

Whangarei District Council Meeting

Agenda

Date: 31 August, 2021

Time: 9:00 am

Location: Virtual Meeting Room

Elected Members: Her Worship the Mayor Sheryl Mai
(Chairperson)
Cr Gavin Benney
Cr Vince Cocurullo
Cr Nicholas Connop
Cr Ken Couper
Cr Tricia Cutforth
Cr Shelley Deeming
Cr Jayne Golightly
Cr Phil Halse
Cr Greg Innes
Cr Greg Martin
Cr Anna Murphy
Cr Carol Peters
Cr Simon Reid

For any queries regarding this meeting please contact
the Whangarei District Council on (09) 430-4200.

1. Karakia/Prayer
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Apologies
4. Decision Reports
 - 4.1. Representation Review 2021 - Deliberation on submissions 1
5. Closure of Meeting

Recommendations contained in the Council agenda may not be the
final decision of Council.

Please refer to Council minutes for final resolution.

4.1 Representation Review 2021 – Deliberation on submissions

Meeting: Whangarei District Council
Date of meeting: 31 August 2021
Reporting officer: Emily Thompson (Manager Democracy and Assurance)
 Nicolene Pestana (Team Leader Democracy)

1 Purpose

To deliberate on submissions relating to the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal for representation arrangements for the 2022 triennial local government elections (the Initial Proposal).

2 Recommendations

That Council;

1. Note the 61 valid submissions received on the Representation Review Initial Proposal for the 2022 triennial local government elections.
2. Deliberate on submissions relating to the Representation Review Initial Proposal for the 2022 triennial local government elections.
3. Note the recommendations as contained in the Submissions Report (Attachment 1), which will be used to inform development of the Representation Review Final Proposal for the 2022 triennial local government elections (including any changes made as a result of deliberations).

3 Background

The Local Electoral Act 2001 (LEA) requires local authorities to undertake a review of their representation arrangements at least once every six years to ensure the arrangements provide fair and effective representation for communities.

Council last reviewed its representation arrangements in 2018 which took effect for the 2019 and 2022 triennial elections. On 3 November 2020, Council resolved to establish Māori ward(s) for the 2022 and 2025 triennial elections, necessitating a review of the representation arrangements in 2021, with the outcome to apply for the 2022 triennial local government elections.

The LEA prescribes the process and timeline that councils are required to follow when undertaking a representation review.

On 24 June 2021, Council considered three options for representation of the Whangarei District and resolved to adopt the following as its Initial Proposal:

- The Whangarei District Council to comprise the mayor elected at-large and 13 councillors elected under the ward system, specifically 11 general ward councillors and 2 Māori ward councillors
- The Whangarei District be divided in six wards:
 - Bream Bay General Ward (represented by 2 general ward councillors)
 - Hikurangi Coastal General Ward (represented by 2 general ward councillors)
 - Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward (represented by 1 general ward councillor)
 - Whangarei Heads General Ward (represented by 1 general ward councillor)
 - Whangarei Urban General Ward (represented by 5 general ward councillors) combining the existing Denby and Okara wards
 - Whangarei District Māori Ward (represented by 2 Māori ward councillors) covering the entire Whangarei district
- No community boards be established

To comply with the prescribed requirements for fair representation (the per-councillor population of any ward may not vary by more than 10% from the average per-councillor population of the whole district), the proposal provided for the following ward boundary changes:

- Bream Bay General Ward
 - to move Toe Toe Road at the south of the city into the Bream Bay General Ward from the existing Okara ward
 - to move the southern part of Cemetery Road, North of SH15 to the west of the city into the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward from the existing Bream Bay ward
- Hikurangi Coastal General Ward
 - to move the Springs Flat area, including Taylor Road, Rose Place, Great North Road, Winger Crescent, Springs Flat Road and all roads to the west of Great North Road down to Station Road (including the beginning of Pipiwai Road, Hiko Road, Waipanga Road, Onoke Lane, Northcroft Drive, Oakwood Rise, east side of Dip Road, Georgia Lane, Brickworks Lane, Whitelaw Place, Butler Place, Tustian Way, Lilian Road, west side of Kamo Road to Station Road, Ford Avenue, Moehau Road, Tuatara Drive, Crawford Crescent, Iti Street and Wentworth Place) into the Hikurangi-Coastal General Ward from the existing Denby Ward
- Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward
 - to move the southern part of Cemetery Road, North of SH15 to the west of the city into the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward from the existing Bream Bay ward
 - to move Redwood Rise, Westwood Lane, Taiko Street, Hihi Rise, Tieke Place, Kokako Place, Pukenui Road, Highfield Way, Pohutukawa Place, Tealmere Grove, Heron Place, Barge Lane, Beaumont Court and Rockwall Place and the northern end of Puriri Park Road, Sutton Close, Tui Crescent, the northern end of Kiwi Avenue, Le Ruez Place, Kowhai Park Road, Clarkson Crescent, Rosella Place into the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward from the existing Okara ward.

Public notice of the Initial Proposal was published on 30 June 2021. Consultation on the Initial Proposal ran from 30 June 2021 to 30 July 2021.

The Initial Proposal was open for feedback on the Council website's Have Your Say page, and in print form at all WDC libraries and service centres and shared with all ratepayers and residents associations and community groups such as Lions, Rotary and Zonta groups, Federated Farmers, Te Huinga and Te Karearea.

Council staff met and provided information to Council's Advisory Groups in July and drop-in sessions were held in the Central Library throughout July.

Engagement sessions for communities significantly affected by the proposed boundary changes were held at the Kamo Library on 24th July and at Maunu Community Hall on 26 July. Affected residents were informed of these sessions via letter drops to all affected properties.

A dedicated communications and advertising campaign (including a video) was undertaken during this period to draw attention to the consultation.

There were eight distinct Facebook posts, each of which also had shares or generated discussions within Facebook groups:

- Proposal image: 30 June

Total reach: 4837. 49 link clicks. Slightly above average performance on this post. Most clicks were to "see more" on the explanation. 4 shares.

- Formal consultation video (animated video) 7 July

Total reach: 16,800 people, of which about 10,000 was from paid promotion spending \$200. Approximately 400 watched the full video. ~36,000 total impressions. 79 link-clicks. Above average for the page. 47 shares. 81 comments on post, 28 on shares. Also showed in Instagram as part of paid placements

- Photo from Kamo library outreach 23 July

Total reach: 3334. 4 link-clicks. Below average performance for the page.

- Final reminder for feedback 29 July

Total reach 1872. 13 link clicks. 31 shares, mostly from one councillor. 2 total comments on shares. Below average performance from this post.

There were four posts to Neighbourly / Youtube. These generated some good discussion but only among a relatively small group of people. 24 total views on the Youtube version of the video (embedded in the Neighbourly post) indicates the low total reach on each platform.

Five tailored weekly print ads were run in the Northern Advocate and Whangarei Leader during the duration of the consultation.

4 Discussion

4.1 Submissions

Formal submissions were able to be made electronically, via email or post or delivered to Council offices and libraries.

Sixty-one submissions on the Initial Proposal were received:

- 59 submissions were received within the consultation period
- 2 submissions were received after close of submissions
- 45 online submissions
- 5 email submissions
- 11 delivered to Customer Services / received by post / dropped off at libraries
- 57 submissions by individuals
- 4 submissions made by organisations

Eight submitters indicated that they wished to speak to their submissions and were heard on 17 August 2021 (seven submitters) and 26 August (1 submitter).

The Submissions Report, appended as Attachment 1, summarises the submissions and provides staff analysis and recommendations.

Council must now consider and deliberate on all submissions received so that a recommendation to either confirm or amend the Initial Proposal can be made to the Council meeting on 7 September 2021.

Council must then give public notice of its Final Proposal within six weeks of the closing date of submissions (i.e. by 10 September 2021). This public notice will detail the submissions received, decisions made in relation to those submissions and reasons for any changes made to the Initial Proposal.

The LEA provides for a one-month objection / appeal period which will run from 10 September to 11 October. If the Final Proposal does not differ from the Initial Proposal, only those who made a submission may appeal Council's Final Proposal. Should the Final Proposal differ from the Initial Proposal, any person may object to the Final Proposal.

If an objection or appeal on the Final Proposal is received or if the per-councillor population of any ward varies by more than 10% from the average per-councillor population of the whole district, then all information regarding the followed process will sent to the Local Government Commission (LGC) for determination. The LGC must make its determination by April 2022.

5 Significance and engagement

The decisions or matters of this Agenda do not trigger the significance criteria outlined in Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, and the public will be informed via Agenda publication on the website.

6 Attachment

Attachment 1 Submissions Report

Submissions Report - with numbers.docx

AUGUST 31, 2021
WHANGAREI DISTRICT COUNCIL

Summary and analysis of submissions

Full copies of submissions were provided in the Submissions bundle for the hearing of submissions which were held on 17 August 2021.

1. Submissions unable to be considered as part of the Representation Review

1.1 Establishment of Māori wards

Six submitters provided commentary to their submissions which related solely to the establishment of Māori wards.¹

Staff analysis

The issue of whether Māori wards should be established does not form part of this review of representation arrangements. Council resolved on 3 November 2020 to establish Māori ward(s) for the 2022 and 2025 local government elections.

1.2 Choice of electoral system – STV

Four submitters provided commentary relating to the choice of electoral system, particularly voting through the Single Transferable Voting electoral system.²

Staff analysis

The choice of electoral system does not form part of this review of representation arrangements. Council resolved on 27 August 2020 to retain the First Past the Post electoral system for the 2022 local government elections.

1.3 Electoral Population Statistics

One submitter required Council to ensure that electoral roll statistic numbers are correct as of 2021, rather than June 2020.³

Staff analysis

The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides that Council must use the latest population estimates supplied by Statistics New Zealand to calculate the electoral population of the district. At the time of this Representation Review, these are the population estimates as at June 2020.

1.4 A detailed survey to be completed on where Māori are domiciled in the Whangarei district.

One submitter required Council to undertake a detailed survey be undertaken on where Māori are domiciled in the Whangarei district.⁴

Staff analysis

¹ Representation Review Submission #8,9,26,53,58,62.

² Representation Review Submission #2,16,36,47.

³ Representation Review Submission #48.

⁴ Representation Review Submission #57.

Council is unable to undertake a survey of this nature ahead of this representation review.

1.5 Māori Electoral Option

One submitter submitted that currently those Māori not on the Māori electoral roll i.e. on the General electoral roll, cannot vote in the Māori ward).⁵

Staff analysis

This issue is being considered by Central Government ahead of the 2022 local government elections. The Te Kārearea Strategic Partnership Standing Committee has provided feedback on this matter to Central Government.

1.6 Only electors on the Māori electoral roll should be allowed to stand as a Māori ward councillor

One submitter stated that the representatives of the Māori ward should be on the Māori electoral register. A candidate who does not have Māori whakapapa should be allowed to stand as a councillor.⁶

Staff analysis

This is provided for in terms of the Local Electoral Act 2001 and a change to this provision of the electoral legislation must be considered by Central Government.

2. Questions asked in the Submission Form

The Initial Proposal Booklet contained detailed information on the Initial Proposal. A submission form was attached to the Initial Proposal booklet.

Sixty-one submissions were received in total. Fifty-nine submissions were completed using the submission form which was attached to the Initial Proposal booklet.

Two submitters did not use the submission form and submitted an email submission.⁷ Their feedback has been incorporated into the submission statistics in this report.

The submission form did not require submitters to provide their details unless they wished to speak to their submission. As a result, 26 submissions were anonymous.

The submission form asked submitters to confirm their current ward. Of the 61 submissions, the ward breakdown was as follows:

- Bream Bay ward – 12 submitters
- Denby ward – 13 submitters
- Whangarei Heads ward – 4 submitters
- Hikurangi-Coastal ward – 9 submitters
- Okara ward – 17 submitters
- Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward - 4 submitters

⁵ Representation Review Submission #57.

⁶ Representation Review Submission #60.

⁷ Representation Review Submission #59 Federated Farmer of New Zealand Page 183 of Submissions bundle, Representation Review Submission #63 Tim Robinson Page 218 of Submissions bundle.

- I don't know my ward – 1 submitter
- General Submission - Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submitters were asked to answer the following questions relating to the proposal:

- Do you support all aspects of the proposal? Yes or No
- Do you agree with Council's proposal to continue to have 13 councillors and the Mayor? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Bream Bay ward? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Hikurangi Coastal ward? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree with retaining the existing Whangarei Heads ward? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree with combining the existing Okara and Denby wards into one Whangarei Urban General ward? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree with the establishment of a single Whangarei District Māori ward comprising the whole area of our District? Yes, No or Neutral
- Do you agree that no community boards be established? Yes, No or Neutral

Submitters had the opportunity to provide comment on each of the above questions as well as additional commentary to the proposal. Not every submitter answered every question or provided commentary on every aspect.

2.1 Do you support all aspects of the proposal?

Submission statistics

- 15 submitters supported or were neutral on all aspects of the Initial Proposal.
- 43 submitters did not support all aspects of the Initial Proposal.
- 3 submitters did not answer this question.

2.2 Do you agree with Council's proposal to continue to have 13 councillors and the Mayor?

Submission statistics

- 31 submitters agreed with Council's proposal to continue to have 13 councillors and the Mayor.
- 17 submitters did not agree with Council's proposal to continue to have 13 councillors and the Mayor.
- 2 submitters proposed an increase in councillors for more effective representation.⁸
- 1 submitter proposed an uneven number of councillors to reduce the chances of split vote and the Mayor feeling the need to abstain or use a casting vote.⁹
- 8 submitters proposed reducing the number of councillors. These submissions proposed:
 - *"10 councillors"*¹⁰

⁸ Representation Review Submission #17,57.

⁹ Representation Review Submission #36.

¹⁰ Representation Review Submission #6.

- *“6 general ward councillors and 2 Māori ward councillors”*¹¹
- *“1 Mayor, 2 Māori ward councillors and 1 general ward councillor per ward”*¹²
- *“5 general ward councillors, 5 Māori ward councillors and 1 Mayor”*¹³
- *“9 general ward councillors, 2 Māori ward councillors and 1 Mayor”*¹⁴
- *“8 general ward councillors, 2 Māori ward councillors and 1 Mayor”*¹⁵
- *“Numbers of Councillors reduced - 6 elected of the general roll, 2 of the Māori roll and one mayor”*¹⁶
- 9 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 4 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

In reviewing representation arrangements, Council must consider effective representation of the citizens of the District.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides that the Whangarei District must be represented between 5 and 29 councillors. When deciding on the number of councillors to effectively represent the district, Council considers the following factors:

- The physical size of the district and current wards
- The numbers of communities of interest
- The need to meet operational workload requirements of both the Council and individual councillors in attending Council and committee meetings and attending to the needs of the community
- Access by the community to elected representatives and the ability for councillors to access and engage with the community through public and face-to-face meetings

Through the review process, 11 possible representation scenarios were developed and considered by Council, including both more and less councillors. Having regard to the above factors, Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain 13 councillors plus the Mayor as the number of elected members providing the most effective representation for the District.

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal.

2.3 Do you agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Bream Bay ward?

Submission statistics

- 15 submitters agreed with the ward boundary changes to the existing Bream Bay ward. 5 of these 15 submitters are in the existing Bream Bay ward.
- 16 submitters did not agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Bream Bay ward. 3 of these 16 submitters are in the existing Bream Bay ward.

¹¹ Representation Review Submission #12.

¹² Representation Review Submission #40.

¹³ Representation Review Submission #51.

¹⁴ Representation Review Submission #63.

¹⁵ Representation Review Submission #67.

¹⁶ Representation Review Submission #16.

- 4 submitters addressed the proposal to move Toe Toe Road at the south of the city into the Bream Bay general ward from the existing Okara ward, stating:
 - *“People living in southern Whangarei have different needs to those in coastal communities such as Ruakaka and Waipu.”*¹⁷
 - *“Toe Toe Road should remain in the current Okara ward, cannot see how this road fits in to Bream Bay Ward.”*¹⁸
 - *“We would prefer to stay with Okara”.* (submission by residents of Toe Toe Road).¹⁹
 - *Toe Toe Road falls within the tribal boundary of Te Parawhau and should remain in the Okara ward.*²⁰ *As raised at the submission hearings held on 17 August.
- 1 submitter addressed the proposal to move the southern part of Cemetery Road, north of SH15 to the west of the city into Mangakahia-Maungatapere general ward from the existing Bream Bay ward:
 - *“Cemetery Road is probably more suited to the current Mangakahia-Maungatapere Ward than the current Bream Bay Ward.”*²¹
- 1 submitter suggested *“that the Bream Bay general ward be divided into two North Bream Bay and South Bream Bay with one councillor representing each part to ensure more equitable representation as the Waipu area has dominated council community expenditure. The dividing line should be drawn between Uretiti and the Waipu Golf Ground across to area north of Waiotira”.*²²
- 20 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 10 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

In reviewing representation arrangements, Council is required by the Local Electoral Act 2001 to consider three legislative criteria:

1. Identify communities of interest;
2. Provide effective representation to these communities of interest (for example number of councillors and wards);
3. Ensure fair representation to these communities of interest (+/-10% rule).

Factors taken into account when considering communities of interest include the following:

- Current and historic boundaries and whether these are still relevant to the district
- Changes to communities over time
- Housing and development patterns and urban growth
- Physical, geographical and topographical features and the issues faced by the communities in relation to these features (rural vs urban vs coastal issues)
- Similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the residents of a community
- Provision of goods and services and support to communities.

The +/- 10% rule requires that Council must ensure that the population of each ward divided by the number of elected members to be elected by that ward, produces a figure of no more than 10%

¹⁷ Representation Review Submission #23.

¹⁸ Representation Review Submission #27.

¹⁹ Representation Review Submission #55.

²⁰ Representation Review Submission #51.

²¹ Representation Review Submission #27.

²² Representation Review Submission #60.

greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of elected members excluding the mayor.

For the initial proposal to the Bream Bay ward, the above three criteria were considered. As some submissions were made on this point, Council must establish whether there is any merit in the submissions and if so, address the concerns. In addressing the concerns Council must consider the provisions of Section 19V of the LEA 2001, particularly around compliance with the +/-10% rule and specifically the splitting of communities of interest.

Section 19V(3)(a)(ii) LEA permits a council to have non-compliance with the +/-10% rule if compliance would divide a community of interest.

The effect of the proposed boundary changes to the Bream Bay general ward is detailed in the table below:

Bream Bay general ward	2020 General electoral population estimate	No of councillors	Population per councillor	Fits +/- 10% rule	Variance
If the proposed ward boundary changes, as identified in the initial proposal (Toe Toe Road) are included in the Final Proposal	13300	2	6650	Yes	-8.0%
If the proposed ward boundary changes from the initial proposal (Toe Toe Road) are excluded from the Final Proposal	13190	2	6595	No	-8.8%

With regard to the submission to divide Bream Bay general ward into two wards - North Bream Bay and South Bream Bay, the populations in the proposed wards would not support representation by one councillor in each ward as per the requirement for fair representation. In this regard staff recommend no change to the Initial Proposal.

Staff Recommendation

1. The Initial Proposal be changed to include Toe Toe Road at the south of the city in the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

Reasons

- The location of Toe Toe Road is geographically more aligned to an urban ward than a rural/coastal ward and issues faced by residents of this road are of an urban nature.
- The geographic proximity of Toe Toe Road is closer to the Whangarei urban area thereby providing urban councillors easier contact with residents of this road and therefore more effective representation.
- The location of Toe Toe Road falls within the tribal boundaries of Te Parawhau whose boundaries fall within the urban area of Okara.
- Submissions in opposition to the proposed boundary changes have provided justification for this change to the Initial Proposal.

2. The Final Proposal to include the proposal to move the southern part of Cemetery Road, north of SH15 to the west of the city into the Mangakahia-Maungatapere general Ward from the existing Bream Bay ward.

Reasons

- The geographical and topographical features and issues faced by residents of this part of Cemetery Road are distinctly rural, as opposed to urban or coastal.
- The inclusion of the southern part of Cemetery Road would not be dividing a community of interest between two wards.

2.4 Do you agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Hikurangi Coastal ward?

Submission statistics

- 10 submitters agreed with the ward boundary changes to the existing Hikurangi-Coastal ward. 2 of these 10 submitters are in the existing Hikurangi-Coastal ward.
- 23 submitters did not agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Hikurangi-Coastal ward. 4 of these 23 submitters are in the existing Hikurangi-Coastal ward and 12 are in the existing Denby ward.
- 16 submitters addressed the proposal to to move the Springs Flat area, including Taylor Road, Rose Place, Great North Road, Winger Crescent, Springs Flat Road and all roads to the west of Great North Road down to Station Road (including the beginning of Pipiwai Road, Hiko Road, Waipanga Road, Onoke Lane, Northcroft Drive, Oakwood Rise, east side of Dip Road, Georgia Lane, Brickworks Lane, Whitelaw Place, Butler Place, Tustian Way, Lilian Road, west side of Kamo Road to Station Road, Ford Avenue, Moehau Road, Tuatara Drive, Crawford Crescent, Iti Street and Wentworth Place) into the Hikurangi-Coastal general Ward from the existing Denby Ward. All of these submitters were in opposition to the proposed ward boundary changes. Submitters stated:
 - *"These areas are not Rural with WDC providing most services".²³*
 - *"There are no clear common issues between "coastal dwellers" and the inland farming fraternity".²⁴*
 - *"Those areas are in Kamo, the rest of the ward is rural and coastal. Not the same representation".²⁵*
 - *"All those streets are in Kamo, most of them within minutes of Kamo shops, schools, Kamo Library etc. Cannot see how these areas have any connection with a rural/coastal ward like Hikurangi-Coastal General Ward. These areas should remain in the current Denby ward".²⁶*
 - *"Don't agree, These Streets identify with the new Urban General Ward, as a Community of interest of Kamo, Not Hikurangi Coastal".²⁷*
 - *"I certainly do not agree with the proposed boundary changes. The streets in the proposal, especially the West side of Kamo Road, have nothing at all to do with a Rural or Coastal area and should be classified in the new Urban General Ward. The Community issues of these streets are entirely different from what is proposed. not only is it splitting households, but it also splits the Business Community north of the*

²³ Representation Review Submission #14.

²⁴ Representation Review Submission #16.

²⁵ Representation Review Submission #23.

²⁶ Representation Review Submission #27.

²⁷ Representation Review Submission #28.

traffic lights on Kamo Road. I am sure these businesses would prefer to be acknowledged in the urban ward, as would the Library and Fire Station.”²⁸

- *“The Community issues of these streets are entirely different from what is proposed. Not only is it splitting households, but it also splits the Business Community north of the traffic lights on Kamo Road. I am sure these businesses would prefer to be acknowledged in the urban ward, as would the Library and Fire Station.”²⁹*
- *“The proposed change would leave a large part of what is essentially "Kamo" in the Hikurangi-Coastal Ward. The areas outlined in the proposed change are currently in Kamo and naturally identify, both geographically and socially, with the Kamo community. The residents of these areas make use of Kamo's facilities; schools, medical centres, shops, library, sports grounds etc. To be placed in another ward and vote for two councillors that represent another community, which is removed, diverse and essentially rural, would be a misrepresentation of their interests.”³⁰*
- *“These streets identify with Kamo as a community of interest. Moving the streets listed into Hikurangi-Coastal would split a unified business and residential area that does not affiliate with either Hikurangi or the coast. It is important to maintain this community based on geography, history, and community interests and keep it together by placing it in the Whangarei Urban General Ward.”³¹*
- *“This proposal would see residents in Kamo represented by rural councillors in the Hikurangi ward or, potentially, councillors elected from the urban environment, neither of which fairly represents the community of interest between the two populations.”³²*
- 1 submitter suggested that “we should be extending the urban ward (was Denby ward) to include more of Pipiwai road, Crane road, church road, etc. These are all areas that are increasing in population density and are enjoying town facilities and should not be used to bulk up the rural ward. Lifestyle block dwellers close to town should be grouped with the urban ward. Urban ward should be larger - encompassing city fringes to better reflect the importance of urban facilities to those close to town.”³³
- 20 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 8 submitters did not answer this question

Staff analysis

In reviewing representation arrangements, Council is required by the Local Electoral Act 2001 to consider three legislative criteria:

1. Identify communities of interest;
2. Provide effective representation to these communities of interest (for example number of councillors and wards);
3. Ensure fair representation to these communities of interest (+/-10% rule).

Factors taken into account when considering communities of interest include the following:

- Current and historic boundaries and whether these are still relevant to the district
- Changes to communities over time
- Housing and development patterns and urban growth

²⁸ Representation Review Submission #32.

²⁹ Representation Review Submission #34.

³⁰ Representation Review Submission #38.

³¹ Representation Review Submission #41.

³² Representation Review Submission #12.

³³ Representation Review Submission #12.

- Physical, geographical and topographical features and the issues faced by the communities in relation to these features (rural vs urban vs coastal issues)
- Similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the residents of a community
- Provision of goods and services and support to communities.

The +/- 10% rule requires that Council must ensure that the population of each ward divided by the number of elected members to be elected by that ward, produces a figure of no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of elected members excluding the mayor.

For the initial proposal to the Hikurangi-Coastal ward, the above three criteria were considered. As submissions were made on this point, Council must establish whether there is any merit in the submissions and if so, address the concerns. In addressing the concerns Council must consider the provisions of Section 19V of the LEA 2001, particularly around compliance with the +/-10% rule and specifically the splitting of communities of interest.

Section 19V(3)(a)(ii) LEA permits a council to have non-compliance with the +/-10% rule if compliance would divide a community of interest.

The effect of the proposed boundary changes to the Hikurangi-Coastal general ward is detailed in the table below:

Hikurangi-Coastal general ward	2020 population estimate	No of councillors	Population per councillor	Fits +/- 10% rule	Variance
If the proposed ward boundary changes as detailed in the initial proposal (streets part of existing Denby ward)are included in the Final Proposal	13400	2	6700	Yes	-7.3%
If the proposed ward boundary changes in the initial proposal (streets part of existing Denby ward)are excluded from the Final Proposal	11561	2	5780	No	-20.1%

With regard to the submission to extend the urban ward (was Denby ward) to include more of Pipiwai road, Crane road, church road, etc. and include lifestyle block dwellers close to town in the urban ward, it is considered that residents of lifestyle blocks consider themselves to be largely rural, notwithstanding geographical proximity to an urban area. In this regard staff recommend no change to the Initial Proposal.

Staff Recommendation

1. The Initial Proposal be changed to include the Springs Flat area, including Taylor Road, Rose Place, Great North Road, Winger Crescent, Springs Flat Road and all roads to the west of Great North Road down to Station Road (including the beginning of Pipiwai Road, Hiko Road, Waipanga Road, Onoke Lane, Northcroft Drive, Oakwood Rise, east side of Dip Road, Georgia Lane, Brickworks Lane, Whitelaw Place, Butler Place, Tustian Way, Lilian

Road, west side of Kamo Road to Station Road, Ford Avenue, Moehau Road, Tuatara Drive, Crawford Crescent, Iti Street and Wentworth Place) into the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

Reasons

- The current and historic boundaries relating to the proposed streets in the urban area of Kamo and the rural area of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward are still relevant.
- The physical, geographical and topographical features of the urban area of Kamo and the rural area of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The issues faced by the communities in the urban area of Kamo and the rural area of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the urban residents of Kamo and the rural residents of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The services provided to the urban residents of Kamo and the rural residents of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The location of these streets is geographically more aligned to an urban ward than a rural ward and issues faced by residents of this road are of an urban nature.
- The proposal would split both an established community of interest and a unified business and residential area.
- The proposal would see residents in Kamo represented by rural / coastal councillors in the Hikurangi-Coastal ward.
- The residents of the urban area of Kamo do not identify with either Hikurangi or the coast.
- Submissions in opposition to the proposed boundary changes have provided justification for this change to the Initial Proposal.
- Urban councillors are in reasonable proximity to the the urban residents of Kamo than councillors for easy contact and face-to-face meetings

2.5 Do you agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward?

Submission statistics

- 11 submitters agreed with the ward boundary changes to the existing Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward. 1 of these 11 submitters is in the existing Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward.
- 13 submitters did not agree with the ward boundary changes to the existing Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward. None of these 13 submitters are in the existing Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward. 5 are in the existing Okara ward.
- 6 submitters addressed the proposal to move Redwood Rise, Westwood Lane, Taiko Street, Hihi Rise, Tieke Place, Kokako Place, Pukenui Road, Highfield Way, Pohutukawa Place, Tealmere Grove, Heron Place, Barge Lane, Beaumont Court and Rockwall Place and the northern end of Puriri Park Road, Sutton Close, Tui Crescent, the northern end of Kiwi Avenue, Le Ruez Place, Kowhai Park Road, Clarkson Crescent, Rosella Place into the the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward from the existing Okara ward. All of these submitters were in opposition to the proposed ward boundary changes. Submitters stated:

- *“Those areas are urban and the rest of the ward is rural”.*³⁴
- *“These streets are all within Maunu, within minutes from Maunu shops eg Tui Crescent, schools, parks and facilities. Cannot see how these streets can identify with a rural ward”.*³⁵
- *“This proposal would see Maunu's urban residents represented by a rural councillor in the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward or, potentially, a councillor elected from the urban environment, neither of which situation fairly represents the community of interest between the two populations”.*³⁶
- *“The area north of Maunu and SH14 should not be part of this ward but should be included in the Whangarei Urban Ward as this is so obviously part of this area”.*³⁷
- 1 submitter agreed with the proposal to move the southern part of Cemetery Road, North of SH15 to the west of the city into Mangakahia-Maungatapere general ward from the existing Bream Bay General ward.³⁸
- 25 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 12 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

In reviewing representation arrangements, Council is required by the Local Electoral Act 2001 to consider three legislative criteria:

1. Identify communities of interest;
2. Provide effective representation to these communities of interest (for example number of councillors and wards);
3. Ensure fair representation to these communities of interest (+/-10% rule).

Factors taken into account when considering communities of interest include the following:

- Current and historic boundaries and whether these are still relevant to the district
- Changes to communities over time
- Housing and development patterns and urban growth
- Physical, geographical and topographical features and the issues faced by the communities in relation to these features (rural vs urban vs coastal issues)
- Similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the residents of a community
- Provision of goods and services and support to communities.

The +/- 10% rule requires that Council must ensure that the population of each ward divided by the number of elected members to be elected by that ward, produces a figure of no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of elected members excluding the mayor.

For the initial proposal to the Mangakahia-Maungatapere general ward, the above three criteria were considered. As submissions were made on this point, Council must establish whether there is any merit in the submissions and if so, address the concerns. In addressing the concerns Council

³⁴ Representation Review Submission #23.

³⁵ Representation Review Submission #27.

³⁶ Representation Review Submission #41.

³⁷ Representation Review Submission #60.

³⁸ Representation Review Submission #27.

must consider the provisions of Section 19V of the LEA 2001, particularly around compliance with the +/-10% rule and specifically the splitting of communities of interest.

Section 19V(3)(a)(ii) LEA permits a council to have non-compliance with the +/-10% rule if compliance would divide a community of interest.

The effect of the proposed boundary changes to the Mangakahia-Maungatapere general ward is detailed in the table below:

Mangakahia-Maungatapere general ward	2020 population estimate	No of councillors	Population per councillor	Fits +/- 10% rule	Variance
If the proposed ward boundary changes as detailed in the initial proposal (Cemetery Road and Maunu streets) are included in the Final Proposal	7560	1	7560	Yes	-4.6%
If the proposed ward boundary changes detailed in the initial proposal (Cemetery Road and Maunu streets) are excluded from the Final Proposal	6315	1	6315	No	-12,7%

Staff Recommendation

1. The Initial Proposal be changed to include Redwood Rise, Westwood Lane, Taiko Street, Hihi Rise, Tieke Place, Kokako Place, Pukenui Road, Highfield Way, Pohutukawa Place, Tealmere Grove, Heron Place, Barge Lane, Beaumont Court and Rockwall Place and the northern end of Puriri Park Road, Sutton Close, Tui Crescent, the northern end of Kiwi Avenue, Le Ruez Place, Kowhai Park Road, Clarkson Crescent, Rosella Place into the the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward from the existing Okara ward. into the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

Reasons

- The location of these streets is geographically more aligned to an urban ward than a rural ward and issues faced by residents of this road are of an urban nature.
 - The geographic proximity of these streets is closer to the Whangarei urban area thereby providing urban councillors easier contact with residents and therefore more effective representation.
 - The issues faced by the communities in the urban area of Maunu and the rural area of the Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward differ significantly.
 - Submissions in opposition to the proposed boundary changes have provided justification for this change to the Initial Proposal.
2. The Final Proposal to include the proposal to move the southern part of Cemetery Road, north of SH15 to the west of the city into the Mangakahia-Maungatapere general Ward from the existing Bream Bay ward.

Reasons

- The geographical and topographical features and issues faced by residents of this part of Cemetery Road are distinctly rural, as opposed to urban or coastal.
- The inclusion of the southern part of Cemetery Road would not be dividing a community of interest between two wards.

2.6 Do you agree with retaining the existing Whangarei Heads ward?

Submission statistics

- 19 submitters agreed with retaining the existing Whangarei Heads ward. 3 of these 19 submitters are in the existing Whangarei Heads ward.
- 10 submitters did not agree with retaining the existing Whangarei Heads ward, of which 1 is in the existing Whangarei Heads ward.
- 1 submitter suggested removing Ngunguru Ford Rd from this ward as it is much more closely linked to the existing Hikurangi- coastal ward.³⁹
- 20 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 12 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

In reviewing representation arrangements, Council is required by the Local Electoral Act 2001 to consider three legislative criteria:

1. Identify communities of interest;
2. Provide effective representation to these communities of interest (for example number of councillors and wards);
3. Ensure fair representation to these communities of interest (+/-10% rule).

Factors taken into account when considering communities of interest include the following:

- Current and historic boundaries and whether these are still relevant to the district
- Changes to communities over time
- Housing and development patterns and urban growth
- Physical, geographical and topographical features and the issues faced by the communities in relation to these features (rural vs urban vs coastal issues)
- Similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the residents of a community
- Provision of goods and services and support to communities.

The +/- 10% rule requires that Council must ensure that the population of each ward divided by the number of elected members to be elected by that ward, produces a figure of no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of elected members excluding the mayor.

For the initial proposal to the Whangarei Heads general ward, the above three criteria were considered. Through the review process, Council considered Whangarei Heads to be a distinct community of interest with issues relevant to the community of Whangarei Heads.

One submission was received with regards to moving Ngunguru Ford Rd from Whangarei Heads ward into the Hikurangi-Coastal general ward. However, there were no submissions from residents of this road to justify considering this as part of this review. Furthermore, the traditional tribal boundaries include Ngunguru Ford Rd within the boundary area of the Whangarei Heads general ward. *As raised at the submission hearings held on 17 August.⁴⁰ In this regard staff recommend no change to the Initial Proposal.

³⁹ Representation Review Submission #36.

⁴⁰ Representation Review Submission #51.

Compliance with the +/-10% rule for Whangarei Heads ward is detailed below:

Whangarei Heads general ward	2020 population estimate	No of councillors	Population per councillor	Fits +/- 10% rule	Variance
No change from initial proposal so remains same for final proposal.	7170	1	7170	Yes	-0.8%

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal

2.7 Do you agree with combining the existing Okara and Denby wards into one Whangarei Urban general ward?

Submission statistics

- 29 submitters agreed with combining the existing Okara and Denby wards into one Whangarei Urban general ward. 14 of these 29 submitters are in the existing Denby or Okara wards.
- 2 of these 29 submitters supported the proposal to combine the existing Okara and Denby wards into one Whangarei Urban general ward on condition the streets proposed to be moved to the Hikurangi-Coastal ward are included in the proposed Whangarei Urban General ward.⁴¹
- 18 submitters did not agree combining the existing Okara and Denby wards into one Whangarei Urban General ward. 12 of these 18 submitters are in the existing Denby or Okara wards.
- 2 of these 18 submitters stated that the streets proposed to be moved to the Hikurangi-Coastal ward must be included in the proposed Whangarei Urban General ward.⁴²
- 1 submitter stated that the streets proposed to be moved to the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward must be included in the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.⁴³
- 1 submitter stated that there is too much representation for people in urban areas and not enough for people in rural areas.⁴⁴
- 1 submitter stated that Rural representation is six seats to five urban, an unfair weighting for rural representation.⁴⁵
- 1 submitter stated that these areas were too diverse to be represented by one group of people and that it gives this area of the district too much control over who gets into council 5/13.⁴⁶
- 1 submitter stated that urban residents will be less fairly represented than rural residents and there are serious 'community of interest' concerns for urban residents represented by rural councillors.⁴⁷
- 6 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.

⁴¹ Representation Review Submission #32,38.

⁴² Representation Review Submission #29,61.

⁴³ Representation Review Submission #60.

⁴⁴ Representation Review Submission #23.

⁴⁵ Representation Review Submission #41.

⁴⁶ Representation Review Submission #36.

⁴⁷ Representation Review Submission #44.

- 9 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

In reviewing representation arrangements, Council is required by the Local Electoral Act 2001 to consider three legislative criteria:

1. Identify communities of interest;
2. Provide effective representation to these communities of interest (for example number of councillors and wards);
3. Ensure fair representation to these communities of interest (+/-10% rule).

Factors taken into account when considering communities of interest include the following:

- Current and historic boundaries and whether these are still relevant to the district
- Changes to communities over time
- Housing and development patterns and urban growth
- Physical, geographical and topographical features and the issues faced by the communities in relation to these features (rural vs urban vs coastal issues)
- Similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the residents of a community
- Provision of goods and services and support to communities.

As part of the review process, Council considered the historical division of the Whangarei urban/city area into two wards, the existing Denby and Okara wards. Feedback from the community and Council is that this is one urban area with similar urban interests and issues. Council considered that the combining of the existing Denby and Okara wards into one Whangarei Urban general ward would provide more effective representation for residents in the urban areas of Whangarei and more candidate options when electing councillors.

The +/- 10% rule requires that Council must ensure that the population of each ward divided by the number of elected members to be elected by that ward, produces a figure of no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of elected members excluding the mayor.

Submissions received have indicated strong sentiment to include the boundary changes proposed to be moved into the Hikurangi-Coastal ward (the Springs Flat area, including Taylor Road, Rose Place, Great North Road, Winger Crescent, Springs Flat Road and all roads to the west of Great North Road down to Station Road (including the beginning of Pipiwai Road, Hiko Road, Waipanga Road, Onoke Lane, Northcroft Drive, Oakwood Rise, east side of Dip Road, Georgia Lane, Brickworks Lane, Whitelaw Place, Butler Place, Tustian Way, Lilian Road, west side of Kamo Road to Station Road, Ford Avenue, Moehau Road, Tuatara Drive, Crawford Crescent, Iti Street and Wentworth Place) into the proposed Whangarei Urban General ward and the boundary changes proposed to be moved into the Maungatapere-Mangakhia ward (Redwood Rise, Westwood Lane, Taiko Street, Hihi Rise, Tieke Place, Kokako Place, Pukenui Road, Highfield Way, Pohutukawa Place, Tealmere Grove, Heron Place, Barge Lane, Beaumont Court and Rockwall Place and the northern end of Puriri Park Road, Sutton Close, Tui Crescent, the northern end of Kiwi Avenue, Le Ruez Place, Kowhai Park Road, Clarkson Crescent, Rosella Place) and Toe Toe Road into the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

The effect of the inclusion of these areas to the proposed boundary changes to the Whangarei Urban general ward is detailed in the table below:

Whangarei Urban general ward	2020 population estimate	No of councillors	Population per councillor	Fits +/- 10% rule	Variance
If the proposed ward boundary changes as detailed in the initial proposal (Maunu streets) are included in the Final Proposal	38100	5	7620	Yes	+5.4%
If the proposed ward boundary changes in the initial proposal (Maunu streets) are excluded from the Final Proposal	41295	5	8259	No	+14.2%

As detailed above, the Whangarei Urban general ward would not comply with the +/-10 % rule. Section 19V(3)(a)(ii) LEA permits a council to have non-compliance with the +/-10% rule if compliance would divide a community of interest.

With regards to the submission on the rural / urban representation split, through the review process, Council considered various possible representation scenarios were considered for urban and rural representation, including numbers of rural and urban councillors. Council resolved through the Initial Proposal that 6 rural / coastal councillors and 5 urban councillors provides effective representation for the District.

Staff Recommendation

1. The existing Okara and Denby wards be combined into one Whangarei Urban general ward.
2. The Initial Proposal be changed to include Toe Toe Road at the south of the city in the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

Reasons

- The location of Toe Toe Road is geographically more aligned to an urban ward than a rural/coastal ward and issues faced by residents of this road are of an urban nature.
 - The geographic proximity of Toe Toe Road is closer to the Whangarei urban area thereby providing urban councillors easier contact with residents of this road and therefore more effective representation.
 - The location of Toe Toe Road falls within the tribal boundaries of Te Parawhau whose boundaries fall within the urban area of Okara.
 - Submissions in opposition to the proposed boundary changes have provided justification for this change to the Initial Proposal.
3. The Initial Proposal be changed to include the Springs Flat area, including Taylor Road, Rose Place, Great North Road, Winger Crescent, Springs Flat Road and all roads to the west of Great North Road down to Station Road (including the beginning of Pipiwai Road, Hiko Road, Waipanga Road, Onoke Lane, Northcroft Drive, Oakwood Rise, east side of Dip Road, Georgia Lane, Brickworks Lane, Whitelaw Place, Butler Place, Tustian Way, Lilian Road, west side of Kamo Road to Station Road, Ford Avenue, Moehau Road, Tuatara Drive, Crawford Crescent, Iti Street and Wentworth Place) into the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

Reasons

- The current and historic boundaries relating to the proposed streets in the urban area of Kamo and the rural area of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward are still relevant.
- The physical, geographical and topographical features of the urban area of Kamo and the rural area of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The issues faced by the communities in the urban area of Kamo and the rural area of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The similarities in the demographical and socio-economic characteristics of the urban residents of Kamo and the rural residents of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The services provided to the urban residents of Kamo and the rural residents of the Hikurangi-Coastal ward differ significantly.
- The location of these streets is geographically more aligned to an urban ward than a rural ward and issues faced by residents of this road are of an urban nature.
- The proposal would split both an established community of interest and a unified business and residential area.
- The proposal would see residents in Kamo represented by rural / coastal councillors in the Hikurangi-Coastal ward.
- The residents of the urban area of Kamo do not identify with either Hikurangi or the coast.
- Urban councillors are in reasonable proximity to the the urban residents of Kamo than councillors for easy contact and face-to-face meetings
- Submissions in opposition to the proposed boundary changes have provided justification for this change to the Initial Proposal.

4. The Initial Proposal be changed to include Redwood Rise, Westwood Lane, Taiko Street, Hihi Rise, Tieke Place, Kokako Place, Pukenui Road, Highfield Way, Pohutukawa Place, Tealmere Grove, Heron Place, Barge Lane, Beaumont Court and Rockwall Place and the northern end of Puriri Park Road, Sutton Close, Tui Crescent, the northern end of Kiwi Avenue, Le Ruez Place, Kowhai Park Road, Clarkson Crescent, Rosella Place into the the Mangakahia-Maungatapere General Ward from the existing Okara ward. into the proposed Whangarei Urban general ward.

Reasons

- The location of these streets is geographically more aligned to an urban ward than a rural ward and issues faced by residents of this road are of an urban nature.
- The geographic proximity of these streets is closer to the Whangarei urban area thereby providing urban councillors easier contact with residents and therefore more effective representation.
- The issues faced by the communities in the urban area of Maunu and the rural area of the Mangakahia-Maungatapere ward differ significantly.
- Submissions in opposition to the proposed boundary changes have provided justification for this change to the Initial Proposal.

2.8 Do you agree with the establishment of a single Whangarei District Māori ward comprising the whole area of our District?

Submission statistics

- 31 submitters agreed with the establishment of a single Whangarei District Māori ward comprising the whole area of our District.
- 16 submitters do not agree with the establishment of a single Whangarei District Māori ward comprising the whole area of our District.
- 3 submitters disagreed with the proposed number of Māori wards, stating:
 - *“1 ward seems too few. I am not tangata whenua and I am not completely across the debates for/against Maori wards; however, Whangarei District would likely benefit from having at least two to represent the different issues faced in urban and rural areas. I would have thought population alone would result in having 3? Surely it can be acknowledged that there are numerous communities within the District that are underrepresented, but possibly none more so than Maori communities?”*⁴⁸
 - *“There should be two Māori wards established eg. North and South”.*⁴⁹
 - *“We need more Māori wards at least the same amount of wards to Maori ward to uphold Te tiriti commitments.”*⁵⁰
- 2 submitters disagreed with the proposed number of Māori ward councillors, stating:
 - *“5 Councillors to represent the proposed entire Whangarei District”.*⁵¹
 - *“I agree with your proposal to establish a single Whangarei District Māori Ward. I am not sure however, whether the proposed '2' Councillors is a fair representation of the District's Maori population. Three Councillors would seem more fair and noting the Māori population is growing. But if '3' is not possible, I support '2' - much better than nothing.”*⁵²
- 5 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 8 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

As part of the review process, the structure and form of Māori representation was considered by Council and its hapū partners, Te Huinga and the Te Kārearea Strategic Partnership Standing Committee. The establishment of one district-wide Māori ward was determined as the best option for representation of Māori across the District.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 prescribes a set formula to determine the number of councillors to be elected from both the general and Māori wards. In terms of this formula, the number of Māori ward councillors is dependent on the total number of councillors. Through the review process, 11 possible representation scenarios were developed and considered by Council, including both more and less councillors. Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain 13 councillors plus the Mayor as the number of councillors providing the most effective representation for the District. Retaining 13 councillors as the total number would, in terms of the formula set by the Local Electoral Act 2001 allow for 11 general ward councillors and two Māori ward councillors.

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal.

⁴⁸ Representation Review Submission #25.

⁴⁹ Representation Review Submission #57.

⁵⁰ Representation Review Submission #44.

⁵¹ Representation Review Submission #15.

⁵² Representation Review Submission #56.

2.9 Do you agree that no community boards be established?

Submission statistics

- 27 submitters agreed that no community boards be established.
- 17 submitters do not agree that no community boards be established.
- 1 submitter suggested that there could be a benefit to having one rural and one coastal community board as that may assist Councillors to understand specific issues to these areas.⁵³
- 1 submitter suggested the need for a community board in Ruakaka.⁵⁴
- 10 submitters were neutral on this aspect of the proposal.
- 6 submitters did not answer this question.

Staff analysis

Through the review process, Council considered introducing community boards and the benefits and disadvantages of establishing community boards. Council resolved through the Initial Proposal not to establish community boards as the community is effectively represented by councillors elected from the wards they represent.

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal.

3. Other issues raised through submissions

In addition to the commentary provided to questions asked in the submission form, submitters also raised other issues or provided preferences for representation in the Whangarei district.

3.1 One General ward and One Māori ward with at large voting

Submission statistics

- Six submitters were in favour of electing all councillors at large, as an alternative to voting in wards.⁵⁵
- Three submitters were in favour of removing all wards and having one general district-wide ward and one Māori district-wide ward with voting at large.⁵⁶

Staff analysis

As part of the review process, Council considered removing the ward-based system and having a district-wide general ward with voting at large.

Council noted that a district-wide general ward with voting at large may result in councillors being elected from one area of the District thereby slanting representation.

Council also considered whether a district-wide system would provide effective representation for citizens in the District considering the physical size of the district and current wards and the

⁵³ Representation Review Submission #16.

⁵⁴ Representation Review Submission #60.

⁵⁵ Representation Review Submission #6,12,13,16,21,36,41.

⁵⁶ Representation Review Submission #7,63.

difficulties councillors would face in travelling great distances to access and engage with the community through public and face-to-face meetings.

Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain the ward system.

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal.

3.2 Mixed model of electing councillors

- One submitter proposed a mixed model of electing councillors both ward-based and at-large, with the new Whangārei Urban General Ward having two ward councillors, the four rural general wards having one councillor each, and the remaining five councillors being elected at large, in addition to the two Whangārei District Māori Ward councillors and the mayor.⁵⁷
- One submitter proposed a mixed model of electing councillors with one Councillor elected per the ward system and the remaining councillors elected at large.⁵⁸

Staff analysis

Through the review process, 11 possible representation scenarios were developed and considered by Council, including both more and less councillors in total and in the wards. Having regard to the physical size of the District and current wards, Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain the number of ward councillors to provide for effective representation of the District and current wards.

Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain the number of ward councillors, elected by the wards they represent.

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal.

3.3 Retain a ward system but cut the number of rural councillors to four and increase the number of urban councillors to six, plus two Māori councillors, with the mayor still elected at large.

- One submitter proposed to retain the ward system, reduce the number of rural councillors, increase the number of urban councillors plus two Maori councillors, with the mayor still elected at large.⁵⁹

Staff analysis

Through the review process, 11 possible representation scenarios were developed and considered by Council, including both more and less councillors in total and in the wards. Having regard to the physical size of the District and current wards, Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain the number of ward councillors to provide for effective representation of the District and current wards.

⁵⁷ Representation Review Submission #2.

⁵⁸ Representation Review Submission #36.

⁵⁹ Representation Review Submission #41.

Council resolved through the Initial Proposal to retain the number of ward councillors, elected by the wards they represent.

Staff Recommendation

No change to the Initial Proposal.

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

That the public be excluded from the following parts of proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

1.	The making available of information would be likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of persons who are the subject of the information. {Section 7(2)(c)}
2.	To enable the council (the committee) to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage commercial negotiations. {(Section 7(2)(i))}.
3.	To protect the privacy of natural persons. {Section 7(2)(a)}.
4.	Publicity prior to successful prosecution of the individuals named would be contrary to the laws of natural justice and may constitute contempt of court. {Section 48(1)(b)}.
5.	To protect information which is the subject to an obligation of confidence, the publication of such information would be likely to prejudice the supply of information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied. {Section 7(2)(c)(i)}.
6.	In order to maintain legal professional privilege. {Section 2(g)}.
7.	To enable the council to carry on without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations {Section 7(2)(i)}.

Resolution to allow members of the public to remain

If the council/committee wishes members of the public to remain during discussion of confidential items the following additional recommendation will need to be passed:

Move/Second

"That _____ be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of his/her/their knowledge of Item _____.

This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because _____.

Note:

Every resolution to exclude the public shall be put at a time when the meeting is open to the public.