

16 September 2021

Request for Official Information responded to under the Local Government and Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA) – reference: 2122-57

Thank you for your information request, which we received on 24 August 2021.

You have asked us to provide the following information:

We would like to get the tabulated results and questions asked to participants in the Empathy report to KCDC for the representation review.

Questions to participants

The preliminary consultation activities referred to in the Empathy Design Community Voice report involved five different design research activities (refer pages 7-8). The report is [available here](#).

The response to your request for “questions asked to participants” for each activity is set out under the headings for each activity below.

Online survey questions

The questions from the online survey that ran from 10 February 2021 through until 5 April 2021 on Council’s **Kōrero mai Have your say** online engagement platform for the Representation Review were:

- Q1 Which communities are you part of?
[Check box: Paekākāriki, Raumati, Paraparaumu, Waikanae, Ōtaki, Te Horo]
- Q2 How does the current mix of ward and districtwide councillors help your community?
- Q3 How might a community board help your community?
- Q4 What do you want us to think about?

Street intercept questions

The questions that were asked as part of the street intercept interviews were:

- Q1 The election boundaries need to be based around communities, so we're interested to find out where you feel you belong?
- Where do you spend your time?
 - Why there?
 - Where to do work, play, shop, exercise?
- Q2 What are some of the communities or groups that you feel part of?
- Where does that happen?
- Q3 How does the current mix of councillors (ward and districtwide) help your community?
- Q4 Did you know that Kāpiti has four community boards?
- Q5 How might a community board help your community?

Community workshops

During March we ran five community workshops in Ōtaki, Paekākāriki, Waikanae Beach, Te Horo and Paraparaumu. Each workshop started with a brief presentation explaining the requirements of a representation review followed by three activities.

Activity 1 – Priority topics voting

The purpose of this activity was to get an understanding of what was important to the participants about where they lived, and why.

A series of posters with the headings **“What’s important to you? Why are these things important in how your live your life?”** were displayed on the walls of the workshop venue. There was a different category on each poster using the headings below. Participants were given sticker dots and asked to place a sticker on anything that was important to them, and then write on a post-it note why that was important to them.

- Sports and recreation facilities
- Cultural facilities
- Education facilities
- Community services
- Roads and transports, e.g. bus routes
- Use of rural land
- Use or urban areas
- Use of the coast
- Affiliation with the area/rohe

- Being around people of my culture or ethnicity
- Houses and properties like mine
- Being around people who aren't like me, i.e. experiencing diversity
- Shops and business
- Other (participants were encouraged to write anything under this heading that was important to them but did not fit under any of the other headings)

Activity 2 – Affinity location map drawing

The purpose of this activity was to get an understanding of where people feel an affinity with. Each participant was provided with two maps – a local map and a map of the Kapiti district. They were asked to mark on the map where they live, and then in a different colour circle the different areas in their suburb and/or across the district they felt was part of their community of interest and label what each circle represented (e.g. school, work, shopping, recreation, etc).

Activity 3: Card sort

Each participant was given their own set of cards which had the statements below on them, they were asked to place the cards in their particular order of priority to form a scale between the two header cards “**Really Want**” and “**Really Don't Want**”.

- A councillor lives in my suburb
- Councillors come from across Kāpiti
- All councillors live in the same suburb
- People in my suburb work closely with councillors
- We do what's best for Kāpiti as a whole
- We do what's best for my suburb
- Communities have a go-to councillor
- We have a small number of councillors
- We have a large number of councillors
- Suburbs are given equal focus
- Councillors focus on the most in-need suburbs

This was followed up with a discussion with each participant along the lines of "What does that statement mean to you? Why did you put it there? Tell us more about that."

Market pop-ups

During March we also ran two pop-up stands at the Paraparaumu Beach and Waikanae Markets.

We repeated Activity 1 and Activity 2 from the community workshops as outlined above at both markets and handed out information brochures on the representation review to those people who did not have time to stop and participate.

Long semi-structured interviews

The long semi-structured interviews were conducted by qualified Empathy Design personnel using social science research techniques. These interviews “explored different relevant topics, digging into their answers to understand accurately and deeply” as set out on page 8 of the Empathy Design Community Voice report (link provided at the beginning of this letter).

We have contacted Empathy Design in relation to your request who have indicated they are not able to provide the specifics of each interview for the reasons set out under the heading ‘Tabulated results’ below.

Tabulated results

The Empathy Design Community Voice report includes the analysis of the responses or results from the five different preliminary engagement activities undertaken. As indicated above, we have contacted Empathy Design in relation to your request who have advised they are not able to provide tabulated results for the preliminary engagement activities carried out, for the reasons set out below:

“Tabulated results are held in confidence by the core project team. People we engaged with were promised that individual responses would not be shared. Even if name and contact details are removed, responses are very contextualised to each person’s life, and is largely deemed to be ‘person-identifying information’.”

It is Empathy’s policy to not share field notes or individual summaries of conversations except when strict protocol is agreed and established at the beginning of projects. This is a very rare occurrence. Putting those protocols in place for this project would have significantly impacted the quality, quantity and specificity of information received from people. That approach was not appropriate for this project.”

As such, we are refusing this part of your request for information under section 17(g) of the Act on the basis that this information is not held by the Council.

When referencing the Act, I am required to advise you that you have the right to make a complaint under section 27(3) of the Act to an Ombudsman, to seek an investigation and review of this response. Please find details of how to make a complaint via the following link <http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz/make-a-complaint>

Ngā mihi



Janice McDougall

Group Manager People and Partnerships
Te Kaihautū, ngā Rangapū, Tāngata hoki