Aucklanders' Attitudes to Auckland's Growth and Environment

Charles Crothers
School of Social Sciences
Auckland University of Technology

Abstract

To New Zealanders south of the Bombay Hills, Auckland is generally seen as a vibrant economic powerhouse perhaps more closely affiliated within an Australasian/Pacific or even Asian set of cities than to the rest of New Zealand. This paper draws on a recent survey in Auckland to ascertain the extent to which Aucklanders themselves share this perspective and to explore what Aucklanders see as the positive and negative features of their region. In particular, themes of attitudinal differences towards the metropolitan region amongst people placed in different parts of Auckland's social structure are explored, drawing on data from the "Aucklanders' Attitudes to Auckland (AAA)" project.

Literature Review: Urban Growth Machines

People's attitudes are important in the operation of an urban region. These shape the extent to which matters are debated publically and may also influence how votes are cast in local (or even national) elections. However, to some extent the public's views are also shaped by the broader political economy of the region, and there is an interaction between these. In particular, there will be different viewpoints publically articulated by those with different "interests" in the region, and it is the effects of these elite viewpoints which are particularly salient in guiding the formation of public opinion. Understanding of these elite viewpoints may be enhanced by seeing them in terms of a (not always open) struggle between growth and anti-growth coalitions – as in the "growth machine" model.

In the late 1980s John Logan and Harvey Molotch consolidated their earlier parallel but separate work in urban sociology by writing their highly acclaimed book *Urban Fortunes: the political economy of place* (1987). Their work is a serious attempt to put urban sociology or the study of places on a sound theoretical footing. They draw on two of the main traditions of urban sociology – human ecology and its successors and Marxian urban political economy - but attempt to merge these to provide a more unified approach. This work could stand alongside (although Logan and Molotch do not make the trans-Atlantic connective leap) earlier British work in urban sociology on 'housing classes' and urban social theory more generally (see Saunders, 1986).

Their argument is that cities must be understood as centering around urban property relations. Urban life involves production processes in which 'place entrepreneurs' are pitted against urban residents. Place entrepreneurs ceaselessly endeavour to attract more investment (often controlled by more general entrepreneurs: e.g. capital investors, industrialists, etc.) to the sites they own, and they engage in competition amongst themselves (both locally and between cities) to attract investment. Each city becomes a 'growth machine' in which the local place entrepreneurs cooperate to increase the aggregate rent levels of their property. This "… growth ethic pervades virtually all aspects of local life, including the political system, the agenda for economic development, and even cultural organizations like baseball teams and museums" (Logan & Molotoch, 1987, p.13). Since potential investors and in-migrants are often influenced by wider aspects of the city image, care needs to be taken to prune this to fit their expectations, against the background of competing places.

More generally, it must be stressed that Growth machines operate in different ways at different times and places, although there has been much temporal and spatial continuity (at least in modern capitalist societies) in their general thrust towards growth. Local governments—despite their protestations about promoting goals held by locals—tend to fall in line with, and even actively promote, their local growth machine. Councillors are often drawn from the ranks of those involved in the growth machine itself, and their prestige (and even pay-packets) along with that of their officials, often rises with urban growth, as the necessary local government bureaucracy swells in size. Local policies and programmes such as land use zoning assist in the drive for growth. In turn, growth machines are situated within wider contexts and these have consequences for their efforts. The ability of any growth machine to effect growth is shaped by the city's situation within the system of cities, and involving city-specific characteristics such as city size, regional location etc. And the success any urban growth machine achieves will often shape the growth trajectory of the town in relation to the system and hierarchy of other cities.

The life chances of residents are affected by growth machines, which tend not to be too concerned with the effects of their activities on the local people. Whereas place entrepreneurs are concerned with generating the maximum achievable exchange value of their property, residents are more concerned with use value. And sometimes (perhaps very often) these interests are pitted against each other. "Neighbourhood stability .. is dependent on an area's strategic utility to the growth machine apparatus. Neighbourhoods whose obliteration would better see growth goals are subject to the strongest pressure; unless their residents and organisations are high enough in the hierarchies of power to resist, neighbourhoods are sacrificed to the growth goal" (Logan & Molotoch, 1987, p.14). On the other hand, neighbourhoods may resist. So, Logan and Molotch add that "Such neighbourhood attributes as the mode of interpersonal supports, the presence or absence of an indigenous business class, and race and racism also help shape specific outcomes" (Logan & Molotoch, 1987, p.14).

Growth machines are clearly endemic in New Zealand as much as North America and many accounts of early New Zealand capitalism document the flamboyant excesses of boosterism (see Crothers, 1984). However, these efforts have seldom been interpreted in terms of this type of

model. It is arguable that in New Zealand's basically 'British' legal framework, with rather more of an emphasis on separating state and economy, that the efforts of the commercial and political arms of our growth machines produce a less virulent version of urban growth machines here.

This "growth machine" analytical approach has been used in a range of studies, and a decade after the book was published, an article summarising two decades of empirical work on urban growth machines claimed substantial empirical backing for this approach (see Logan, Whaley, & Crowder, 1997). But there has also been useful critique. For example, Cox and Mair (1989) raise a plethora of points which need more attention in the "growth machines" approach: often ambiguities which have not been sorted through in the model (and remain conceptually un-repaired). In particular, they point to the wide range of relations which can exist between capitalists in general and 'place entrepreneurs'. The distinction, they suggest, is better made between 'place-dependent' (who do not necessarily have to own capital) and more footloose capitalists.

The lacuna in the literature concerning the role of citizens in reacting to the growth machine is even greater. The conditions which shape whether residents are likely to ally with or oppose place entrepreneurs have not been spelled out. In particular, it is arguable that many residents, especially those who are home owners (or even petite landlords), will have their property values pulled up through the activities of growth machines, which is generally to their advantage. Employees may obtain employment and/or higher wages as opportunities expand. Residents in general, whatever their property interests, may be caught up in swelling community pride, since growth machines trail a tail of pro-growth ideology. Also growth machines often help to provide general amenities of use to the citizenry in general. On the other hand, those with fixed incomes may not be so readily able to stem the tide of rising costs which is likely to accompany growth. Would-be home purchasers have rising difficulties in breaking into the housing market. Other factors may be a moderating force, especially in the New Zealand situation where local governments do not provide the array of services more often supplied at this scale in overseas jurisdictions (eg education, police, welfare services). The widespread ideology of 'ratepayer' interests tends to enjoin low local government expenditures, with the possible effect of detaching some local political energy from the growth machine's path. In sum, the patterns of citizens' reactions is likely to be complex.

While the concept of an urban growth machine seems reasonably clearcut, how any machine works, and the extent to which anti-growth alliances may built up against it, is unclear. Empirical research is necessary to sort out the efficacy of the idea. In this paper, I concentrate on trying to indicate the ways in which ordinary citizens are variously involved in supporting or opposing growth. My argument is that those whose interests are congruent with growth policies will tend to support them, whereas others will be either neutral or even oppositional. Elites that govern or invest in city expansion can operate independently of the public: particularly where there is little public concern. Once mobilised, however, public opinion can come to bear in setting the parameters of the growth machine's operation. This is particularly so when support is provided to any anti-growth coalition. The public pressures can affect planning regulations but also can

create a climate in which it is more difficult for development activities to proceed. The attitudinal data provided in this paper indicate the extent to which the Auckland public is likely to become involved in pressure or even action in relation to future urban development.

Before turning to the study whose results are being reported here, I need to place my study within local literatures on Auckland's growth and attitudes to this.

Existing Auckland Literature

There has developed a new tradition in New Zealand of considerable surveying of local authority citizenry but this has largely been aimed at ascertaining levels of satisfaction with council services. A more recent addition to the array of local authority initiated research has been the six (and now 12) big cities quality of life survey (2001, 2003, 2005), and also Auckland's own life-style magazine (*Metro*) recently published the first of what it intends to be an annual cycle of surveys (Legat et al., 2003). Selected results from the Metro survey are summarised in Appendix 2.

Alongside these newer developments there continues something of an older tradition of citizen participation (including the deployment of survey methodologies) in city planning development processes in which citizen-defined issues are taken as central and their views on development options important (several such studies have been carried out in Auckland: see summary in Crothers, 2001). In addition, there is some survey work concerning "local spatial issues" which has been developed separately from planning work (e.g. polls by DigiPoll for the *NZ Herald* and earlier Phoenix Research for the *Sunday Independent*. Heylen has also run Auckland-orientated survey work in the past). However, it can be difficult to track down some of this survey work, and this exercise is marked for attention as part of this project.

The Auckland Regional Growth Forum (ARGF) has conducted a programme into growth options for Auckland. Their consolidated report (1999) covers results from a newspaper mail drop questionnaire survey, telephone surveys of environmental awareness, focus group discussions, a business opinion survey, a survey of physical infrastructure providers, a survey of residential intensification developers, a survey of regional environmental organizations and submissions from the seven iwi authorities in the region. The report covers:
- values (what we like/dislike most about living in the Auckland region);
- urban qualities preferred in the future;
- preferred form of growth (where future population might be accommodated: eg options of compact city, satellite cities, peripheral expansion. Composite approach);
- attitudes to growth;
- priorities and choices;
- implementation issues.

However, this information needs to be updated and more systematically gathered. A further task with the survey data reported here is to link it to the earlier information collected by ARGF.

Study Aims and Performance

The aims of the AAA study was to provide a broad appreciation of the views and attitudes of Aucklanders (residents of one of the 4 main cities in the region together with the 3 district councils) in relation to 'metropolitan' Auckland (and their own local areas within Auckland) more specifically and NZ more generally. The study was designed to build on the interest in some of these issues aroused by the October 2001 local authority elections, although in fact the fieldwork took longer to organize and was perhaps somewhat affected by controversy concerning the ARC rate increase furore in mid-2003. More specifically, the study updates and tracks earlier studies of public attitudes to development and other issues arising in Auckland. The scatter of earlier studies referenced in Crothers 2001 each provide valuable insights into Aucklanders views, but in this study the issues raised in the earlier studies will be more systematically covered in terms both of the battery of questions and of the range of the sample. The earlier studies provide early time-lines of measurement, so that current views of the public can be compared to the earlier patterns. In turn, this temporal perspective implies the possibility of repeating this survey in the future, perhaps in conjunction with the next round of local authority elections.

The questionnaire was a much cut-back version of a questionnaire used in the South-East Queensland study (e.g. see Kemp et al., 1997). In a further paper, comparisons with the results of their studies (and perhaps other studies being carried out across a consortium of cities) will be made. The number of interviews obtained (as planned) was 400, which provides a 'margin of error' of some plus/minus 5 percent. The final response rate was 22 percent. This is lower than expected – although NRB report that their interviewers had to work very hard to achieve the 400 interviews. The results have been post-weighted to better reflect the population-sizes of the different local authorities in the region.

A major difficulty is that the questionnaire is not designed to ask questions directly pertinent to the topic of support of the urban growth machine in Auckland. However, indirectly linked attitude items can be utilised.

Results

The dissatisfactions with Auckland (up to 4 items were recorded) tend to be focused around several issues which are clearly size- or growth-related: traffic congestion, lack of public transport, cost of living, overcrowding, crime (see appendix 1). Positive features of the region are dispersed across twice as many categories, more diffusely, on natural amenities or man-made facilities. A scatter of comments relate to the appositeness of the city's size. Ratings give Auckland good marks for overall quality of life, natural environment, and facilities in general, but there is concern with the built environment and social conditions generally: whereas health

facilities are panned, educational facilities attract warmer feelings. Auckland's 'clean green' image takes a battering in the face of widespread condemnation of various forms of pollution, although those surveyed are less concerned about the long-term degradation of the environment through continuing urban sprawl.

(1) Negatives and Positives about Living in the Auckland Region

Negatives about living in Auckland (up to four comments recorded)

Category label	Code	Count	Responses	Cases
Traffic congestion/ too much traffic	1	177	37.8	44.4
Poor public transport	2	62	13.2	15.5
Overcrowded/too many people	3	33	7.1	8.4
The crime rate/too much crime/safety iss	4	28	6.0	7.1
Cost of living is high/cost of housing/h	5	35	7.4	8.7
Lack of employment opportunities	6	15	3.2	3.7
Pollution - air/water pollution	7	13	2.8	3.3
The weather	8	8	1.6	1.9
Parking problems	9	5	1.2	1.4
Too many immigrants	10	7	1.5	1.7
Racism	11	2	0.5	0.6
Unfriendly people/negative attitudes/rud	12	8	1.7	2.0
Poor driving	13	8	1.7	2.0
Fast pace of life	14	7	1.4	1.6
Size - too spread out	15	4	0.9	1.0
Others	19	37	8.0	9.4
Nothing negative	20	20	4.2	4.9
Total responses		469	100.0	117.6

Positives about living in Auckland (up to 4 comments recorded)

Category label	Code	Count	Responses	Cases
Employment opportunities	1	46	6.2	11.5
Handy to beaches/harbour/ water/lots of	2	96	13.0	24.0
Overall lifestyle/can have a good lifest	3	25	3.4	6.4
Beautiful city	4	23	3.1	5.7
Access to parks/green areas	5	28	3.8	7.1
The climate/weather	6	32	4.4	8.0
Friends and family are here	7	32	4.4	8.1
Lots to do/all the recreation and entert	8	83	11.3	20.8

Good facilities/everything you need	9	35	4.8	8.8
Availability of natural environment/bush	10	29	3.9	7.2
Good shopping facilities	11	38	5.1	9.5
Good educational facilities/ opportuniti	12	25	3.4	6.2
Handy to all amenities/everything easily	13	33	4.5	8.3
Friendly people	14	24	3.2	6.0
Wide variety of cultural activities	15	18	2.5	4.6
Clean environment/clean, green environme	16	14	1.8	3.4
Multi-cultural society/ diversity of peo	17	22	3.0	5.6
Good restaurants/cafes	18	9	1.2	2.2
Nice place to live/like Auckland/I love	19	16	2.2	4.0
Wide range of outdoor activities	20	12	1.6	2.9
Availability of sports activities	21	10	1.3	2.4
Nice sized city/not too big/ not very cr	22	3	0.5	0.9
Safe city/low level of crime	23	8	1.1	2.0
Access to countryside/ rural areas/open	24	11	1.5	2.8
Commercial capital of New Zealand	25	5	0.7	1.2
Availability of health services	26	5	0.7	1.3
Peaceful/quiet/slower pace	27	9	1.2	2.2
A big city/biggest city in New Zealand/v	28	13	1.8	3.3
Things are cheaper/free concerts, etc.	29	6	0.9	1.6
Accessibility to other places/links othe	30	6	0.8	1.6
Others	39	15	2.1	3.8
Nothing positive/can't think of anything	40	5	0.6	1.2
Total responses		736	100.0	184.5

When asked some general attitude questions respondents focused on growth/size-related issues, in particular public transport, and (presumably its flip-side in the eyes of many) traffic congestion, and then indicated moderately high levels of concern about the regional economy and about preserving farmland, before indicating any concern with Auckland's size: although 40 percent agreed that Auckland had too many people. Whereas a quarter were happy about the effectiveness being shown with Auckland local government's job in managing growth and development, 40 percent were unhappy and the remaining one third neutral. Very similar proportions considered their local councillors effective.

(2) Assessments of Quality of Life in the Auckland Region

		Very poor	Poor	Neither good nor poor	Good	Very good
Q1 Overall quality of life in Auckland region	%	1.1	3.8	28.0	51.2	15.9

Q2 Climate	%	1.0	8.5	33.1	44.9	12.6
Q2 Lifestyle	%	0.8	7.3	20.1	49.3	22.5
Q2 Services and facilities	%	1.3	7.6	21.1	42.8	27.1
Q2 Social conditions	%	7.1	27.3	37.3	23.7	4.7
Q2 Economic conditions	%	1.4	9.7	31.6	46.8	10.4
Q2 Natural environment	%	2.1	5.9	16.6	45.2	30.2
Q2 Built environment	%	6.8	28.9	35.5	24.4	4.4
Q2 Prov. of educational services	%	0.9	5.9	23.5	47.7	22.1
Q2 Prov. of health services	%	3.4	15.5	31.6	36.8	12.7

(3) Problems in the Auckland Region

		1: A very great problem	2	3	4	5: Not a problem
Q3 Air pollution	%	7.1	20.5	32.5	21.4	18.5
Q3 Noise pollution	%	3.3	14.7	33.8	30.7	17.5
Q3 Water pollution in rivers	%	8.4	29.8	30.3	23.4	8.1
Q3 Water pollution in harbours	%	11.8	33.9	34.3	17.0	3.0
Q3 Loss of wetland	%	7.9	14.9	52.7	15.0	9.5
Q3 Loss of natural areas	%	7.0	24.4	39.0	22.4	7.2
Q3 Cost of housing	%	36.3	33.3	18.6	8.2	3.5
Q3 Cost of living	%	17.1	31.9	38.0	10.4	2.6

(4) Issues about things in the Auckland region as a whole

	%	Strongly disagree	Dis-agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Q4 There are too many people in Auckland	%	6.5	25.9	21.4	29.7	16.5
Q4 I think that traffic congestion is a problem	%	2.6	4.2	5.2	32.0	55.9
Q4 We need better public transport in the Auckland region	%	0.6	3.4	10.0	31.1	54.9
Q4 A strong economy will depend on						

developing Auckland as a better place to live and work	%	1.4	6.9	14.9	51.8	24.9
Q4 Preserving farmland will improve the quality of life for future generations	%	1.0	9.9	19.9	43.2	25.9
Q4 Reliable safe public transport is important to the quality of life of residents in Auckland	%	0.3	2.2	9.7	37.8	50.0
Q4 Local govt. doing a good job in managing growth and development.	%	12.0	29.3	30.3	26.7	1.8
Q4 Local councillors in my community pay attention to what people think.	%	14.7	32.0	23.4	27.4	2.5

Examination of the Metro poll results (see summary provided in Appendix 2) shows similar sentiments to those reported in this survey, with Aucklanders falling into three even-sized groupings of those who are pro-growth, neutral or anti-growth. A slew of further concerns about size/growth-related issues is also obvious. Arrangements have been made to obtain this data-set so that parallel analyses can be pursued.

Further analysis of the AAA data-set followed the avenues of factor analysis to see if clear patterns lying behind people's attitudes could be elicited, and to explore which of the social background variables worked best as predictors. The factor analysis failed to clearly cluster attitudes to Auckland's size along with other growth-related concerns. Attitudes to Auckland in general seem to cluster fairly well together. Attitudes to size link to attitudes to cost of housing and traffic congestion. With the failure to establish a robust overall scale of attitudes to growth in Auckland, I took each of the variables which might have made up such a scale and cross-tabulated each against a range of social background variables, including: employment status, occupation, education, age, gender, country of birth, maori descent, ethnicity, mode of transport to work, type of dwelling, tenure, household size, household type, and whether voted/not in 2002 local authority elections. (Appendix 3 list tabulations against tenure, others are available from the author, as is information concerning levels of statistical significance, etc.)

Given the modest sample size it is not surprising that several of the tables are not statistically significant, and a larger data-set might yield more robust findings. In terms of tenure some of the expected relationships were revealed. Home-owners are somewhat more satisfied with the overall quality of life in Auckland, are less concerned about the cost of housing, and are less concerned about the size of Auckland. On some issues, mortgage-holders seem more concerned than either outright-owners or renters: eg mortgages seem less convinced that local government is doing a good job. On other issues – and these seem quite expected – there is almost no difference amongst those from the three different tenure groups: e.g. concern with cost of living generally or seeing traffic congestion as a problem.

Other social background characteristics are also associated with these key attitudes. For example, the unemployed, those in lower status occupations, and those in detached housing, together with those of Maori descent are more likely to be concerned about Auckland's size. On several of the issues more recent arrivals in Auckland, and also too, minority ethnic groups are happier about things to do with Auckland (presumably as many have migrated from even larger urban agglomerations). As might be expected, too, the elderly are often nostalgic for a smaller more sedate and less conflict-ridden Auckland. Since some of these characteristics are correlated with household tenure, there may be complex statistical interactions at work, which need to be teased out in further analyses.

Conclusions

It is likely that those (quite considerable number of) Auckland residents who are concerned with its size or growth and/or the correlates and consequences of size/growth do not see their concerns of high salience, and so are unlikely to voice their concerns too loudly. Moreover, views may be complex or nuanced. Nor are there obvious institutional mechanisms to enable them to do so, if they wished, or circumstances that would allow people to openly protest. The size/growth issue is rather too diffuse and insidious. (The parallel here is the story of a frog slowly brought to boil in a water-filled pot who doesn't notice the steady rise in temperature and therefore fails to leap out even though the danger-point is long passed.)

In turn, this interpretation suggests that support for the Auckland growth machine (or machines) and potentially crystallisable anti-growth movements are similarly diffuse. There is a very broad support for existing local policies in the general belief that they are not vigorously supporting or limiting growth or restraints on growth, and perhaps that they represent the various elements of a broad consensus. Mobilisation is possible, though, over more strictly local issues.

As in 'democratic theory' more generally, quietness equals agreement. And even more so, as in 'market theory', it is assumed that dissatisfied customers will just prefer not to buy what's on offer. So too with 'growth machine' theory: elites pursue their interests untrammelled until they run into extreme limits. The difficulty, though, is that the choice of no-growth is not on offer and so the degree of support for it is untested.

The most common positive responses ranked in order were:
1. Location – access to services.
2. Safety and security.
3. Community identity and cohesion.
4. Lifestyle – low maintenance.

The most common negative responses ranked in order were:
1. Noise.
2. Parking – especially for visitors (although parking is not really a social issue).

3. Design and amenity.
4. Privacy.

Non-residents' Views

Overall there were considerably more negative responses than positive
responses from non-residents.

The most common positive responses ranked in order were:
1. Access to services/amenities.
2. Safety and security.
3. Perception of occupiers – their socio-economic make-up.
4. Community cohesion and identity.

The most common negative responses ranked in order were:
1. Poor design and amenity.
2. Concentration of deprivation.
3. Noise.
4. Lack of privacy.
5. Poor access to services.

The surveys tend to highlight design and location issues associated with intensive housing
developments, that is the quality of the living environment provided, rather than specific social
issues. However, people's attitudes to social issues are clearly connected with their appreciation
of the physical design of the development. The surveys highlight concerns from many residents
and non-residents about the future quality of developments.

Appendix 1: ARC Survey on Auckland Amenity 2003-04

74% percent of Aucklanders think the region is a good or great place to live, according to a recent
survey undertaken by the Auckland Regional Council (ARC).

Results from the ARC's Environmental Awareness Survey, which canvassed nearly 2,000 people
from throughout the region, provide some insight into the things that people both like and
dislike about living, working and playing in the Auckland region.

So what does make the Auckland region such a good place to live? Beaches (30% of
respondents), the natural environment in general (21%), and good access to parks and open space
(19%) top the list of good things, closely followed by employment opportunities and cultural
facilities.

Traffic congestion (52% of respondents), lack of or poor public transport (19%) and crime (12%) are the three key things that people disliked the most about living in the region. The survey showed that 71% were either very concerned or concerned about the environment in the region. 91% considered the environment to be their responsibility, 83% said that better public transport would make it easier to get around, and 76% thought that landowners should be given more assistance and incentives to protect the environment.

Chair of the ARC's Strategic Policy committee, Cr Ian Bradley says that overall the results of the environmental awareness survey are positive, and that it is encouraging to see that the majority of Aucklanders are proud of the region (77% define themselves as an "Aucklander"), and care about the environment in which they live.

"The survey gives us an insight into the level of importance that people place on some of the things that contribute to the Auckland region as a whole. While it is easy to focus on the things that provide the biggest challenges such as transport, which we are attempting to address, the survey shows that on the whole people really do care about the things that make this region so special — the beaches, the coast, and the cultural diversity," he says.

The survey, undertaken between October 2003 and June 2004, aimed to establish a clearer view of the values and perceptions of the regional community, and covers a range of issues including general values and perceptions regarding living in the Auckland region; environmental values, specific issues such as biosecurity and intensification, and awareness of the ARC and its activities.

Highlights of the ARC's Environmental Awareness Survey
 (top five in each section)

Values of individuals and their family %
(*things that are important in order to have a fulfilling life*)

Affordable lifestyle/financial security	23
Safe environment/personal security	22
Personal health/happiness	21
Education	19
Material assets	18

Values of the community %
(*things that matter most to their community*)

Safe environment/personal security	29
Good transport system	20
Less Crime/law and order	19
Good environment in general	14
Education	13

Key contributors to quality of life in the Auckland region %

Beaches   30
The natural environment in general   21
Good access to parks and open space   19
Employment opportunities   17
Cultural facilities   14

Key impediments to quality of life in the Auckland region %

Traffic congestion   52
Lack of/poor public transport   19
Crime   12
High level of pollution   6
High population growth   5

Perceptions of environmental problems in the Auckland region %
(*the environmental problems people think exist in the region*)

Air pollution   41
Traffic congestion   34
Water pollution   19
Waste and rubbish   16
Polluted harbours   13

Levels of concern about specific environmental issues %
(*either concerned or very concerned about specific issues*)

Traffic congestion   90
Water pollution   86
Air pollution   76
Loss of native plants and animals   71
Loss of streams, wetlands, bush forests   69

Appendix 2: Metro Poll 2003

		Agree	Neu-tral	Dis-agree	Categories most in support
Auckland is getting better as a place to live	%	34	27	39	Newcomers, Asians (not: older, South Aucklanders)
Auckland is best place to live in NZ	%	47	26	27	Asian/Pacific
Consider moving out of Auckland (to NZ provinces)	%	35			
Consider moving out of Auckland (to overseas)	%	29			16 - 29 year olds, no kids, Pacific
					Non-Pakeha, S

Housing market boom will continue	%	47	29	24	Auck, few yrs in Auck
Immigration good for Auckland	%	46	24	30	males, recent not S Auck
Immigrants should be forced to live outside Auckland	%	28	28	47	S Auck
Asian migrants benefit Auckland	%	-	-	27	
Pacific migrants benefit NZ	%	-	-	28	
Refugee migrants benefit NZ	%	-	-	42	
Ideal population for greater Auckland – 1M	%	25			
Ideal population for greater Auckland -1.5M	%	25			
Ideal population for greater Auckland -1.2M (same)	%	20			
Tolls to fund new roads	%	37	-	49	
Issue most concerned with -congested roads	%	25			
Issue most concerned with – race relations	%	10			
Issue most concerned with - hi house prices	%	8	-	-	-
Issue most concerned with- population growth	%	8			
Issue most concerned with- air and water pollution	%	11			
Concern w congested roads	%	90			
Concern w crime & violence	%	88			
Concern w air/water pollution	%	82			
Concern w race relations	%	70			
Concern w hi house prices	%	70			
Concern w pop growth	%	59			
Immigration has contributed to more crime & violence	%	48	23	29	

Appendix 3: Attitudes by Tenure Groups

		Tenure grouped		
		Owned	Purchasing	Rented

		mortgage free	mortgage	
		Col %	Col %	Col %
Q1 Overall quality of life in Auckland region	Very poor	0.7		3.3
	Poor	6.4	3.0	2.1
	Neither good nor poor	25.3	26.0	34.4
	Good	48.3	54.9	48.0
	Very good	19.4	16.2	12.2
Q2 Social conditions	Very poor	10.4	5.0	6.5
	Poor	30.1	24.6	26.9
	Neither good nor poor	28.8	44.5	37.3
	Good	25.1	24.6	20.7
	Very good	5.6	1.4	8.5
Q3 Cost of housing	1: A serious problem	29.6	34.3	48.0
	2	29.0	39.2	30.8
	3	27.8	15.8	10.8
	4	8.2	9.6	5.4
	5: Not a problem at all	5.3	1.1	5.1
Q3 Cost of living	1: A serious problem	15.1	14.7	23.0
	2	26.6	35.7	33.3
	3	43.1	41.3	27.1
	4	12.0	7.5	13.2
	5: Not a problem at all	3.2	0.8	3.3
Q4 Too many people in Auckland	Strongly disagree	5.5	7.6	5.1
	Disagree	32.9	26.9	16.0
	Neither agree nor disagree	21.5	21.0	21.9
	Agree	26.4	27.8	37.2
	Strongly agree	13.7	16.7	19.8
Q4 Traffic congestion is a problem	Strongly disagree	1.1	3.1	3.6
	Disagree	4.8	2.4	6.5
	Neither agree nor disagree	7.5	5.6	2.2
	Agree	31.1	31.8	32.9
	Strongly agree	55.5	57.1	54.8
Q4 Local govt. doing a good job in controlling growth	Strongly disagree	11.6	18.1	3.6
	Disagree	32.8%	32.6%	21.5%
	Neither agree nor			

	disagree	25.0	28.0	40.8
	Agree	29.1	18.4	33.6
	Strongly agree	1.5	2.9	0.5

References

Auckland Regional Growth Forum. (1999). Summary of consultation processes: The views of stakeholders and the public. Auckland: ARC.

Big Cities Quality of Life Project (2001, 2003) see website http: //www.bigcities.govt.nz

Clark, T. (1997). Book review: challenging the growth machine. *American Journal of Sociology*, *103* (1); 224-225.

Cox, K. & Mair, A. (1989). Book review essay: Urban growth machines and the politics of local economic development. *International Journal or Urban and Regional Research 13* (1); 137-147.

Crothers, C. (1984). Housing: The role of the private sector over the post-war period. In I. Shirley & C. Wilkes (Eds.), *In the public interest* (pp. 231- 253). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Crothers, C. (2001). Auckland studies: A bibliography. Auckland: School of Social Sciences, AUT.

Crothers, C. (2003). Report on Aucklanders' attitudes to Auckland study. Auckland: School of Social Sciences, AUT.

Humphrey, C. (2001). Disarming the war of the growth machines: A panel study. *Sociological Forum 16* (1); 99-121.

Kemp, D., Mullins, P., et al. (1997). *Urban Metabolism*. Brisbane: South East Queensland Study

Legat, N., et al. (2003). Fragile peace: The Metro Auckland Poll. *Metro* (Nov), 30-38.

Logan, J., & Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Logan, J.R., Whaley, R.B., & Crowder, K. (1997). The character and consequences of growth regimes: An assessment of twenty years of research. *Urban Affairs Review 32*, 603-630.

Saunders, P. (1986). *Social theory and the urban question* (2nd ed.). London: Hutchinson Education

Syme C., & Mcgregor, V. (2005). *Social implications of housing intensification in the Auckland region: Analysis and review of media reports, surveys and literature*. Auckland: Auckland Regional Council.