

STAFF REPORT

TO: Mayor & Councillors

FROM: Administration Advisor

REFERENCE: E313

DATE: 4 April 2006

SUBJECT: Representation Review Subcommittee
Recommendations

PURPOSE/REASON FOR REPORT

To advise Council of the Representation Review Subcommittee's recommendations and reasoning from their 7 February 2006 meeting, to enable Council to adopt an "initial proposal".

BACKGROUND

The Representation Review Subcommittee met on 7 February 2006 to discuss the public feedback on a suggested scenario of five wards/twelve councillors, Community Board for Golden Bay, removing the Motueka Community Board and encouraging community associations for wards without a community board, as outlined in Tasman Newsline The Mag.

COMMENT/DISCUSSION

The Subcommittee was advised that 234 letters had been received from the Preliminary Consultation Exercise commenting on the suggested scenario, viz:

Golden Bay – 194 responses

- 161 supporting status quo of two councillors and Community Board
- 25 supported 2 or more councillors
- 6 supported 2 councillors and no Board
- 1 supported Board only
- 1 gave no clear direction either way.

Motueka – 15 responses

- 15 supported retention of Community Board
- 2 supported retaining 2 Golden Bay councillors and both Community Boards

Murchison/Lakes – 9 responses

- 8 requested status quo with 2 councillors
- 1 suggested either 2 councillors, or 1 councillor and a community board

Richmond – 2 responses

- Both in favour of 4 councillors

Moutere/Waimea – 5 responses – all different

- Will disenfranchise rural people with less representation
- Support proposal including abolishing Motueka Community Board
- Proposed boundary changes take away community of interest for Wakefield residents
- Suggest 4 wards and 3 community boards, 10 councillors
- Support proposal of reduced councillors, and prefer community associations.

Miscellaneous – 9 responses

- 3 concerned re lack of consultation
- 2 concerned rural representation being eroded
- 1 if reduced Lakes/Murchison and Golden Bay councillor – more community board delegation, or amalgamation
- 2 status quo
- 1 in agreement of proposed number of councillors.

The Subcommittee considered several options for five wards, and 12 or 13 councillors, including the status quo. They decided to comply as close as possible to $\pm 10\%$ the population formula by increasing the Lakes/Murchison Ward to include Wai-iti, and to accommodate the non-compliance with Golden Bay that a case for an isolated community should be made.

Arguments to justify this could include:

- (a) Golden Bay is an isolated community requiring specific representation in order to provide effective representation;
- (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.

The Subcommittee also considered the comments with regard to the two community boards, and bearing in mind the issues raised in comments regarding Golden Bay, including the possible reduction of one councillor and the increased workload, decided to recommend to Council to retain this board. With regard to the Motueka Community Board, the Subcommittee felt it could be abolished, as Motueka is more accessible to Richmond and the other wards.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS REQUESTED AT THE RECENT WORKSHOP

At the Council Workshop on 18 May 2006 the following suggestions were made:

- 1 That Council be elected "At Large" ie no Wards.
- 2 That Council be elected partly "At Large" and partly by the Ward system.

Staff have contacted all Councils in New Zealand for feedback on either of these systems and at the time of writing this report only one response had been received. Should sufficient information be received prior to the meeting it will be circulated under separate cover.

We have however obtained the following information from the Department of Internal Affairs:

- 1 Local authorities using "At Large" systems:

Kawerau District
Wairoa District
Napier City
Upper Hutt City
Nelson City
Kaikoura District
Chatham Islands
Invercargill City

- 2 Local authorities using mixed "Wards/At Large" systems:

Tauranga City
Kapiti Coast District

Elections at large have the significant advantage that it eliminates the need to comply with the $\pm 10\%$ rule. With this option the size of the Council would become the main consideration. Should Community Boards be retained it is anticipated that the boundaries for these would continue to be the same as the current Wards. There may need to be a legal process to create "Community" areas to replace the Wards and this can be checked out should Council wish to consider being elected at large.

The combination of some elected at large and some by Wards is a difficult one to ensure representation in the rural areas. The problem is that the $\pm 10\%$ population thresholds still apply to the Wards. The fewer Councillors elected under the Ward system, the higher the population threshold. The following examples illustrate the difficulty:

- a) 12 Member Council – 6 elected at large and 6 from Wards. Population (45 850) divided by 6 = 7 641. One Councillor therefore = 6 895 to 8 387 (7 641 ± 10%)
- b) 12 Member Council – 8 elected at large and 4 elected from Wards then one Councillor = 10 316 to 12 608 (11 462 ± 10%).

As can be seen from these examples Golden Bay with a population of 5 180 is not close to meeting the population thresholds and areas like Lakes/Murchison would need to combine with a significant part of Moutere/Waimea to be eligible for a Ward Councillor.

WHERE TO FROM HERE?

Once Council has made its initial representation review decision, the Special Consultative Procedure as outlined in the Local Government Act 2002, will be used, and Council's decision will be publicly notified inviting submissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REPRESENTATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE:

- 1 THAT Council consider the following two options:
- (i) 5 Wards – 12 Councillors
Lakes/Murchison 1, Richmond 4, Motueka 3, Moutere/Waimea 3, Golden Bay 1

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
12	1=	3439	3821	4203
	2=	6878	7642	8406
	3=	10317	11463	12609
	4=	13756	15284	16812

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	1
Motueka	11400	3
Richmond	14650	4
Moutere/Waimea (minus Wai-iti)	10908	3
Lakes/Murchison (plus Wai-iti)	3712	1
	45850	12

NB:

Moutere/Waimea 11950 – 1042 (Wai-iti) = 10908

Lakes/Murchison 2670 + 1042 (Wai-iti) = 3712

Golden Bay Ward treated as an isolated community, and therefore does not meet the population thresholds

- (ii) 5 Wards- 13 Councillors
Lakes/Murchison 1, Richmond 4, Motueka 3, Moutere-Waimea 3, Golden Bay 2

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
13	1=	3175	3527	3880
	2=	6350	7054	7760
	3=	9525	10581	11640
	4=	12700	14108	15520

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	2
Motueka	11400	3
Richmond	14650	4
Moutere/Waimea (minus Wai-iti)	10908	3
Lakes/Murchison (plus Wai-iti)	3712	1
	45850	13

NB:

Moutere/Waimea 11950 – 1042 (Wai-iti) = 10908

Lakes/Murchison 2670 + 1042 (Wai-iti) = 3712

Golden Bay Ward treated as an isolated community, and therefore does not meet the population thresholds

2 THAT Council consider the following community board options:

- (i) Golden Bay Community Board be retained;
- (ii) Motueka Community Board be abolished, as it is considered Motueka is more accessible to Richmond and other wards.

3 THAT Council consider encouraging independent community associations in wards that do not have a community board.

PROCESS & REVIEWED TIMETABLE

Attached is a reviewed process/timetable which will be effective when Council resolves its initial proposal today.

Sandra Hartley

<http://tdctoday:82/Shared Documents/Meetings/Council/Full Council/Reports/2006/RCN060601 Report Representation Review.doc>

PROCESS & TIMETABLE UPDATE

	Process	LEA Authority	Council/ Committee Timetable
1	Council determines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed number of Wards; - proposed name and boundaries of each Ward; - number of members to be elected by the electors of each Ward; - number of members proposed to be elected by whole district; - The existence and composition of Community Board 	19H 19H 19H 19H 19J	01.06.06
2	Public notice of initial resolution	19M	03.06.06
3	Submissions close not less than one month after public notice.	19M(2)(d)	03.07.06
4	After close of submission period. No submissions received. Give public notice.	19Y(1)	08.07.06
5	Submissions received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider all submissions; - may amend the resolution; - give public notice 	19N(1)(a) 19N(1)(b)	19.08.06
6	Last day for lodging of appeals and objections to the Council's revised proposals.	19O 19P	18.09.06
7	No appeals or objections – give public notice.	19Y(1)	23.09.06
8	Appeals or objectives received – refer to Local Government Commission.	19Q	18.09.06
9	Local Government Commission issues a final determination	19R 19S	
10	Election day		13.10.07

Note: The above timetable complies with the requirements of the Local Electoral Act.