences.

People and communities must be viewed as active agents rather than passive recipients of change (C16), and more explicit acknowledgement made of peoples' involvement in multiple communities over their life cycle.

There is no one golden model that will miraculously produce strong functional communities across Auckland City. It is more a matter of identifying and moving

forward the building blocks as outlined in Section 5.0 and minimising the barriers as outlined in Section 6.0.

Building on the framework above, the implications of the documents reviewed for Auckland City Council when developing its policy framework for building strong communities are as follows.

7.1 Role based approach to building strong communities

The current community/social development foci for Auckland City Council is on supporting interaction through public spaces and facilities, resourcing community groups, and providing a limited range of community services. Possible Council roles in building strong communities involve:

1. What it provides directly (Council does it).
2. What it facilitates (Council supports others to do it).
3. What it advocates for (Council lobbies others to do it).
4. What it works with others to do (partnering approaches).

Instead of its traditional physical environment and community development focus, Council can choose for any particular issue the role or mix of roles it wishes to play (provision, facilitation, advocacy or partnership). In most instances a mix of roles will be appropriate, as Council involvement in any single issue is rarely straightforward. A framework for building strong communities can focus on appropriate roles at particular times rather than fixed models of involvement or focus (i.e. what it does or doesn't get involved in). This is a more flexible and responsive approach that can respond to priorities and changing needs quickly.

Defining the Council's roles according to circumstance means gaining community involvement in service development and delivery (beyond sporadic consultation). It also means flexible provision that can adapt to changing needs and wants. Facilities and programmes that reflect community as well as council imperatives, and community input as a means of community empowerment are clear priorities in the literature.

As such, working with the community to get the mix of services, programmes and facilities right may be more important and effective in building strong communities than simply refining the functions of individual facilities.

7.2 Resource sustained community organising and leadership

The suggestion is that the Council should seek opportunities and means of resourcing communities to develop the leadership and skills to advance their own interests. This includes supporting the emergence and maintenance of community advocates, leaders and activists. This may have implications for funding community organisations and some community projects/programmes (i.e. longer funding terms than one year). At the

same time, some research (P11) showed that few people are interested in participation at the levels associated with traditional broad based community development approaches. Instead, Council can:

- ♦ Support the development of leadership in the community at all levels.
- ♦ Support local residents and interest groups to organise and take action around issues of interest to them.

Supporting volunteers and volunteering organisations is also key to continuing adequate social support, facilities and services in Auckland City.

7.3 Governance and leadership

The Future Auckland research called for leadership to be regionally organised to ensure resources were shared and duplication reduced. This would also ensure a strong regional voice when advocating to central government and others. Leadership was seen as needing to:

- ♦ Be visionary and future focused.
- ♦ Encourage participation of constituents through genuine, realistic consultation.
- ♦ Work effectively with Maori.
- ♦ Work with Pacific communities to ensure they are an integral part of decision-making processes.
- ♦ Engage with refugee and migrant communities.
- ♦ Foster community development and support community groups in their work.

Conflicts between and among communities however defined are inevitable. It is the way in which the governance process allows this conflict to emerge and be resolved that will influence the strength of local communities and people's willingness to participate.

A key aspect of good governance and leadership involves collaboration and partnership development. Building strong communities is a collaborative exercise. Communities generally don't have the resources to drive their own development and the community sector tends to be poorly resourced. Government agencies tend to focus on national policy and decision-making and the welfare needs of individuals and households, albeit that some central initiatives do contribute to strong communities on the ground. This leaves local authorities with central responsibility for the needs of local communities, and for advocating to central government on their behalf in partnership with them.

A focus on collaboration, partnership and building community capability to support self-determined development is in line with recent government policy⁴. The Future Auckland research clearly identified that partnerships and collaboration are seen as key to the success of Auckland's future. These can be across the board, involving the public,

⁴ "A Framework for Developing Sustainable Communities – A Discussion Paper", 2002, Department of Internal Affairs, p8.

private and community sectors. Partnerships with iwi and Maori were also seen as critical to the future development of Auckland. Identifying priority areas for collaboration is needed (see 7.5 below), given the time and energy intensive nature of collaboration.

7.4 Foster (local) participation

The need for programmes and events that facilitate networking, encourage social inclusion, and support participation in community matters are cited in many studies. Some research, e.g. the Eastern Bays focus groups, suggest that supporting active participation might be the single most critical aspect of building strong communities, lifting people from a passive concern for safety, security and familiarity to a level at which they seek to know their neighbours and neighbourhood and participate in community matters. This includes taking part in political decision-making, local activities and recreation, and acknowledging that people tend to want to engage around issues of particular interest to them.

7.5 Focus on the big city-wide levers

The preceding discussion has been pitched mainly at how Council can respond locally to the needs of local communities. There are also some areas in which the documents indicate action is required at a city-wide level. The key levers affecting the building of strong communities across Auckland City that need to be addressed at a policy level are as follows (in no order). Note that Auckland City Council does not have a direct provider role in some of these areas, but can coordinate, facilitate and advocate for improvements.

- ♦ Supporting local economic development and employment opportunities.
- ♦ Settlement services and support.
- ♦ Involvement of Maori in the leadership and development of Auckland City.
- ♦ Bicultural understanding and clarifying what biculturalism means in this increasingly multicultural society.
- ♦ Just and sustainable immigration policies, which have the support of host communities.
- ♦ Increasing intercultural interaction and understanding.
- ♦ Maintaining and enhancing personal safety and security.
- ♦ Resolving transport issues.
- ♦ Affordable, accessible and high quality housing.
- ♦ Quality of the natural and physical environment, especially in the CBD. In an era where there is an institutional focus on increasing urban densities, the quality of building design, public spaces, heritage values, parks, reserves and public art all come to the fore to offset the limited capacity of people in communities to shape their own environments.
- ♦ Developing a regional/city wide vision to drive the place-based policy and action.

These are the areas to prioritise in terms of resourcing, partnership development and advocacy over the medium term.

8.0 FURTHER WORK NEEDED

From the literature reviewed, areas where more work would be beneficial are as follows (in no order of priority). Note that this is based on the documents reviewed for this report, and that some areas may already be covered or available from other sources. There is also a need to build on work previously done and to develop systems to easily identify and access this work, for example electronic databases of research and work commissioned under key headings or by Council department, which is accessible to all staff. This would support the development of Council as a learning organisation, and ensure that the intellectual memory of the organisation is sustained even as individual staff move on.

Note also that Council can advocate that other agencies do some of the further work below, for example further work on migration.

Area or issue	Comment
Community consultation and engagement	Develop a comprehensive approach to community consultation and engagement. This should respond to current claims of over-consultation or consultation fatigue, and identify more effective vehicles for community engagement and participation in issues of interest and the future development of Auckland City. It should also focus on voices that do not tend to be heard in traditional consultation processes.
How research, policy and planning can respond to increasing diversity	How to counter the tendencies in policy and (urban) planning processes and regulations to not acknowledge or respond to the diversity of needs in the population. This involves staff training to understand the diversity in Auckland city and what this means for their work. A filter could also be developed that examines the impacts on different groups of policy and service options, to ensure that cultural and social issues are included in policy and planning.
Transport	More detailed work is needed on the role of transport in strengthening or weakening communities and what mix of responses will best address the problems identified.
Community and voluntary sectors	How these sectors can be supported to develop leadership and build stronger communities, using local resources and leaders.

Managing conflict	Explore effective processes for managing conflict both within and across communities.
Impact of traditional Council activities on communities	Explore the impact on communities of traditional Council service delivery and how these can reinforce or undermine community wellbeing, for example waste, water and planning.
Migrants and host communities	Examine the differing needs of short term versus long-term migrants, and host community views on migration. Further work is needed on the different types of migrant groups in Auckland city and their different needs and expectations.
Sustainable development	How sustainable development principles and concepts can support building stronger communities in Auckland City.
Economic and social development	Related to the above, clarify the links between social and economic development, including how economic development policies and action can enhance or impede building strong communities.
Housing	Detailed housing research relevant to community building, including issues of density, planning and design.
Measuring success in building strong communities ⁵	Identifying appropriate measures of success for building strong communities in Auckland City. These can be based on the elements identified in this report and from international literature.

This is a substantial list, which can be ordered into a coherent programme. A key to doing this, and advancing the Council's capacity to contribute to community building, may well be through the partnerships the Council can develop, both with other agencies and with the communities concerned.

⁵ Key sources to refer to from the literature reviewed for this report are: Asia New Zealand Foundation: Engaging Asian Communities in New Zealand (G22); the Sense of Community Index (Chavis G17); Spellerberg 2001; and the measures used by CYFS in their SCAF programme (which includes Glen Innes), see <http://www.msd.govt.nz/publications/journal/21-march-2004/21-pages67-82.html>

and <http://www.mapl.com.au/A2.htm>.

Appendix One: Documents Reviewed

As the starting point for this exercise, officers within Auckland City Council were asked to identify and supply all documents that they were aware of since 2000 that addressed matters affecting communities or community development in Auckland City.

The documents reflect the perspective of the various departments, and how and why they deal with communities. Some departments supplied fewer documents than others, indicating differences in contact, consultation and dealings with communities. For example, few of the commissioned or internal documents reviewed reflect traditional infrastructure services.

The consultant team was requested to seek out other documents, with reference for example to the Auckland Regional Council, New Zealand Police, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Social Development and relevant academic documents. In the event, few directly related to the subject matter were forthcoming.

The documents were reviewed according to a template developed for the purpose (Appendix 2). Because many were drawn from Council files and were not necessarily published documents, referencing was often incomplete, and commissioning departments not explicit.

After a preliminary scan, documents were grouped into broadly common subject areas as a basis for the review. This was done in order to manage the review process, and to help identify common themes in key areas.

The grouping of documents for review purposes was arbitrary, however, with many containing information pertinent to two or more categories. However, an internal discussion paper was prepared around these categories, which following workshops with the client team, became the foundation for this report.

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
Context – Issues				
C1	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Auckland Regional Settlement Strategy
C2		ACC		Background to Future Auckland Community Outcome Research
C3				City Economics/Transport travel time modelling CBD
C4	2005	Syme, McGregor and Mead	Auckland Sustainable Cities Programme.	Social Implications of Intensive Housing
C5	2005	Sue Cooper		Digital Communities Project Report
C6	2005	ACC	Internal ACC	Summary of Future Auckland Research – Auckland is Interesting and Enjoyable
C7	2005	ACC	Internal ACC	Summary of Future Auckland Research – Having a Beautiful and Natural Environment
C8	2004	ACC	Internal ACC	Future Auckland: Identification of Community Outcomes
C8b	2005	Wong,	Tamaki Community Board	“Glen Innes into the Future” Strategy: Action Plan
C10	2005		Auckland District Health Board	Strategic Plan 2005-2010 Consultation Document
C11	2005	Gravitas Research	ACC	First City of the Pacific Survey – Results for September 2004 – August 2005
C12	2005		Ministry of Social Development	The Social Report
C13	2005	Gravitas Research	Council	Quality of Life In New Zealand’s Largest Cities – Results for Auckland City
C14	2004	Market Economics	Council	The Nature and Scale of Migration Movements to and from Auckland City and Auckland Region
C15		Tracy Whitehouse	ACC	Community Outcomes Topline Summary of Qualitative Findings
C16	2003	Murphy, Friesen & Kearns		“The Divided City and Urban Sustainability: Auckland’s experience of ethnic segregation and social polarisation”, in “Living Space: Towards sustainable settlements in New Zealand” Freeman and Thompson-Fawcett eds, University of Otago Press
C17	2000	Friesen et al.		Mapping Change and Difference: a Social Atlas
C18	2004	Melanie Anae		“From Kava to Coffee: the Browning of Auckland”, in Almighty Auckland, 2004, Carter, Craig and Matthewman eds
C19	2005	ACC		Summary of Future Auckland Research – Opportunities to Earn

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
C20	2005	Lyons, Pradan	ACC	Snapshot: Auckland's Creative Industries
C21	2004	Allen & Clarke	Auckland Regional Sports Trust Alliance	Sport and Physical Activity : A Review of the Evidence
C22	2004	Centre for Gambling Studies	Auckland Councils	Gambling Impact Assessment
C23	2005	IDEAction	ARC	Identifying key themes based on resident feedback on the future of Auckland region
Facilities Documents				
F1		2004	Internal ACC	Summary of Future Auckland Research – access to social and health services
F2		2004	Internal ACC	Summary of Future Auckland Research – efficient transport
F3	2000	Libraries Manager	Community Development Committee	Library Services to Older Adult Customers and Mobile Services
F4	2000	Libraries Manager	Community Development Committee	Library Services to Older Adult Customers and Other Key Sectors
F5	2000	Libraries Manager	Community Development Committee	Library Services to Older Adult Customers and Mobile Library Services 2
F6	2001	Access Specialist, Libraries	Community Development Committee	Update on Library Services to Older Adults
F7	2000	Forsyte Research		Community and Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment: Avondale/Roskill Ward
F8	2002	ACC Libraries	Not specified	Glen Innes Community Library Profile – Draft
F9	2002	Leisure & Arts Planning Manager	Community Services Committee	Otahuhu Library and Community Centre Future Options
F10	2002	Datacom Systems		Auckland City Libraries Technical Architecture
F11	2002	Datacom Systems		Auckland City Libraries Web Strategy (Draft)
F12	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Auckland City Library User
F13	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Avondale Library User

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
F14	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Blockhouse Bay Library User
F15	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Epsom Library User
F16	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Glen Innes Library User
F17	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Mt Wellington Library User
F18	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Grey Lynn Library User
F19	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Leys Institute Library User
F20	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Mt Albert Library User
F21	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Mt Roskill Library User
F22	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Onehunga Library User
F23	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Otahuhu Library User
F24	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Parnell Library User
F25	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Pt Chevalier Library User
F26	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Remuera Library User
F27	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the St Heliers Library User
F28	2002	Longdill & Assocs	Council	Profile of the Waiheke Library User
F29	2002	NZ Tourism Research Institute		Community Gardens Focus Group Repor
F30	2003	Catherine Early, Victoria University	Thesis, Victoria Uni of Wellington	An investigation into public library services for new migrants to New Zealand
F31	2003	Gravitas Research	City Libraries	Review of Auckland City Libraries' Services 2003
F32	2003	Manager, Libraries		Mobile Library: proposed changes to routes
F33	2003	Longdill &	City Libraries	Understanding the Central Library User

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
		Assocs		
F34	2003	Mobius Research & Strategy	Community Planning	Usage of Auckland City Leisure and Recreation Facilities – Research Report
F35	2003	Mobius Research & Strategy	Regional Council	Customer Experience Monitor: Auckland Regional Parks, Draft Final Report
F36	2004	Anita Coy	Library Review programme	Community Libraries Review Final Report, Draft
F37	2004	Gravitas Research	Council	Community Resources Model Survey Report,
F38	2004	Gravitas Research	Council	Sylvia Park – Community Facility Needs Assessment
F39	2004	Hope McKinstry	Library Review programme	Central City Library Review Final Report
F40	2005	Anita Coy	Library Review programme	Community Libraries Review Final Report – Version 1.4 Executive Summary
F41	2005	Gravitas Research	Council	Use of and Attitudes to Open Space & Communal Onsite Facilities
F43	2003	Group Manager - Libraries	Community Services	Mobile Library: proposed changes to routes
F44	2005	Sue Cooper	Digital Strategies Steering Group	Digital Communities Project
F45	2002	Amadeus and Datacom	Auckland City Libraries	Internet Initiatives & associated documents
F46	2002	Datacom Systems	Auckland City Libraries	Web Strategy (Draft)
F47	2004	Gravitas Research	Community Development	Community Resource Modelling - Level Draft of Provision
F48	2003	No Doubt Research	Council	Mt Wellington Quarry Social & Community Needs Assessment
Groups Documents				
G1	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Involving migrant and refugee communities in service and policy development
G2	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and Compulsory Education
G3	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and Employment
G4	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and English language for adults
G5	2005	Alison	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and Health

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
		Hudgell		
G6	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and Host Communities
G7	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and Housing
G8	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement and Local Government
G9	2005	Alison Hudgell	Mayoral Forum	Settlement-related Services
G10	2003	Asian Public Health Project	Ministry of Health	Asian Public Health Project Report
G11	2003	The Providence Report Ltd.	Syndicated	Kiwi Asia
G12	2004	Gia Nghi Phung:	Council	Avondale Asian Community Workshop Phase 2
G13	2004	Gravitas Research	Council	Community Resources Model Survey Report – Apartment Dwellers Compared to Non-Apartment Dwellers
G14	2004	The Providence Report.	Syndicated	Welcome to the New New Zealand
G15	2005	Internal	Community Development & Equity	What the Children Told Us: Summary of research conducted for Auckland City’s Draft Child and Family Policy
G16	2005	Electoral Commission -Dr Helena Catt,	Conference Paper	Children and young people as citizens: Participation, provision and protection, for 6 th child and family policy conference, University of Otago, Dunedin
G17	2005	Gravitas Research	Council	A survey of higher density development dwellers in Auckland’s CBD North
G18	2005	The Providence Report Limited	Syndicated	Hula Haka Research
G19	2005	The Providence Report Limited	Council	Relevant insights to Auckland City from the Providence Reports on Kiwiasia, New Zealand and Hula Haka
G20	2005	Kudos	Council	ACC Demographic Mapping, Duncan Stuart: Summary of Mapping Exercise
G21	2005	McGrath,	Asia:NZ	Asian Communities: Detailed Literature Review

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
		Butcher, Pickering & Smith	Foundation	
G22	2005	McGrath, Butcher, Pickering & Smith	Asia:NZ Foundation	Engaging Asian Communities in New Zealand
G23	2000	Kudos	ACC	Asian Community Needs:, lifestyle and interaction with Auckland City Council
G24	2005	Ethnic Voice NZ Inc.	(Supported by ACC)	Voice of Ethnic Youth
G25	2004	Megan Fidler	ACC	Asian People in the CBD: A literature review
G26	2005	Kudos	ACC Inter cultural Cities programme	Literature Search of central government policies and reports, and academic discussion on: biculturalism, multiculturalism and cultural diversity, immigration, creative industries, creativity and innovation
G27	2004	Anne Henderson		The Settlement Experiences of Migrants
G28	2004	Quartez, Jacobsen, Fuemana	Not Given	Open Decks – Avondale Youth express their views (sponsored video)
G29	2004	Megan Fidler Research	CBD Project Team	Asian Peoples in the CBD: Literature Review: the Ethnic Diversity framework Project
Place-Based Documents				
P1		Annette Campion	Newmarket's Future Project	A Social Assessment of Newmarket: an analysis of Social, Recreation, Education and Health Provision and Future Trends
P2	ND	Not Given	Not Given	Avondale Consultation Notes
P3	1999	Megan Fidler	Community Planning	Liveable Communities – a Discussion of Potential Social Impacts of Intensification Eastern SGMA – Western SGMA
P4	2003	Caroline Robinson	Community Planning	Panmure Sense of Place Scrapbook
P5	2003	De Beer Marketing & Communica- tion	Council	Aspirations for the Auckland CBD Experience
P6	2003	New River	Council	Auckland City CBD social and cultural development research
P7	2003	No Doubt Research	CBD Strategic Directions Project	Auckland City's CBD Report 1: A Metadata Analysis of Auckland City Council's Research around Social and

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
				Cultural Workstream Themes
P8	2003	No Doubt Research	CBD Strategic Directions Project	Auckland City's CBD Report 3: A Metadata Analysis of Auckland City Council's Research Around the Key Tensions in the CBD
P9	2003	No Doubt Research	CBD Strategic Directions Project	Auckland City's CBD Report 5: Social and Cultural Workstream Research Metadata Templates
P10	2004	Gravitas Research	CBD Development	Nelson Quarter Social & Residential Needs Assessment
P11 A	2005	CityScope Consultants	Community planning	Community Needs Assessment Eastern Bays and Tamaki Wards – Stage 1 Issues Analysis
P11b	2005	CityScope Consultants	Community planning	Community Needs Assessment Eastern Bays and Tamaki Wards – Stage 2 Report Community Needs Analysis
P12	2005	Cathy Casey & Charles Crothers	Council	Perceptions of Public Safety in the Auckland CBD
P13	2006		Council	Avondale Sense of Place Document, forthcoming
P14	2003	Leo Jew Consultants & No Doubt Research	Council	Avondale: A Metadata Analysis of Auckland City's Research
P15	2002	Patrick Partners	Council	Newmarket – its Roles and Position in the Auckland Region
P16	2005	Gravitas Research	Council	Wynyard Point Development Research
P17	2004	ACC	City Development Committee	Glen Innes into the future, Auckland Urban Living
P18	2004	City Development	Council	Newmarket's future framework, Auckland Urban Living
P19	2005	Not Given	Council	Defining Auckland's CBD: Summary – Urban Design Framework, confidential
P20	2005	Various	Council	This Place is Maungarei
P21	2005	Ka Mau Te Wero	Community	Glen Innes Visioning Project
P22	2005	Richard Reid	Community Planning Group	Auckland City CBD Public Art Work Development Plan
P23	2005	Not Given	Not Given	Draft CBD Public Open Space Plan
P24	2002	Mona Avia ACC	Community Development	Glen Innes Research Review
P25	2006		Council	Auckland City Safety Perceptions: high level summary report

Ref	Date	Author	Report to	Title
Context - Framework Documents				
W3	2002	Douglas Paton,	ACC Community Development	Modelling Community Empowerment to Manage Community Change and Development
W4	2004	Nexus Planning & Research (NZ) Ltd	ACC Community Development	Capacity Building Consultation Project
W5	2004	Rhiannon Herrick	Community Planning	Planning for the information needs of an increasing diverse community
W6	2002	Bollard and Associates	Community Development	Community Advice Into the Future
W7	2003	Bearing Point	ACC	Understanding Community Development – Literature Review
W8a	2005	Mayoral Task Force		Designing Auckland: A Springboard for Actoin
W8b	2005	Mayoral Task Force	ACC	Citywide Urban Design Strategy, Update, August 2005
W9	2003	Connexions Group New Zealand Ltd	Pae Herenga Tangata (ACC)	Taurahere Consultation Policy, November 2003
W10	2005	Duncan Stuart	ACC	Literature Search of central government policies and reports and academic discussion on biculturalism, multiculturalism and cultural diversity, migration, creative industries, creativity and innovation
W11	2005	Motu Social Research	FRST Funded research	Defining Geographic Communities
W12	2006	Brecknock Consulting	ACC	Intercultural City: Auckland Case Study Report - Draft

Appendix Two – Review Template

Document	
Author	
Commissioned by	
Date	
Status	
Reviewer	

Purpose

Research objectives & questions

Method

Sources (primary, secondary)

Who was addressed/represented?

What was covered?

Strengths

Weaknesses

Significance (validity/value)

Substantive Findings – knowledge (relative to research questions)

Principle Conclusions (relative to purpose)

Omissions

Relevance to Current Analysis (communities, building strong communities, resilient communities, coping well with growth, enjoying diversity, welcoming newcomers, - what is meant by these terms, barriers, initiatives, indicators):

Definitions of community etc.

Desirability of strong/resilient communities

Actions that could assist and agents who may be responsible

Outstanding questions