

STAFF REPORT

TO: Mayor and Councillors

FROM: Administration Advisor/Community Services Manager

REFERENCE: C772

DATE: 27 October 2005

SUBJECT: Representation Review Subcommittee Recommendations from 25 October 2005 Meeting

At their 25 October 2005 meeting the Representation Review Subcommittee considered the following scenarios on the number of wards, number of councillors and community board/community association options.

1 FOUR WARD SCENARIOS

1.1 12 Councillors

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/Lakes	14620	4
	45850	12

Comments:

- 1 Only change made is the combining of the Moutere/Waimea Ward and the Lakes/Murchison Ward.
- 2 As the population of Golden Bay is outside the $\pm 10\%$ requirement a special case would need to be made for the Ward to be treated as an isolated community.

1.2 11 Councillors

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
11	1=	3752	4168	4585
	2=	7504	8336	9170
	3=	11256	12504	13755
	4=	15008	16672	18340

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	1+
Motueka	13380	3
Richmond	15226	4
Moutere/Waimea/Lakes	12064	3
	45850	11

Motueka Ward 11400 + 1980 (Motueka Outer) = 13380

Richmond Ward 14650 + 576 (Appleby) = 15226

Moutere/Waimea/Lakes 14620 – 1980 (Mot Outer) – 576 (Appleby) = 12064

Comments:

- 1 *A number of changes are necessary to meet the ±10% requirement, but it can be achieved.*
- 2 *As the population of Golden Bay is outside the ±10% requirement a special case would need to be made for the Ward to be treated as an isolated community.*

1.3 10 Councillors

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
10	1=	4127	4585	5044
	2=	8254	9170	10088
	3=	12381	13755	15132
	4=	16508	18340	20176

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	7200	1+
Motueka	14656	3
Richmond	19111	4
Lakes/Murchison	4883	1
	45850	10

Golden Bay Ward 5180 + 2020 (Kaiteriteri/Riwaka/Brooklyn) = 7200

Motueka Ward 11400 – 2020 (Kaiteriteri/Riwaka/Brooklyn) + 1980 (Mot Outer) + 2027 (Mapua) +1015 (Bronte) +254 (Dovedale/Thorpe) = 14656

Richmond Ward 14650 + 3375 (Brightwater/Wakefield) + 1086 (Appleby/Redwood Valley) = 19111

Lakes/Murchison 2670 + 2213 (remainder of Moutere/Waimea) = 4883

Comment:

- 1 *An attempt was made to expand the Golden Bay Ward in an endeavour to meet the population thresholds by including Riwaka/Kaiteriteri/Brooklyn, but this was not achieved, and did not meet the 'community of interest' criteria .*

1.3.1 10 Councillors

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
10	1=	4127	4585	5044
	2=	8254	9170	10088
	3=	12381	13755	15132
	4=	16508	18340	20176

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	1+
Motueka	13380	3
Richmond	14650	3
Lakes/Murchison/Moutere/Waimea	12640	3
	45850	10

Motueka Ward 11400 + 1980 (Motueka Outer) = 13380

Lakes/Murchison/Moutere/Waimea 14620 – 1980 (Motueka Outer) = 12640

Comment:

- 1 *This scenario involves the combining of the Moutere/Waimea and Lakes/Murchison Wards.*
- 2 *Apart from Golden Bay, this scenario meets the population threshold, therefore a special case would need to be made for Golden bay to be treated as an isolated community.*

1.4 9 Councillors

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
9	1=	4585	5094	5603
	2=	9170	10188	11206
	3=	13755	15282	16809

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	1
Motueka	11000	2
Richmond	14650	3
Lakes/Murchison/Waimea/Lakes	15020	3
	45850	9

Motueka 11400 – 400 (Motueka Valley) = 11000

Moutere/Waimea/Lakes 14620 + 400 (Motueka Valley) = 15020

Comment:

- 1 *Only one minor change is required to the Motueka Ward to make this work for nine Councillors.*
- 2 *Although this scenario fitted the population threshold, the Subcommittee considered the workload on nine councillors would be too great, and therefore disregarded this option*

2 FIVE WARD SCENARIOS

The following examples showed an altered Ward boundary between Moutere/Waimea and Lakes/Murchison, in that part of the 'Wai-iti' Area Unit population is taken out of Moutere/Waimea, and put into Lakes/Murchison (extra 1042) and are based on 9, 11 and 12 Councillors.

2.1 12 Councillors

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+

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

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

Comment:

- 1 This five Ward example fits the population criteria the best, with only Golden Bay being just outside the threshold, and once again a special case would need to be made for an isolated community.

2.2 11 Councillors

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
11	1=	3752	4168	4585
	2=	7504	8336	9170
	3=	11256	12504	13755
	4=	15008	16672	18340

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	1+
Motueka	13380	3
Richmond	15226	4
Moutere/Waimea	8352	2
Lakes/Murchison	3712	1
	45850	11+

Richmond Ward 14650 + 576 (Appleby) = 15226

Moutere/Waimea Ward 11950 – 1042 (Wai-iti) – 576 (Appleby) – 1980 (Mot Outer) = 8352

Motueka Ward 11400 + 1980 (Mot Outer) = 13380

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

(NB: Lakes/Murch is approx 36 short of -10% figure for 1 Councillor, so would require a minor adjustment to make this comply.)

Comment:

- 1 *This example includes numerous boundary changes to comply with the population threshold.*
- 2 *A special case would have to be made for Golden Bay as an isolated community as it does not meet the population threshold.*

2.3 9 Councillors

Total # Councillors	# Councillors/ Population	Population Thresholds		
		-10%	Medium	+10%
9	1=	4585	5094	5603
	2=	9170	10188	11206
	3=	13755	15282	16809

WARD	POPULATION	# COUNCILLORS
Golden Bay	5180	1
Motueka	11400	2+
Richmond	14650	3
Moutere/Waimea	10908	2
Lakes/Murchison	3712	0+
	45850	8+

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

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

Comment:

- 1 *This example shows that the Motueka and Lakes/Murchison population thresholds cannot be met, and although some boundary tweaking between Motueka and Moutere/Waimea could ensure compliance for Motueka, it would be difficult to achieve the same for Lakes/Murchison without taking part of Wakefield into the Lakes/Murchison Ward.*

3 COMMUNITY BOARDS & COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION OPTIONS

3.1 Community Board in Each Ward

This would entail four to five boards, depending on the number of Wards decided upon. Under the Local Electoral Act 2001, membership is:

[19F. Membership of Community Boards—

- (1) *Every Community Board—*
 - (a) *is to consist of not fewer than 4 members nor more than 12 members; and*
 - (b) *is to include at least 4 elected members; and*
 - (c) *may include appointed members.*
- (2) *The number of appointed members is to be less than half the total number of members.*

- (3) *The persons who are appointed under subsection (1)(c) as members of the Community Boards must—*
- (a) be members of, and must be appointed by, the territorial authority for the district in respect of which the community is constituted; and*
 - (b) if the territorial authority is divided into Wards, also be members of the territorial authority representing a Ward in which the community is situated.]*

The Local Government Act 2002 outlines the status, role and powers of Community Board, viz:

51. Status of Community Board—

A Community Board—

- (a) is an unincorporated body; and*
- (b) is not a local authority; and*
- (c) is not a committee of the relevant territorial authority.*

52. Role of Community Board—

The role of a Community Board is to—

- (a) represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community; and*
- (b) consider and report on all matters referred to it by the territorial authority, or any matter of interest or concern to the Community Boards; and*
- (c) maintain an overview of services provided by the territorial authority within the community; and*
- (d) prepare an annual submission to the territorial authority for expenditure within the community; and*
- (e) communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community; and*
- (f) undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the territorial authority.*

53. Powers of Community Board—

- (1) A Community Board has the powers that are—*
 - (a) delegated to it by the relevant territorial authority in accordance with clause 32 of Schedule 7; or*
 - (b) prescribed by the Order in Council constituting its community.*
- (2) The powers of a Community Board prescribed by Order in Council expire at the close of 6 years after the order comes into force.*
- (3) Despite subsection (1), a Community Boards may not—*
 - (a) acquire, hold, or dispose of property; or*
 - (b) appoint, suspend, or remove staff.*

The current Community Boards are made up of four elected members, and two appointed members (Ward Councillors). These Boards are administered by the Service Centres Manager and his staff.

Remuneration of board members is currently funded 50% from the remuneration pool, and 50% from general rates. The Remuneration Authority had determined that Board Chairs be paid \$9,338.00 per annum, and Members \$4,699.00 per annum. Appointed members, who are Ward Councillors, do not receive any extra remuneration for their Community Boards duties.

3.2 Community Associations in each Ward, supported by adequate council funding

Council does currently fund these associations, with a budget of \$20,000 per annum. All organisations need to meet the following criteria:

- Organisations must be formally constituted as an incorporated society;
- Organisations must operate in Wards where there is no Community Boards;
- The office bearers of organisations must be publicly elected through a process approved by Council and they must hold regular (at least quarterly) publicly advertised meetings in the Ward;
- They must have Council related matters as their primary function; and
- They must carry out liaison and advocacy with Council.

Organisations are written to at the beginning of each financial year asking for detailed information as to the level of funding they seek, and also request a copy of their annual report.

Currently the following organisations receive Council funding:

- Dovedale Residents Group
- Murchison & Districts Community Council
- Mapua Ruby Bay Residents & Ratepayers Association
- Rotoiti District Community Council
- Wakefield Community Council
- Motueka Valley Association
- Richmond Community Forum
- Tapawera & Districts Community Council
- Tasman Area Community Association; and
- Brightwater Community Association.

If the council agreed to this option, there would also be requests from community associations in Motueka and Golden Bay (NB: Motueka Valley Association is in the Moutere/Waimea Ward).

3.3 Mixture of Community Board and Community Associations

This would presumably be the status quo, with the two Community Board and the above Community Associations.

3.4 Community Boards only in Golden Bay as part of the Isolated Community Status

This was considered an option, especially if the Golden Bay Ward only has one Councillor.

4 SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

In making definitive recommendations on this review, the Subcommittee took the following into consideration:

4.1 Workloads of Councillors

Tasman District Council is a Unitary Council with the responsibilities of a Regional Council and a Territorial Local Authority.

The growth within the Tasman District is likely to continue, having just recently been quoted as the fastest growing region in New Zealand with a 1.7% increase to 30 June 2005. Although this is not at the same rate as has been in the last few years, workloads of Councillors will still be high. Therefore a reduction to 9 or 10 Councillors may be too great, even if Community Boards were introduced to all Wards.

The Subcommittee therefore recommends that the Council size be either 11 or 12 Councillors, which would provide a good balance between effective representation and efficiency.

4.2 Number of Wards

The purpose of Wards is to provide a spread of Councillors across the district with each Councillor once elected being responsible for the whole of the district, not just the Ward that elected them.

The current five Ward system has provided a good spread of Councillors, and the question needs to be asked – would a reduction in Wards provide such a good spread.

Under the 11 and 12 Councillor options for four Wards, it could be argued that the spread of Councillors in the Lakes/Murchison/Moutere/Waimea could be compromised, i.e. all the Councillors for this combined Ward could come from the larger urban areas.

The Subcommittee therefore recommends to Council that the number of Wards remain at five, thus ensuring an even spread of representation

4.3 Number of Councillors under Five Wards

Recommendation 4.1 suggests a council of 11 or 12 Councillors and recommendation 4.2 suggests five Wards be retained.

The following are the 11 and 12 Councillor options under the five Ward scenarios:

WARDS	POPULATION	12 CRS	11 CRS
Golden Bay	5180	1+	1+
Motueka	11400	3	3 (13380) + Mot Outer
Richmond	14650	4	4 (15226) + Appleby
Moutere/Waimea	11950	3 (10908) – Wai-iti	2 (8352) – Appleby, Mot Outer, Wai-iti
Lakes/Murchison	2670	1 (3712) + Wai-iti	1 (3712) + Wai-iti
	45850	12+	11+

NB: Figures in brackets are where boundary changes have had to be made to meet ± 10% criteria.

The only changes required under the 12 Councillor option is taking the Wai-iti area out of Moutere/Waimea Ward and adding to the Lakes/Murchison Ward. This does not affect the

number of Councillors for the Moutere/Waimea Ward as 11950 and 10908 both fall within the three Councillor range.

The 11 Councillor option adds 1980 to the Motueka Ward but does not increase the number of Councillors (11400 and 13380 both fall within the three Councillor range), whereas Moutere/Waimea reduces to two Councillors as a result of assisting three other Wards meeting the $\pm 10\%$ criteria.

The Subcommittee therefore recommends to Council that the number of Councillors be 12 in total with the Wai-iti area being added to the Lakes/Murchison Ward.

4.4 Community Board/Community Associations

Throughout the review process it has been suggested that as Golden Bay may only have one Councillor, that the Community Board be retained. This could change if a case was made for two Councillors instead of one as shown in the 12 Councillor/5 Ward proposal. The need for the Board was in recognition of the workload on one Councillor in the Ward. Appropriate delegations would need to be investigated with a view to the Board members assisting their Councillor.

In the other four Wards it has been proposed that Community Associations be supported by Council.

- (i) The Subcommittee therefore recommends to Council that a Community Board be retained in Golden Bay if there is only one councillor for the ward, for the reason that council considers Golden Bay to be an isolated community, and that appropriate delegations for the Board be investigated further; and***
- (ii) That in the other four Wards Council will encourage independent Community Associations, that meet Council's Community Association criteria, and that they receive some financial assistance from Council.***

Staff will be formalising a case for the "isolated community" status for the Golden Bay Ward, which will be forwarded to the Local Government Commission for their consideration along with Council's initial proposal.

NB: If Golden Bay Ward was to have two councillors on an isolated community basis, this would increase the total number of councillors by one.

5 PROCESS/TIMETABLE

Consultation with the community prior to Council approving its initial proposal could be most beneficial, and it is suggested that once the Council has looked at the options today, that dates be set aside to put this to the community for initial feedback. Council can then revisit their preferred option, take cognisance of the community opinion, then resolve and publicly notify their initial proposal. This may well reduce the number of submissions received down the track.

If Council is in agreement with this, the attached timetable factors in time for this process.

PROCESS & SUGGESTED TIMETABLE

	Process	LEA Authority	Legislation Timetable	Council/ Committee Timetable
1	Council consideration of Maori representation	19Z	By 23 Nov 05	03/11/05
2	Council consideration of detailed options and pre-review communications strategy	-	-	03/11/05
3	Consultation with community	-	-	Nov/Dec
4	Identify preferred option	-		26/01/06
5	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	By 31 Aug 06	26/01/06
6	Public notice of initial resolution	19M	By 8 Sep 06	28/01/06
7	Submissions close not less than one month after public notice.	19M(2)(d)	9 Oct 05	24/02/06
8	After close of submission period. No submissions received. Give public notice.	19Y(1)		25/02/06
9	Submissions received: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider all submissions; - may amend the resolution; - give public notice 	19N(1)(a) 19N(1)(b)	By 19 Nov 06	01/04/06
10	Last day for lodging of appeals and objections to the Council's revised proposals.	19O 19P	20 Dec 06	01/05/06
11	No appeals or objections – give public notice.	19Y(1)		06/05/06
12	Appeals or objectives received – refer to Local Government Commission.	19Q	15 Jan 07	
13	Local Government Commission issues a final determination	19R 19S	11 Apr 07	
14	Election day		13 Oct 07	13/10/07