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Executive Summary

Wellington City Council is proposing a 24/7 city-wide liquor ban in public places. This research assesses support towards the proposed city-wide amendment as well as support towards other alternative city options and support for bans in specific public places around the city. Additionally residents were asked about their level of support for a ban in their own suburb.

The following table shows a summary of results for the various proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>In Favour / Strongly in Favour %</th>
<th>Opposed / Strongly Opposed %</th>
<th>Neither In Favour nor Opposed %</th>
<th>Don't care / no opinion %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current bylaw</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed city-wide amendment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending to Newtown only</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending to Mt Cook only</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending to both Mt Cook and Newtown</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban in own suburb</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban at bus shelters</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban on streets or footpaths (other than licensed premises with outdoors or footpath areas)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban in public parks or reserves</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban at sports grounds (excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban at beaches or coastlines</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While support for the current ban is strong, support for the proposed city-wide amendment is less so, with almost half of Wellington residents indicating they would be opposed to such a ban.

Residents are more supportive of alternative suburb-specific bans. Specifically a ban which extends to either Newtown only or both Newtown and Mount Cook.

Support for bans at public places such as bus shelters and streets or footpaths, which are not otherwise licensed premises, is strong with three-quarters of Wellington residents supporting these proposals.
Research Needs Assessment

Introduction

This report presents the findings of research undertaken in April 2010 among 600 Wellington residents to assess the level of support of the proposed amendment to the Liquor Control Bylaw.

Current Situation

The current Liquor Control Bylaw prohibits the consumption and possession of liquor in public places in the Wellington central business district, Oriental Bay, Mt Victoria lookout, Te Aro and Central Park, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Exemptions around the carriage of unopened liquor are covered in LGA s147.

Proposed Amendment

The council proposes to amend the bylaw so that the possession and consumption of liquor in public places is prohibited at all times city-wide. This includes all of Wellington's suburbs, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. A public place is anywhere under the control of the Council and includes parks and playgrounds, beaches and coastline, roads and footpaths, bus shelters and so on.

The proposal has come about as a number of communities have asked the Council for a liquor ban in their area because they are concerned about liquor consumption in public places, associated anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related harm. These requests have come from city fringe and suburban communities including Tawa, Kilbirnie, Newtown, Berhampore, Island Bay and Owhiro Bay.

While alcohol-related disorder and harm resulting from drinking in public places may not be as frequent in suburban and city fringe locations as it is in the central city, when it does happen it has a significant impact, particularly on perceptions of safety and community use of public places.

The current Liquor Control Bylaw has proved a valuable tool for Police, who observe that when bylaw enforcement goes up, violence in the city reduces, and people feel safer using public places.

The Council’s view

The Council believes a city-wide liquor ban for 24 hours a day, seven days a week would be the most effective solution to the problem. The existing bylaw would be extended to cover the entire city as far as its coastal and jurisdictional boundaries.

The bylaw does not apply to licensed premises with outdoor licensed areas, road encroachments, areas covered by pavement permissions or to people carrying liquor to and from licensed premises.

While some people may consider that an extended bylaw would restrict their rights and freedoms, the Council believes that any limitations that may arise from the bylaw are justified and reasonable. The proposed bylaw does not prevent activities but rather requires them to happen without liquor. The proposed bylaw also provides for people to apply for an exemption.

The Council’s goal is to reduce alcohol-related harm in support of its vision that Wellington be a safe, healthy, vibrant city for people to live, work and play in.
Liquor consumption in public places outside the control area of the current bylaw is believed by the Council to be adversely affecting perceptions of Wellington as a safe city and is inhibiting people’s enjoyment of public spaces.

**Police View**

The Police support a 24/7 city-wide public place liquor ban. They consider that a uniform bylaw covering the entire city would be more effective than having parts of the city included in the bylaw with multiple control boundaries.

**Alternative Options**

Given that the proposal to amend the bylaw was, to some extent, driven by concerns from the Newtown community, the Council could choose to amend the current bylaw to include Mt Cook and Newtown. It could also choose to amend the bylaw to include other suburban areas or areas such as reserves, parks or bus shelters.

The Council could also decide against making any amendments to the bylaw, which would mean the current bylaw would be retained in its present form.

**Research Objectives**

The primary objectives of the current research are to measure the level of support for:

- the proposed city-wide amendment
- alternative city proposals covering Mt Cook and Newtown
- a liquor ban in specific public places
- a liquor ban in residents’ own suburb

Secondary objectives which provide context for the research include:

- measuring awareness, knowledge and support of the current bylaw
- measuring residents experiences in relation to alcohol being consumed in public places in Wellington.
## Research Design

### Methodology

Telephone interviewing was undertaken between the 22 April and 4 May 2010 with 600 Wellington residents aged 15 years and over, who live within the Wellington City Council area.

To ensure the sample was representative of residents in the Wellington region, quotas were set for gender, age and ward.

At the analysis stage data was weighted to adjust for minor discrepancies between the numbers of interviews achieved and the known Wellington population.

### Margin of error

The maximum margin of error on a sample size of 600 respondents is ± 4.0 % (based on results for 600 complete surveys). However note that, when comparing across sub-groups, the margin of error will be larger.

### Notes to the Report

Only statistically significant differences have been highlighted or commented on in this report.

Differences between residents aged 15-17 years and residents aged 18-24 years (i.e. those of legal drinking age) were investigated. However, no major differences in attitudes or behaviour between these two sub-groups were found.
Awareness, Knowledge and Support of the Current Bylaw - Context

Introduction

In order to provide context around the results presented in this report, we start with a brief overview of Wellington residents’ awareness, knowledge and support of the current bylaw and perceptions in relation to public drinking around Wellington (for further analysis of these key results please refer to later sections of this report).

Awareness of the Current Bylaw

Awareness of the current bylaw is very high with the majority (90%) of residents aware of it.

As shown below, awareness increases with age and is similar across Wards.

Awareness of current bylaw by age group.

![Graph showing awareness by age group]

Awareness of current bylaw by Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Awareness levels %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow-Western</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton*</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern**</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes Mt Cook
** includes Newtown
Knowledge of the Current Bylaw

Specific knowledge of the scope of the current bylaw is more limited.

Just over half aware of the bylaw (53%) know the ban applies every day, while a similar number (49%) know the ban applies over a 24 hour period.

Residents less likely to know the ban is in place every day are:

- Of Asian ethnicity (32% c.f. 53% average)

Knowledge of days of the week current bylaw is in place.

As far as you are aware, what days of the week is the ban in place?

- Every day: 53%
- Weekends only: 10%
- Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday: 9%
- Week days only: 2%
- Other: 5%
- Don't know: 21%

Base: Those who are aware of the current bylaw (n=542)
Residents *less likely* to know the ban is in place 24 hours a day are:

- Of Asian ethnicity (25% c.f. 49% average)

**Knowledge of hours of the week current bylaw is in place.**

*And during what hours does this liquor ban apply?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correct response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 hours a day</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night time</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Those who are aware of the current bylaw (n=542)*
More people are aware of the main area the ban applies to rather than the days and hours it applies to. As shown below three-quarters (74%) of residents aware of the bylaw know the ban applies to the Wellington CBD.

Residents less likely to know the ban applies to the Wellington CBD are:

- Of Asian ethnicity (58% c.f. 74% average)
- Have a household income of $30,000 or less (58% c.f. 74% average)

Residents more likely to know the ban applies to the Wellington CBD are:

- Living in a flat and not a family home (88% c.f. 74% average)

Knowledge of areas the bylaw applies to.

What areas around Wellington do you think this liquor ban applies to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD/Central Wellington</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Bay</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of Wellington (including suburbs)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranui Valley</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Victoria Lookout</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Those who are aware of the current bylaw (n=542)
Support for the Current Bylaw

Prior to asking residents to what extent they were in favour of or opposed to the current bylaw, they were told the following:

The current bylaw bans people from possessing and drinking alcohol in a public place at all times in the Wellington central area (CBD), Oriental Bay, Mt Victoria Lookout, Aro Valley, and Central Park. The exception is that people can carry unopened liquor in public places while they are in transit provided it is removed from the public place promptly. A public place is anywhere under the control of the Council and includes parks and playgrounds, beaches, roads and footpaths, bus shelters and so on.

Support for the current bylaw is strong, with 79% of residents in favour of it and 11% opposed to it.

Residents more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of the current bylaw are:

- Residents in the Northern (84%) and Onslow-Western Ward (84%) c.f. residents in the Southern Ward (71%)

Residents more likely to be neither in favour nor opposed to the current bylaw are:

- 15-24 years of age (18% c.f. 10% average).
Level of support for the current bylaw.

To what extent are you in favour of or opposed to this current ban?

Base: All respondents (n=600)
Drinking in Public Places around Wellington - Context

Following are a few key facts about drinking alcohol in public places around Wellington as context for attitudes to the proposed bylaw amendment:

- 34% of residents have consumed alcohol in a public place over the most recent daylight saving period (October 2009 – April 2010), mostly in public parks or reserves and beaches for a picnic or sporting or cultural event
- 71% of residents have seen people drinking alcohol in a public place
- 62% of residents have seen or heard about problems associated with people drinking in a public place
- 28% of those residents who have either seen people drinking or heard of problems associated by drinking in public places have been affected by public drinking; it either caused them to leave a public place or avoid going to it. As a proportion of total population 15+, 23% of residents have been affected by drinking in public spaces.
- Adverse effects were predominantly feeling unsafe (50% of those residents who said they left or avoided the public place) or actually being threatened or intimidated (35%).
Residents’ Attitudes Towards the Proposed City-Wide Amendment

Introduction - Context

This section of the report discusses residents’ attitudes towards the proposed amendment to the Liquor Control Bylaw, including the extent to which people are in favour of or oppose the change, and reasons why.

Prior to asking residents the extent to which they were in favour of or opposed to the proposed city-wide amendment, they were told the following:

The Council is currently proposing changing the current bylaw as a way to better manage alcohol issues and also because some communities have asked to have a liquor ban in public places in their suburb. I now need to take a minute or so to give you some information about this proposal before asking your opinion of it.

The proposal is to extend the bylaw so that the possession and consumption of liquor is banned in public places across the entire city, including all Wellington’s suburbs, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. A public place is anywhere under the control of the Council and includes parks and playgrounds, beaches and coastline, roads and footpaths, bus shelters and so on.

We would like your views on this but, before answering, we want you to think about some of the pros and cons of changing the bylaw:

A city-wide ban will mean people can no longer take their own alcohol to any public place throughout the city or suburbs at any time. However, people will be able to obtain written permission from the Council for specific activities that would otherwise breach the bylaw.

Some people are against the city-wide ban as they feel it is unfair to put restrictions on the people who act responsibly with the alcohol they take to public places (for example, a group who share a bottle of wine at a picnic at a park or beach). They also feel that those who misuse alcohol in public places will still misuse alcohol somewhere else if the ban is put in place, so it will just move the problem rather than reducing it.

A city-wide ban is supported by the Police and others who feel it will help manage alcohol-related anti-social behaviour and harm and will help people feel safe and free from intimidation throughout Wellington city and suburbs. They feel it will complement other initiatives already in place to manage alcohol and will be an improvement on the current situation outside the current bylaw zone, where offending needs to occur before any action can be taken against people drinking in public places.

Half were told the negative sentiments first, and half were told the positive to minimise order bias.

Proposed Amendment

Almost four in ten (39%) say they are strongly in favour/in favour of the proposed amendment to the bylaw, while 47% are opposed/strongly opposed. This is a statistically significant difference.
Level of support for proposed amendment.

To what extent are you in favour of or opposed to extending the liquor bylaw to cover all public places in Wellington city and suburbs seven days a week and 24 hours a day?

Residents more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of the change are:

- Older residents; 40-59 years old (46%) and 60 years plus (50%) c.f. 15-24 years old (29%)
- Residents in the Northern Ward (52% c.f. 39% average)
- Of Asian ethnicity (63% c.f. 39% average)
- Have a household income of $30,000 or less (61% c.f. 39% average)

The two main reasons residents give, for being in favour of the proposed amendment, relate to reducing anti-social and inappropriate behaviour (28%) and for reasons of public and personal safety (24%). Just over one in ten (12%) residents feel they can trust the police to act with discretion in terms of enforcing the amendment and they also feel an overall ban would free up police time.
This document is highly confidential and intended for Wellington City Council’s internal use only.
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Reasons for being in favour of proposed amendment.

- Limits alcohol fuelled anti-social/inappropriate behaviour too much violence/disorderly behaviour/criminal behaviour
- Public safety reasons/excessive drinking endangers personal/public safety
- Drinking in public places should be banned/don’t like seeing people drinking in the street
- Policing (positive) - in favour of police viewpoint/trust the police to act with discretion/makes it easier for police/will free up police time
- Not necessary for people to drink in public places/can drink in licensed premises/at home
- In favour of a city wide ban/would like it to be part of a city-wide ban
- There is too much uncontrolled drinking (in NZ)/too many people drinking to excess/too many alcoholics
- Families/children should not be exposed to drunken behaviour
- Too much youth/under-age drinking/may help to control excessive drinking by young/under-age drinkers
- Will improve the environment/make Wellington a better city /drinking in public is a bad look /ruins other people’s enjoyment of a public place
- Too much rubbish/litter/broken bottles
- A way for council to control drunkeness in the streets/don’t like drunk people around me/too many drunk people in public places
- Probably will reduce the problems/issues associated with the consumption of alcohol/reduce the harm/damage caused

Base: All respondents who are strongly in favour / in favour of the proposed ban (n=241)
Note: Only reported if 5% or over

Residents more likely to be opposed/strongly opposed to the change are:

- Residents in the Southern Ward (58% c.f. 47% average)
- Those who are ambivalent (neither opposed to or in favour of) towards the current bylaw and those who are opposed to the current bylaw (79% and 89% respectively c.f. 47% average)

Half (51%) of all residents opposed to the bylaw feel that a blanket ban on alcohol would be too restrictive and unfairly affect residents who drink responsibly. Some also fear that such a ban would drive responsible drinkers ‘underground’, for example, by encouraging drinkers to hide alcohol. Nearly four in ten (38%) feel they should be able to have a glass of wine or beer at a picnic or in a controlled area. As discussed later in this report, the majority of residents who have consumed alcohol in a public place have done so at a picnic or public gathering with friends and family (82%).
Reasons for being opposed to proposed amendment.

- Blanket ban is too restrictive/unfair/affects those who drink responsibly/buries law-abiding citizens as well/may drive responsible drinkers underground e.g. hiding alcohol (51%)
- Should be able to have a glass of wine/beer at a picnic/controlled area (38%)
- Will have no effect/offenders will drink anyway will just shift the problem (to other locations) (21%)
- Policing (negative) - will be difficult to police/lack of police resource/will increase pressure on the police (7%)
- Area is too wide/hard to police/should be limited to areas that are worse than others (CBD) not a problem in my suburb (6%)
- Relevant laws already exist/Need better policing of existing laws against drinking in public/public drunkenness (5%)
- Other (8%)

Base: All respondents who are opposed / strongly opposed to the proposed ban (n=281)
Note: Only reported if 5% or over

Similarly, three in ten (31%) of those residents who are neither in favour of nor opposed to the proposed amendment feel that a blanket ban on alcohol would be too restrictive and unfairly affect residents who drink responsibly, while one quarter (24%) feel they should be able to have a glass of wine or beer at a picnic or in a controlled area. Just over one in ten (13%) say it won’t affect them as they are not a drinker or won’t be living in the area and a similar number (12%) are ambivalent because they feel the proposed amendment wouldn’t be effective i.e. offenders will drink anyway, and that it would only shift the problem elsewhere.
Reasons for neither being in favour nor opposed to proposed amendment.

- Blanket ban is too restrictive/unfair affects those who drink responsibly/punishes law abiding citizens as well/may drive responsible drinkers underground e.g. hiding alcohol (24%)
- Should be able to have a glass of wine/beer at a picnic/controlled area (31%)
- Won't affect me/not a drinker/don't live there (12%)
- Will have no effect/offenders will drink anyway/will just shift the problem (to other locations) (13%)
- Policing (negative) - will be difficult to police/lack of police resource/will increase pressure on the police (5%)
- Limits alcohol fuelled anti-social/inappropriate behaviour (incl violence/aggression/verbal abuse/crime/noise/too much violence/disorderly behaviour/criminal behaviour) (5%)
- Area is too wide/hard to police/should be limited to areas that are worse than others (CBD)/not a problem in my suburb (5%)
- Drinking in public places should be banned/don't like seeing people drinking in the street (5%)
- Policing (positive) - In favour of police viewpoint/trust the police to act with discretion/makes it easier for police/will free up police time (5%)
- Not necessary for people to drink in public places/can drink in licensed premises/at home (5%)
- Other (12%)
- Don't know (10%)

Base: All respondents who are neither in favour nor opposed to the proposed ban (n=77)
Note: Only reported if 5% or over
Residents’ Attitudes Towards Alternative City Proposals

Introduction
This section of the report discusses residents’ attitudes towards alternative proposals, should a city-wide ban not be an option.

Prior to asking residents to what extent they were in favour of or opposed to the alternative proposals, they were told the following:

*If the Council decides against extending the bylaw to be city and suburb-wide, another option is to extend it just to Newtown, because groups representing the Newtown community have asked for a liquor ban in their suburb.*

*Those asking for a liquor ban in Newtown report high levels of alcohol-related anti-social behaviour in their suburb. They believe a ban will help people in Newtown feel safe and that it will reduce anti-social behaviour and harm caused by public place drinking in their suburb.*

*Others, including the police, prefer a city-wide ban because it would be easier to police and because there is a risk that people who drink in public places in Newtown would just change to drinking in a nearby suburb if a ban was imposed in Newtown.*

*There is also the option of extending the ban area to include Mt Cook as well as Newtown. Mt Cook has been highlighted because it borders the CBD area where the liquor ban is already in place and because it connects Newtown with the CBD - so extending through Mt Cook to Newtown would help have a clearly defined geographical area for a liquor ban.*

Alternative proposals
Half of all residents (52%) are in favour of extending the ban to both Mt Cook and Newtown, followed by a similar number (49%) who are in favour of extending the ban to Newtown *only*. There is less support for extending the ban to Mt Cook *only*, with 35% in favour of this option.

Between one-quarter and one-third of all residents were neither in favour nor opposed to the alternative proposals (24% Newtown *only*, 34% Mt Cook *only*, 24% both Mt Cook and Newtown).
Level of support for alternative proposals.

If a city-wide ban was not an option, to what extent would you be in favour of or opposed to each of the following alternative proposals?

- Extending to Newtown only:
  - 2% Strongly in favour
  - 10% In favour
  - 15% Neither in favour nor opposed
  - 24% Opposed
  - 25% Strongly opposed

- Extending to Mt Cook only:
  - 4% Strongly in favour
  - 9% In favour
  - 25% Neither in favour nor opposed
  - 27% Opposed
  - 34% Strongly opposed

- Extending to both Mt Cook and Newtown:
  - 2% Strongly in favour
  - 8% In favour
  - 15% Neither in favour nor opposed
  - 22% Opposed
  - 24% Strongly opposed

Base: All respondents (n=600)
The following table shows the level of support for each alternative proposal.

To summarise key points in the table below:

- 31% of residents support all three alternative proposals
- 18% of residents are opposed to all three alternative proposals
- 16% of residents are ambivalent (neither in favour of nor opposed to) to all three alternative proposals
- 2% of residents are in favour of a ban in Newtown only, but do not support the other options
- No residents are in favour of a ban in Mt Cook only, but do not support the other options
- 4% of residents are in favour of a ban covering both Mt Cook and Newtown, but do not support the other options
- 6% of residents are in favour of a ban covering Newtown only, and both Mt Cook and Newtown, but do not support a Mt Cook only ban
- 1% of residents have no opinion about all three alternative proposals.

**Level of support for alternative proposals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newtown only</th>
<th>Mt Cook only</th>
<th>Both Mt Cook and Newtown</th>
<th>Residents %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>In favour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't care / no opinion</td>
<td>Don't care / no opinion</td>
<td>Don't care / no opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*

- **In favour** = strongly in favour / in favour
- **Opposed** = opposed / strongly opposed
- **Neither** = neither In favour nor Opposed
Those more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of all three alternative proposals are:
- Residents in the Northern Ward (28%) c.f. residents in the Eastern (18%), Lambton (17%), and Southern Ward (15%)

Those more likely to be opposed/strongly opposed to all three alternative proposals are:
- Residents in the Eastern Ward (29%) c.f. residents in the Lambton (14%) and Northern Ward (11%)

Those more likely to be neither in favour of nor opposed to all three alternative proposals are:
- Residents in the Northern Ward (29%) c.f. residents in the Eastern (14%) and Southern Ward (13%)

---

**Extending the ban to Newtown only**

Those more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of extending the ban to Newtown only are (note there are no differences by Ward):
- Of Asian ethnicity (67% c.f. 51% average)

Those more likely to be opposed/strongly opposed to extending the ban to Newtown only are:
- Residents in the Southern (32%) and Eastern Ward (29%) c.f. residents in the Northern Ward (15%)
- New Zealand Maori (41% c.f. 25% average)

Of the 28 Newtown residents we spoke to, 11 indicated they are in favour/strongly in favour of a Newtown only ban, while 11 indicated they are opposed/strongly opposed to the ban. The remaining six are neither in favour of nor opposed.

---

**Extending the ban to Mt Cook only**

Those more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of extending the ban to Mt Cook only are:
- Of Asian ethnicity (56% c.f. 37% average)
- Residents in the Northern Ward (45%) c.f. residents in the Eastern Ward (31%)

Those more likely to be opposed/strongly opposed to extending the ban to Mt Cook only are:
- Residents in the Southern (43%) and Eastern Ward (43%) c.f. residents in the Northern Ward (25%)

Of the eight Mt Cook residents we spoke to, only one is strongly in favour of a Mt Cook only ban, while two are opposed to the ban. Of the remaining five, four are neither in favour nor opposed and one doesn’t care or has no opinion.
Extending the ban to both Mt Cook and Newtown

There are no differences by ward in terms of those more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of extending the ban to both Mt Cook and Newtown.

Those more likely to be opposed/strongly opposed to extending the ban to both Mt Cook and Newtown are:

- Residents in the Southern (35%) and Eastern Ward (32%) c.f. the Northern (15%), Onslow-Western (21%) and Lambton Ward (18%)

Twelve of the 28 Newtown residents, and two of the eight Mt Cook residents are in favour of a ban covering both the Mt Cook and Newtown areas.

Eleven of the 28 Newtown residents, and one of the eight Mt Cook residents are opposed to a ban covering both the Mt Cook and Newtown areas.

Five of the 28 Newtown residents, and five of the eight Mt Cook residents are neither in favour of nor opposed to a ban covering both the Mt Cook and Newtown areas.

Reasons for supporting or opposing the alternative city proposals

Of the 31% of Wellington residents who are in favour of all three alternative proposals, the principle reasons given are as follows:

- Because these areas have been identified as problem areas (31%)
- Because the ban then covers a wider area and Mt Cook would connect Newtown to the central business district (23%)
- The community has requested a ban and we respect their right to support for action on this issue / it’s for the local residents to decide (16%)
- Limits alcohol fuelled anti-social / inappropriate behaviour (incl violence / aggression / verbal abuse / crime / noise) (15%)
- For public safety reasons / excessive drinking endangers personal and/or public safety (14%)
- Drinking in public places should be banned / don’t like seeing people drinking in the street (12%)

Of the 18% who oppose all three alternative proposals, the principle reasons given are:

- Because it will have no effect and offenders will drink anyway. It will just shift the problem to other locations (52%)
- A blanket ban is too restrictive / unfair / affects those who drink responsibly / punishes law abiding citizens as well / may drive responsible drinkers underground e.g. hiding alcohol (12%)
- Relevant laws already exist. They need better policing of existing laws against drinking in public / public drunkenness (12%)
Of the 16% who are **neither in favour nor oppose all three alternative proposals**, the principle reasons given are:

- Because it won't affect me / I'm not a drinker / I won't be living there (37%)
- Because it will have no effect and offenders will drink anyway. It will just shift the problem to other locations (21%)
- The community has requested a ban and we respect their right to support for action on this issue / it's for the local residents to decide (19%)

For the 2% of residents who **support the Newtown only ban**, the main reason given is because this area has been identified as problem area (64%).
Residents’ Attitudes Towards a Liquor Ban in their own Suburb

Introduction
Residents (aside from those who live in Mt Cook or Newtown) were asked the extent to which they support or oppose a liquor ban in their own suburb. (For a list of responses to this question by suburb please refer to Appendix II in this report – caution is required when interpreting results by suburb due to low base sizes).

Opinions about a suburb-wide ban were almost evenly split, with slightly more residents opposed to the concept than in favour of it (41% c.f. 38%). This is not a significant difference.

Level of support for a ban in residents’ suburb.
If a city and suburb-wide liquor ban in public places was not put in place, to what extent would you be in favour of or opposed to having a liquor ban in public places 24 hours a day 7 days a week in the suburb where you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>22%</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't care / no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither in favour nor opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly in favour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents except those who reside in Newtown or Mount Cook (n=568)

Those more likely to be strongly in favour/in favour of having a ban in their own suburb are:
- Residents with a household income of $30,000 or less (63% c.f. 38% average)
- Of Asian ethnicity (58% c.f. 38% average)
- Residents in the Northern Ward (51% c.f. 38% average)
- Residents in the Lambton Ward (42%) c.f. residents in the Southern Ward (24%)
• Those in favour of the current bylaw (46%) and proposed city-wide amendment (73%) c.f. 38% average

The two main reasons residents are in favour of having a ban in their own suburb is to limit alcohol-fuelled anti-social behaviour, including violence and aggression (29%) and for public and personal safety reasons (22%).

Reasons for being in favour of having a ban in their own suburb.

Those more likely to be opposed/strongly opposed to having a ban in their own suburb are:

• Residents in the Southern Ward (55% c.f. 42% average)
• Those who are opposed to the proposed city-wide amendment (73% c.f. 42% average)

The three primary reasons for residents being opposed to a ban in their own suburb are because there is no evidence of any alcohol-related issues in their suburb (46%), a blanket ban in the suburb is too restrictive and unfairly punishes law-abiding citizens (25%), and because residents feel they should be able to have a glass of wine or beer at a picnic area or controlled area (25%).
Reasons for being opposed to having a ban in their own suburb.

- No need for a liquor ban in public places in this area or evidence of a problem (incl small/quiet/safe suburb): 46%
- Blanket ban is too restrictive/unfair/affects those who drink responsibly/punishes law-abiding citizens as well/may drive responsible drinkers underground e.g. hiding alcohol: 25%
- Should be able to have a glass of wine/beer at a picnic/controlled area: 25%
- Will have no effect/offenders will drink anyway/will just shift the problem (to other locations): 7%
- Educate not regulate/need to sort out the binge drinking mentality/address the real problem/how people are drinking it's about responsible alcohol consumption: 6%
- Relevant laws already exist/Need better policing of existing laws against drinking in public/public drunkenness: 5%

Base: All respondents who are opposed/strongly opposed to a ban in their own suburb (n=232)
Note: Only reported if 5% or over

Those more likely to be neither in favour nor opposed to having a ban in their own suburb are:

- Residents aged 15-24 years of age (35% c.f. 20% average)
- Young couples with no children (31% c.f. 20% average)
- Neither in favour nor opposed to the proposed city-wide amendment (40% c.f. 20% average)

Again, one of the main reasons for residents feeling ambivalent towards a suburb-wide ban is because there is no evidence of any alcohol-related issues in their suburb (52%).
Reasons for being neither in favour nor opposed to having a ban in their own suburb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need for a liquor ban in public places in this area/no evidence of a problem (incl small/quiet/safe suburb)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won’t affect me/not a drinker/don’t live there</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an area conducive to public consumption of alcohol (no shops/too hilly/not a place for people to stop off at)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket ban is too restrictive/unfair/affects those who drink responsibly/punishes law abiding citizens as well/may drive responsible drinkers underground e.g. hiding alcohol</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who are neither in favour nor opposed to a ban in their own suburb (n=107)
Note: Only reported if 5% or over
Residents’ Attitudes Towards a Liquor Ban in Key Public Places

Introduction
Residents were also asked the extent to which they support or oppose a liquor ban in key public places around Wellington. As alternative options to a 24/7 city-wide liquor ban.

Residents are far more likely to be in favour of a liquor ban at bus shelters (78%), and on streets or footpaths (75%) compared with other public locations. Almost half of all residents support a ban in public parks and reserves (48%) and sports grounds (48%, excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs).

Level of support for a ban in key public places.

If a city and suburb wide liquor ban in public places was not put in place, to what extent would you be in favour of or oppose a liquor ban in each of the following locations:

- **At bus shelters**: 78% in favour, 16% opposed
- **On streets or footpaths (other than licensed premises with outdoors or footpath areas)**: 75% in favour, 17% opposed
- **In public parks or reserves**: 48% in favour, 35% opposed
- **At sports grounds (excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs)**: 48% in favour, 33% opposed
- **At beaches or coastlines**: 38% in favour, 46% opposed

Residents more likely to be in favour of a ban in the following public places are:

- **In public parks or reserves**
  - 60 years plus (60%) and retired (66%) c.f. 48% average
  - In favour of the current bylaw (56%) and proposed city-wide amendment (88%) c.f. 48% average
On streets or footpaths (other than licensed premises with outdoors or footpath areas)

- Young couples with no children (87% c.f. 75% average)
- In favour of the current bylaw (81%) and proposed city-wide amendment (91%) c.f. 75% average

At beaches or coastlines

- Residents in the Northern Ward (45%) and Onslow-Western Ward (47%) c.f. Lambton (34%), Southern (31%) and Eastern Ward (34%)
- Of Asian ethnicity (64% c.f. 39% average)
- In favour of the current bylaw (46%) and proposed city-wide amendment (74%) c.f. 39% average

At sports grounds (excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs)

- 40-59 year olds (60% c.f. 50% average)
- Older couples with no children or none living at home (68% c.f. 50% average)
- Retired residents (66% c.f. 50% average)
- Residents in favour of the proposed city-wide amendment (75% c.f. 50% average)

At bus shelters

- Residents in favour of the proposed city-wide amendment (91% c.f. 79% average)
Residents’ Experience of Community Use of Public Places in Relation to Alcohol

**Introduction**
In this section we investigate residents’ experience of drinking in public places in Wellington.

**Consuming alcohol in a public place**
One third (34%) of all Wellington residents consumed alcohol in a public place over the daylight saving period from October to April.

Residents who have consumed alcohol in a public place over the daylight saving period.

*Over the daylight saving period from October to April, did you consume alcohol in a public place in Wellington such as at a park, beach, street or sportsground?*

- **Yes**: 34%
- **No**: 65%
- **Dont know**: 1%

*Base: All respondents (n=600)*
Residents who have consumed alcohol in a public place over the daylight saving period by Ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Yes, have consumed alcohol in a public place %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow-Western</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton*</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern**</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes Mt Cook  
** includes Newtown

Residents who are more likely to have consumed alcohol in a public place in Wellington such as a park, beach, street or sports ground are:

- Males (39%) c.f. females (28%)
- Younger residents; 15-24 years old (35%) and 25-39 years old (40%) c.f. 60 years plus (22%)
- Opposed to the current bylaw (66% c.f. 34% average)
- Opposed to the proposed city-wide amendment (51% c.f. 34% average)

Residents more likely to have not consumed alcohol in a public place are:

- Residents in the Northern Ward (75% c.f. 65% average)
Public places in which alcohol has been consumed over the daylight saving period.

- In public parks or reserves: 65%
- At beaches or coastlines: 63%
- At sports grounds (excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs): 17%
- On streets or footpaths (other than licensed premises with outdoors or footpath areas): 12%
- At bus shelters: 5%
- Other: 2%
- Don’t know/none: 2%

*Base: All respondents who have consumed alcohol over the daylight saving period in a public place (n=200)*

Of those residents who have consumed alcohol over the daylight saving period, those more likely to consume alcohol in the following public places are:

**In public parks or reserves**
- Households where the youngest child is 5 – 13 years old (84% of those with primary school age children who drank in a public place did so in a park of reserve c.f. 65% average)

**On streets or footpaths (other than licensed premises with outdoors or footpath areas)**
- 15-24 year olds compared with other age groups (36% c.f. 12% average)

**At beaches or coastlines**
- 25-39 year olds (67%) and 40-59 year olds (68%) c.f. 15-24 year olds (45%)
- Residents opposed to the current bylaw (83% c.f. 63% average)

**At sports grounds (excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs)**
- Residents in the Southern Ward (33% c.f. 17% average)
Of the residents who have consumed alcohol over the daylight saving period in a public place, 72% oppose/strongly oppose the proposed city-wide amendment, and 21% are opposed/strongly opposed to the current ban.

**Gatherings at which alcohol has been consumed over the daylight saving period.**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of residents who consumed alcohol at different types of gatherings.]

- **Picnic / public gathering with friends / family**: 82%
- **Sporting / cultural event**: 34%
- **Celebration (e.g. wedding)**: 23%
- **Street party / neighbourhood function**: 17%
- **Other**: 2%

*Base: All respondents who have consumed alcohol over the daylight saving period in a public place (n=200)*

---

**Community use of public places in terms of alcohol**

Residents were asked statements relating to their experience of alcohol use in public places around Wellington. The following table shows each statement and the percentage of residents who answered yes to them:
Most residents have seen people either drinking alcohol in a public place or have seen/heard about problems associated with people drinking alcohol in a public place. This resulted in almost three in ten (28%) of these residents changing their behaviour, either by leaving the public place where people were drinking or by avoiding a public place.

**Public place which was avoided or left.**

*What place or places did you avoid or leave?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street or footpath (other than licensed premises with outdoors or footpath areas)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public park or reserve</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach or coastline</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports ground (excluding Westpac stadium and licensed clubs)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Those who avoided or left a public place (n=146)*
Reasons for avoiding or leaving the public place.

What happened, or what were you concerned about, that made you avoid or leave that place?

- Felt unsafe: 50%
- Was actually threatened or intimidated by those drinking: 35%
- Was concerned about children being exposed to this: 21%
- Litter, such as bottles, cans, glass: 11%
- Smell/hygiene of the space (e.g., urine, vomit): 8%
- Nothing/no impact: 1%
- Other: 23%
- Don’t know: 1%

Base: Those who avoided or left a public place (n=146)

Of those residents who avoided or left a place due to alcohol being consumed there or the threat of alcohol being consumer there:

- those more likely to be concerned about children being exposed are female (27%) c.f. male (13%)
- those more likely to have been threatened or intimidated by those drinking are aged 25-39 years old (48%) c.f. 40-59 years old (24%)
- those more likely to have been affected by litter are aged 40-59 years old (20%) c.f. 25-39 years old (4%)
Appendix I: – Sample Profile

Sample Design - Quotas

Quotas were set for the sample to ensure it was representative of the Wellington population, according to ward, age and gender. Any discrepancies were corrected by weighting the data to the known make-up of Wellington’s population. For weighting purposes a minimum of 7 residents were obtained in each weighting cell (i.e. gender within age group within ward). Details of the sample achieved are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>% of Wellington population</th>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow-Western</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>% of Wellington population</th>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39 years</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59 years</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>% of Wellington population</th>
<th>Unweighted sample</th>
<th>Weighted sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sampling Error

Sampling error:
- The maximum margin of error on a sample size of 600 respondents is ± 4.0 % (based on results for 600 complete surveys).

### Response Rate

The response rate for this survey was 42%
## Appendix II: – Support of a Suburb Specific Ban shown by Suburb

(Caution is required when interpreting results due to small base sizes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Strongly opposed</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Neither in favour nor opposed</th>
<th>In favour</th>
<th>Strongly in favour</th>
<th>Don’t care/no opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Net Oppose</th>
<th>Neither in favour nor opposed</th>
<th>Net in Favour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aro Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhampure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaker Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churtton Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton Downs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada Village</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Bay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsonville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaparawhara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaka Bays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karori</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelburn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khandallah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilbirnie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowhai Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyall Bay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose (west - city side)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose (east - airport side - View Road/Hornsey Road)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Cook</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Victoria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngahia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owairiki Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paparangi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipitea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongotai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseneath</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatoun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Aro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorndon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogeltown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadestown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results for Mount Cook and Newton are from questions asked of all residents about bans in these two suburbs
**Appendix III: – Nielsen Quality Assurance**

| Quality Assurance | Nielsen is committed to the principles of Total Quality Management, and in 1995 achieved certification under the International Standards Organisation ISO 9001 code. The company maintains rigorous standards of quality control in all areas of operation. We believe no other commercial research organisation in New Zealand can provide clients with the level of confidence in survey data that we are able to. Furthermore, Nielsen is routinely and regularly subjected to independent external auditing of all aspects of its survey operations. |
| ISO 9001 | In terms of this project, all processes involved are covered by our ISO 9001 procedures. As part of these procedures, all stages of this research project (including all inputs/outputs) are to be approved by the Project Leader. |
| Code of Ethics | All research conducted by Nielsen conforms with the Code of Professional Behaviour of the Market Research Society of New Zealand. |