

STAFF REPORT

TO: Representation Review Subcommittee
FROM: Administration Advisor
REFERENCE: C772
DATE: 19/10/2010
SUBJECT: Representation Review

At the 16 August 2005 meeting of this subcommittee, the following was agreed:

- (i) Council reconfirm CN03/04/36 to carry out the representation review;
- (ii) The number of members be a maximum of 12 and minimum of 10 (to balance size/efficiency with need for adequate representation);
- (iii) There be four wards;
- (iv) There be no separate Maori Ward;
- (v) Community Board options include:
 - (a) No community boards, but promote community associations with enhanced training and funding from Council
 - (b) Two community boards between four wards;
 - (c) Four community boards – one per ward; or
 - (d) One community board in Golden Bay because of its isolated/island nature.

COUNCIL TO RECONFIRM TO CARRY OUT THE REPRESENTATION REVIEW

This will be put to full Council at their 22 September 2005 meeting.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS BE A MAXIMUM OF 12 AND MINIMUM OF 10, AND THERE BE FOUR WARDS

Cr Higgins suggested that there be four wards as follows:

Lakes/Murchison Ward – extend to take in Wakefield (one member)
Golden Bay – to include Riwaka and Kaiteriteri (two members)
Motueka – take in Motueka Valley and Mapua (three members)
Richmond – include Waimea Basin (four or five members)

To assist with the production of maps etc. for this scenario, a comparison was done with ward populations based on the 2001 census and the 2004 estimated ward population, as follows:

	2001 census %	2004 estimate %
Golden Bay	13.7	13.7
Lakes/Murchison	8.2	8.0
Motueka	34.5	34.0
Richmond	43.6	44.3
	100.0	100.0

As there was only a small difference, it was decided to proceed with the 2001 census figures, as we already have these on the meshblocks.

COMMUNITY BOARD OPTIONS

1 NO COMMUNITY BOARDS, BUT PROMOTE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS WITH ENHANCED TRAINING AND FUNDING FROM COUNCIL

Information regarding the current community/ratepayer associations that receive funding from Council, and the funding criteria, will be tabled at the meeting.

If this option is pursued, it is envisaged that training would include meeting procedures (including chairmanship) and a briefing on accounting procedures relative to incorporated societies.

2 TWO COMMUNITY BOARDS BETWEEN FOUR WARDS

This option could mean two things:

- The status quo, with retaining boards in Golden Bay and Motueka; or
- Two wards sharing a community board.

Problems could be perceived with the latter with distances and venues for both staff and elected members, as well as the issue of community of interest.

Guidance is sought from the Subcommittee as to which option was intended.

3 FOUR COMMUNITY BOARDS – ONE PER WARD

Staff consider that community boards could work in Motueka, Golden Bay and Richmond – as these wards are all focussed around a major town. The proposed Lakes/Murchison ward is sparsely populated, with many small communities, and the only way to ensure fair and effective representation would be to subdivide the ward and allow for several community boards.

This would probably be seen as an expensive option for a very small population. The better option may be to promote the community associations

in this area.

4 ONE COMMUNITY BOARD IN GOLDEN BAY BECAUSE OF ITS ISOLATED/ISLAND NATURE

This is another option which could tie in with proposed case for Golden Bay as an “isolated community”. If the elected member number is reduced, the Board delegations could possibly be enhanced to assist with the workload of the elected member.

Council Representation

Attached are three scenarios (numbered 1-3) based on Cr Higgins suggestions at the last meeting. These show that with some juggling of ward boundaries it is possible to meet the \pm % criteria.

Isolated Communities

Scenarios 4-6 are based on the Golden Bay Ward remaining unchanged which creates the need to make a case for the Bay to be treated as an “isolated community”.

Staff consider that the existing Golden Bay Ward is an isolated community that requires specific representation in order to provide effective representation for the Bay area and therefore a case could be made regarding this.

Arguments to justify this could include:

- (a) Golden Bay has a very clear geographic line that separates the Bay from the balance of the Tasman District;
- (b) Weather patterns can vary considerably from the rest of Tasman District with heavy rain causing flooding that can isolate the Bay;
- (c) Council contracts for roading, parks and reserves etc. are all carried out from depots based in the Bay;
- (d) The Bay has a relatively small permanent population which swells considerably during the holiday season with people using the camping grounds and many of the baches that remain empty for most of the year.

One of the difficulties we could have is arguing for more than one councillor for Golden Bay if the total councillors for the Tasman District is less than 12 members.

For a 12 member Council the population thresholds for one and two councillors are:

One councillor – 3103 to 3792

Two councillors – 6206 to 7584

The Golden Bay population is 4791 which falls between one and two councillors. Therefore justification will need to be given so that the Local Government Commission is satisfied that Golden Bay is an isolated community.

For an 11 member Council the population thresholds for one and two councillors are:

One councillor – 3384 to 4136)

Two councillors – 6728 to 8272) Golden Bay population = 4791

For committee members interest the following is an extract from the Local Government Commission Reorganisation Scheme for Banks Peninsula and Christchurch City which gives the Commissions reasons for determining Banks Peninsula as an isolated community requiring specific representation:

“The Commission is satisfied that the proposed Banks Peninsula Ward, in the context of the enlarged Christchurch City, is an isolated community requiring specific representation in order to provide effective representation for the Banks Peninsular area. Banks Peninsula has a geography that is quite distinct from that of the existing Christchurch City. Its mix of urban areas, small settlements and dispersed rural communities, spread over a wide geographical area, with difficult and weather-affected roading access in places, creates a unique set of factors that underpin the provision of specific council representation on the basis of isolation for the Banks Peninsula area.”

RECOMMENDATION

That consideration be given to the various scenarios detailed in this report and advise what further information is required to assist members in making a recommendation on the Representation Review.

Sandra Hartley

<http://tdctoday:82/Shared Documents/Meetings/Council/Full Council/Reports/2005/RCN050830 Representation Review.doc>