


Analysis of Feedback: Quantitative Data

Feedback Received for Annual Plan Consultation																										
Dates	All feedback to 11.59pm on 22 May 2020																									
Number of responses to date	164 responses via Bang the Table (BTT) from 163 individuals and 1 organisation																									
	18 email/post submissions from individuals																									
	28 email/post submissions from organisations																									
Demographic results for all feedback																										
Ward (164 responses from BTT and 5 email/post responses)																										
Central	20% (33)	<table border="1"> <caption>Ward Feedback Distribution</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Ward</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Central</td> <td>20%</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern</td> <td>19%</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harbour</td> <td>18%</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern</td> <td>8%</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wainuiomata</td> <td>23%</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western</td> <td>11%</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>1%</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ward	Percentage	Count	Central	20%	33	Eastern	19%	32	Harbour	18%	31	Northern	8%	13	Wainuiomata	23%	39	Western	11%	19	Other	1%	2
Ward	Percentage		Count																							
Central	20%		33																							
Eastern	19%		32																							
Harbour	18%		31																							
Northern	8%		13																							
Wainuiomata	23%		39																							
Western	11%		19																							
Other	1%	2																								
Eastern	19% (32)																									
Harbour	18% (31)																									
Northern	8% (13)																									
Wainuiomata	23% (39)																									
Western	11% (19)																									
Other	1% (2)																									
Age (164 responses from BTT)																										
Under 30	7% (12)	<table border="1"> <caption>Age Feedback Distribution</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Under 30</td> <td>7%</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30-39</td> <td>26%</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40-49</td> <td>17%</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50-59</td> <td>23%</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-69</td> <td>17%</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 & over</td> <td>9%</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Age Group	Percentage	Count	Under 30	7%	12	30-39	26%	42	40-49	17%	28	50-59	23%	38	60-69	17%	28	70 & over	9%	15			
Age Group	Percentage		Count																							
Under 30	7%		12																							
30-39	26%		42																							
40-49	17%		28																							
50-59	23%		38																							
60-69	17%		28																							
70 & over	9%	15																								
30-39	26% (42)																									
40-49	17% (28)																									
50-59	23% (38)																									
60-69	17% (28)																									
70 & over	9% (15)																									
Rate Payer (164 responses from and 7 email/post responses)																										
No	17% (29)	<table border="1"> <caption>Rate Payer Feedback Distribution</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Rate Payer Status</th> <th>Percentage</th> <th>Count</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>17%</td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>83%</td> <td>142</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rate Payer Status	Percentage	Count	No	17%	29	Yes	83%	142															
Rate Payer Status	Percentage		Count																							
No	17%		29																							
Yes	83%		142																							
Yes	83% (142)																									
• Residential	95% (136)																									
• Commercial	5% (7)																									
• Rural	5% (7)																									
• Network Utility	-																									

Agreement or disagreement with the overall approach outlined in one-year emergency budget and draft Annual Plan 2020-21


Overall, 60 percent of those who responded agreed with the overall approach being taken.

Ratepayers were less likely to be in agreement (57 percent agreed) with the approach than non-ratepayers (71 percent agreed).



	Number of responses			Percentage (not incl. not stated)		
	BTT	Email or Post	Total	BTT	Email or Post	Total
Strongly agree	26	2	28	16%	*	17%
Agree	67	5	72	42%	*	43%
Neutral	21	0	21	13%	*	13%
Disagree	24	1	25	15%	*	15%
Strongly disagree	20	0	20	13%	*	12%
Not stated	6	38	44			
Total	164	46	210			


*Note number of email/post responses is too small to use percentages



Does the proposed 3.8% overall rates increase strike the right balance

Nearly 60 percent of those who responded agreed the proposed 3.8% overall rates increase struck the right balance.


Most (83 percent) non-ratepayers agreed along with just over half (54 percent) of responding ratepayers.




	Number of responses			Percentage (not incl. not stated)		
	BTT	Email or Post	Total	BTT	Email or Post	Total
Yes, I agree	91	6	97	58%	*	59%
No, higher rates increase	21	0	21	13%	*	13%
No, lower rates increase	44	3	47	28%	*	28%
Not stated	8	37	45			
Total	164	46	210			

*Note number of email/post responses is too small to use percentages

Ratepayers



Non-ratepayers



Which of three Rates Split options do you prefer?

Over three quarter of those who responded preferred option 1, Council’s preferred option.



There was no difference between the preferences of ratepayers and non-ratepayers – over three quarters of both groups preferred option 1.

All those who pay rural rates selected option 1. Of the six respondents who pay commercial rates two preferred option1, three preferred option 2 and one did not respond.



	Number of responses			Percentage (not incl. not stated)		
	BTT	Email or post	Total	BTT	Email or post	Total
Option 1	117	5	122	78%	*	77%
Option 2	26	3	29	17%	*	18%
Option 3	7	0	7	5%	*	4%
Not stated	14	38	52			
Total	164	46	210			

*Note number of email/post responses is too small to use percentages



	Residential	Commercial	Rural
Option 1	93	2	6
Option 2	21	3	0
Option 3	6	0	0
Not stated	10	1	0

Organisations

The following organisations gave feedback to Council's 2020-2021 Draft Annual Plan engagement

1. Flouride Free NZ
2. Sports New Zealand
3. Sport Wellington
4. Love Wainuiomata
5. Moera Community House
6. Te Rūnanganui o Te Atiawa ki te Upoko o Te Ika a Maui Inc
7. E tu
8. Health Care Aotearoa
9. Hutt Valley Living Wage Network
10. Dsport
11. Callaghan Innovation
12. Technology Valley Forums
13. Racetech
14. Petronic
15. Times-7
16. Living Streets Aotearoa
17. Youth Inspire
18. Wainuiomata Sportsville
19. Petone Community Board
20. Tawhiri Festivals and Experiences
21. Wainuiomata Trails Trust
22. Stride Investment Management Limited and Diversified NZ Property Trust
23. Business Central & Wellington Chamber of Commerce
24. Property Council New Zealand
25. Jackson Street Programme
26. Maungaraki Community Association
27. Hutt Valley Tennis
28. Wainuiomata Community Board
29. New Zealand Chinese Language Week