

1. 2003 ELECTORAL REVIEW

| | |
|--|---|
| Officer responsible Director of Legal & Secretariat Services | Author Peter Mitchell, DDI 941-8549 |
|--|---|

The purpose of this report is to set out the statutory framework for the electoral review the Council has carried out and to provide recommendations to the Council at its meeting on 28 August 2003 from the Strategy and Finance Committee regarding the proposed basis of election for the Council and community boards for the 2004 and 2007 triennial elections.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on 24 April 2003 the Council resolved that an electoral review be carried out for the 2004 elections; that a seminar be held for Council and community board members to discuss options regarding the matters to be reviewed and that, following the seminar, staff prepare a report from the Strategy and Finance Committee setting out options which received substantial support at the seminar recommending further consideration by the Committee and recommendation to the Council.

The Council had delayed commencing the electoral review process until the poll on voting systems was held in May 2003. For that timing reason, it has not been possible to include the public in the review of the electoral system considered by the Council in this process.

In furtherance of those resolutions, seminars have been held to which all Councillors and community board members have been invited on 21 June, 28 July and 22 August 2003. At the 21 June 2003 seminar elected members considered options such as the current system of 12 wards, 6 wards, 8 and 9 wards and option viii as recommended by the Commissioners in June 1999.

Arising from the seminar held on 28 July 2003 it was agreed, at that seminar, after consideration of communities of interest, that a Boundary Review Working Party comprising Councillors Chrissie Williams (Chairperson), Councillors Carole Anderton, Barry Corbett, Carole Evans, Barbara Stewart, Ingrid Stonhill and Mr Mike Wall be formed to carry out further work on six and eight ward representation options. The working party met on 30 July, 6 August, 14 August and 20 August 2003. The work of that working party was considered at an elected member seminar held on 22 August 2003 and further considered at a meeting of the Strategy and Finance Committee on 27 August 2003.

To assist it in its work, following the 21 June 2003 seminar the Council retained Mr John Dryden, a qualified town planner, to provide advice relating to the various options considered at the seminars, by the Boundary Review Working Party and at the Strategy and Finance Committee meeting to be held on 27 August 2003 and at the Council meeting to be held on Thursday 28 August 2003.

Regarding the role of the Local Government Commission, the Commission itself cannot initiate an electoral review; only the Council itself can do that. The Commission only becomes involved in electoral review process if some person or body either appeals or objects against the Council's decision and if the Commission becomes involved then its decision will bind the Council.

STATUTORY CHANGES TO THE REVIEW PROCESS

The Local Electoral Amendment Act 2002 changed the law so that the Council now has the option of carrying out an electoral review every six years, instead of every three years as formerly. As stated above, the Council resolved to carry out a review for the 2004 elections. The decisions from this review will also apply for the 2007 elections unless the Council carries out another review by 31 August 2006.

Notwithstanding that the Council has resolved to have an electoral review this year, it is still legally an option for the Council not to carry out a review in 2003 but defer the review until 2006.

Key changes in the Local Electoral Amendment Act 2002 are:

- (a) Reviews of representation arrangements need only be undertaken every six years. Currently local authorities may choose either 2003 or 2006.
- (b) Members of a territorial authority may be elected partly by the district as a whole and partly by the electors of wards.

- (c) As part of its representation review, all territorial authorities must consider whether their district should have communities and community boards and if so, what the nature and structure of each board should be.
- (d) The number of members appointed to a community board must be less than half the total number of members of that community board.
- (e) Communities may be subdivided for electoral purposes with members being elected by the electors of each subdivision.
- (f) A requirement that the population of each ward, divided by the number of members to be elected by that ward, produces a figure no more than 10 per cent greater or smaller than the total population of the city, divided by the total number of elected members (other than the Mayor).
- (g) The Local Government Commission is required to issue guidelines identifying the matters to be taken into consideration by local authorities when carrying out an electoral review.
- (h) Provision for Maori wards.
- (i) The Council must determine the number of elected and appointed members to a community board at this review. Formerly the Council could consider the issue of appointed members after each triennial election. The Act now requires that that decision be made as to whether or not to have appointed members to a Community Board, and, if so, how many appointed members must be made in the course of electoral review process and will set the number of appointed members until the next electoral review process.

Another change in the Amendment Act is that if any resolution proposes any change to the basis of election from the last election “... *that resolution must include an explanation of the reasons for the proposed change.*” The Council is also required to specify in the public notice the communities of interest considered by the Council in carrying out the review.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION GUIDELINES

In March 2003 the Commission produced “Guidelines to Assist Local Authorities Undertaking Representation Reviews” and a copy of those guidelines has been circulated to all elected members.

As the Commission notes in its guidelines in carrying out an electoral review the Council should be mindful of the purpose of the principles set out in Sections 3 and 4 of the Local Electoral Act.

Of particular relevance are:

- Section 3(c)(ia) which states that a purpose of the Act is to provide for the “.... *the regular review of representation arrangements for local authorities*”; and
- Section 4(1)(a) which states that one of the principles the Act is designed to implement is “*fair and effective representation for individuals and communities.*”

The Commission notes that there are three key factors that must be carefully considered by the Council when determining its review proposal and these are:

- Community of interest;
- Effective representation - wards;
- Fair representation – number of elected members.

Each of these matters will be considered in further detail below in relation to the sections on review of the Council and review of community boards.

The Commission also stated that it would be desirable for the Council to follow a consistent process in undertaking its electoral review and recommended the following process:

- Step 1 Identify communities of interest.
- Step 2 Determine effective representation for identified communities of interest.
- Step 3 Consider fairness of representation for electors of the electoral subdivisions.

PREVIOUS LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION DECISIONS

In 1998 and 2001 the Commission issued electoral review decisions in which it commented on the size of the Christchurch City Council.

(a) 1998 Decision

In its 1998 decision the Commission noted that Christchurch City contains a large number of communities of interest and that these are sufficiently distinct so as to require the constitution of wards for effective representation. The provision of effective representation could be achieved by any ward encompassing more than one community of interest.

The Commission noted that a Council representative had said that the present ward boundaries divided some communities of interest. The Commission expressed the view that the current number of Councillors was *"..... considerably higher than necessary....."* and that prior to the 2001 election the Council should carry out a comprehensive investigation of existing wards to ensure what changes should be made. This investigation should be with a view *"..... to identify a possible reduction in the number of elected and appointed members of the Council, community boards, and other council operations."*

(b) 2001 Decision

In its 2001 decision the Commission noted that the criterion in the Act is the provision of effective representation of various communities of interest within the district and the Commission repeated its 1998 comment that a number of communities are sufficiently distinct in Christchurch to warrant separate representation on the Council. Individual communities of interest did not need separate ward representation and the sole requirement is that the representation of communities of interest must be "effective".

The Commission noted that the number of wards should be such number *"... as is necessary and consistent with the concept of effective representation and various communities of interest"* and the Commission considered that it was unacceptable that the Council had made no change in 2001, following the 1998 review, given the two acknowledgements by the Council regarding the present structure as dividing the communities of interest.

The Commission recorded that it *"... expects the Council to meet its assurances of undertaking a thorough review of its membership and basis of elections for the 2004 elections. Given the recognition that the current ward system divides some communities of interest the Commission will expect significant substantive changes to be made to the ward system as a result of the review."* The Commission also stated that it expected the Council to make publicly available *"...its identification and analysis of communities of interest, including options considered for their appropriate grouping into wards and reason for deciding on the option that the Council considers best meets the legislative criteria."*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION GUIDELINES

As noted above, the Commission, in its 2003 guidelines has said that there are three key factors that must be considered by the Council when determining its electoral review proposal. These will now be considered in further detail and it must be borne in mind that these criteria must be taken into account both for the review as it relates to the Council and the review as it relates to the community boards. Where there are specific matters referring to either the Council or the community boards then they will be noted in the appropriate section of this report.

The three factors are:

(a) Communities of Interest

In its 2003 guidelines the Commission states:

"The term "community of interest" is not defined by statute. It is a term that can mean different things to different people, depending on an individual's or group's perspective from time to time.

Giving proper consideration to defining local communities of interest is, however, an essential part of the representation review process. It is a necessary precursor to determining effective representation.

In a general sense, the Commission is of the view that a community of interest is the area to which one feels a sense of belonging and to which one looks for social, service and economic support. Geographic features and the roading network can affect the sense of belonging to an area. The community of interest can often be identified by access to the goods and services needed for ordinary everyday existence. Another community of interest factor could be the rohe or takiwa area of tangatawhenua.

A community of interest usually has a number of defining characteristics, which may include:

- *a sense of community identity and belonging;*
- *similarities in the demographic, socio-economic and/or ethnic characteristics of the residents of a community;*
- *similarities in economic activities;*
- *dependence on shared facilities in an area, including schools, recreational and cultural facilities and retail outlets;*
- *physical and topographic features;*
- *the history of the area; and*
- *transport and communication links.*

Communities of interest may alter over time. Local authorities need to give careful attention to identifying current communities of interest within their districts when undertaking representation reviews.

For the purpose of the representation review process, a community of interest must be able to be defined as a single geographic area, i.e. a physical boundary must be able to be defined for the community of interest for the purpose of determining appropriate representation. Boundaries based on prominent physical characteristics of an area (e.g. rivers, principal roads, hill ridge lines) are likely to provide strong visual reminders for the residents of the community of interest and may assist in engendering feelings of belonging and empowerment.”

(b) Effective Representation for Communities of Interest

In its guidelines the Commission states:

“Determining effective representation is based on considering the identified communities of interest

Effective representation for communities of interest is the determinant in selecting the overall representation arrangements of the local authority. While the members of a regional council must be elected on a constituency basis, members of a territorial authority may either be elected at large (i.e. by the electors of the district as a whole), by ward, or partially by ward and partially at large. The members of community boards may be elected at large, by subdivision of the community, or by ward if the community contains two or more wards of a district.

The arrangements chosen must, in the view of the Commission, be those which, out of the various possible options, best provide for effective representation of communities of interest.”

The Commission notes that in respect of this criteria the Council will decide upon whether or not to have elections at large, by ward, or for the first time, a mixture of at large and wards.

The Commission notes that if the Council proposes to adopt a mixed system of representation it would need to give careful consideration to an appropriate balance between the number of ward members and the number of at large members. The Commission notes that careful and recorded consideration would be needed to justify the Council comprising of a majority of members elected at large.

(c) Fair representation for electors

In its guidelines the Commission notes that Section 19V of the Local Electoral Act details the factors to be applied in determining the membership of wards and subdivisions.

The Commission's guidelines state:

"Section 19V of the Act details the factors to be applied in determining the membership for wards, constituencies and subdivisions.

Under this provision, membership for each form of electoral subdivision is required to comply with the basic principle of population equality unless there are good reasons to depart from it."

"Section 19V(2) of the Act outlines the specific requirements in this regard:

'... The population of each ward or constituency or subdivision, divided by the number of members to be elected by that ward or constituency or subdivision, produces a figure no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district or region or community divided by the total number of elected members (other than the mayor, if any).'

In respect of territorial authorities and communities, Section 19V(3)(a) provides the only grounds for not complying with the provisions of Section 19V(2). These grounds are to provide for effective representation for communities of interest within island communities or isolated communities."

"Any local authority proposing membership for any of its electoral subdivisions involving a member:population ratio falling outside the +/- 10% provided for under Section 19V(2) would need to specifically identify its reasons for doing so and justify its decision. Separate justification should be provided for each individual electoral subdivision receiving "enhanced" representation, rather than a blanket justification being provided for a number of subdivisions. Any such decisions are likely to be the subject of considerable public scrutiny and would be carefully assessed by the Commission."

The population figures in this report and the accompanying options are based on Statistics New Zealand official latest estimated population figures for Christchurch City.

REVIEW OF COUNCIL ELECTORAL STRUCTURE

Regarding the Council, the Local Electoral Act requires the Council to determine by resolution:

- Whether councillors are proposed to be elected at large, by wards, or by a mix of at large and by wards; and
- If by wards the proposed name and boundaries of each ward, and the number of councillors to be elected from each ward.

In making this determination the Council must ensure:

- (i) That the election of councillors will provide "... *effective representation of communities of interest within the city*"; and
- (ii) That ward boundaries coincide with the boundaries of current statistical mesh block areas determined by Statistics New Zealand; and
- (iii) That, as far as practicable, ward boundaries coincide with community boundaries.

In deciding the number of councillors to be elected from any ward the Act requires the Council to ensure that the electors of each ward receive "fair representation" having regard to the population of the city and each ward.

This requirement is given effect to by the Council ensuring that the population of each ward, divided by the number of councillors to be elected by that ward, produces a figure no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of councillors.

In considering the Council's basis of election the Boundary Review Working Party agreed that ward representation ratio should all be within the 10 per cent tolerance specified in the Local Electoral Act and that no dispensation from this tolerance should be sought by the Council. Provision should continue to be made for community boards in Christchurch City.

(a) **Communities of Interest**

Factors the working party believes should be taken into account in identifying communities of interest are:

- Current and historic suburban and related boundaries.
- Socio-economic groupings and housing patterns (although it was noted that each ward could contain a mixture of differing socio-economic groups, rather than comprise a particular group or groups, and could include a mix of urban, suburban and rural areas).
- Business and education activities such as extensive industrial areas, defined shopping hubs and existing schools.
- Residents' Association boundaries.
- Areas of significant open space and topographic and other features (such as rivers and major roads) which form natural boundaries.
- Potential for future urban growth.

The generally flat and concentric nature of Christchurch means that communities of interest are not always distinct. While the communities of interest tend to merge into one another, for residents, and particularly longstanding residents, their local communities can have a sense of local identity. When considering communities of interest there is a need to place some weight on traditional suburbs and the patterns of development. By and large the suburban communities of interest in Christchurch tend to be smaller than the size of the wards and so each ward may have 2-3 distinct communities of interest within it.

(b) **Effective Representation - Election at Large, by Ward Structure or Mixed**

The Council agrees with the observation of the Commission in its previous decisions that a number of the communities of interest in Christchurch City are sufficiently disparate to require the constitution of wards for effective representation and the Council also agrees that the provision of effective representation can be achieved by a ward encompassing more than one community of interest.

Given these relatively large numbers of communities of interest it is not possible to have a ward for each community of interest and accordingly wards themselves will contain a number of different communities of interest.

The working party believes the proposed 6 and 7 ward options better reflect the city's communities of interest and does not divide them.

(c) **Fair Representation**

The Act's requirement that the membership for wards is required to comply with the basic principle of population equality unless there is a reason to depart from it is noted.

REVIEW OF COMMUNITY BOARDS

As noted above the Local Electoral Act now requires the Council, as part of its review process, to carry out a review of community boards.

In particular the Council is required to consider:

- Whether there should be communities and community boards; and
- If it resolves there should, the nature of any community and the structure of any community board.

The Local Electoral Act provides that community boards may have between 4 and 12 members. Boards must include at least four elected members and may include appointed members. The number of appointed members must be less than half the total number of members.

The Council's resolution must also determine:

- (a) Whether one or more communities should be established;
- (b) Whether any community should be abolished or united with another community;
- (c) Whether the boundaries of a community should be altered;

- (d) Whether a community should be subdivided for electoral purposes;
- (e) Whether the boundaries of a subdivision should be altered;
- (f) The number of members of a community board;
- (g) The number of members of a community board who should be elected and appointed.
- (h) Whether the members to be elected should be elected:
 - from the community as a whole; or
 - from subdivisions; or
 - where the community comprises two or more wards, from wards;
- (i) Where members are to be elected from subdivisions:
 - the name and boundaries of subdivisions; or
 - the number of members to be elected from each subdivision.

In carrying out this community board review the Council must ensure that in the case of the matters specified in paragraphs (a) to (g) above the Council has regard to such of the criteria as apply to reorganisation proposals under the Local Government Act 2002 as the Council considers appropriate in the circumstances.

Those reorganisation criteria are:

- Will the proposal promote the good local government of the parent district and the community area concerned?
- Would the community have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its responsibilities, duties and powers?
- Would the community encompass an area that is appropriate for the efficient and effective exercise of its responsibilities, duties and powers?
- Would the community contain a sufficiently distinct community of interest or sufficiently distinct communities of interest?
- Would the community be able to meet the decision making requirements of Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002, to the extent that they are applicable?

The Council is also required to ensure that the election of members of the community board by either the electors of a community as a whole, by the electors of two or more subdivisions, or if the community comprises two or more whole wards by the electors of each ward, *“... will provide effect representation of communities of interest within the community and fair representation of electors.”*

The Council is also required to ensure that the boundaries of every community, and subdivision of a community, coincides with the boundaries of the current statistical mesh block areas determined by Statistics New Zealand.

The Boundary Review Working Party formed the view that with the 6 ward and 8 ward options the number of communities should follow the number of wards. The Boundary Review Working Party also considered that 6 or 8 communities option also met the reorganisation criteria referred to above.

OBJECTION PROCESS

If the Council passes a resolution at its meeting on 28 August 2003, it must then give public notice of the proposal in that resolution, including specifying the communities of interest considered by the Council and reasons for change from the current system.

The Council must give not less than one month's notice within which any person, including community boards, may make submissions on the proposal to the Council. The timetable below allows for some five weeks for persons to make submissions on the Council's proposal. Submissions can be in support or opposition to the Council's proposal.

The Council must then consider the submissions received and give submitters an opportunity to be heard. The Council may then make such amendments to its August proposal as it thinks fit and must then give public notice of its decision on those submissions, including any amendments.

The recommendations below include the Council authorising the Strategy and Finance Committee to hear any submissions on the August proposals and to make decisions on behalf of the Council. This is the same process as was used in the 2000 Electoral Review.

The Council's public notice given on any amended proposal must incorporate any amendments agreed to by the Council, and the reasons for the amendments, the reasons for the rejection of any submissions and advise of the right of appeal of those persons who made submissions. Also it must advise that any other person has a right to object to the amended proposal.

Any person who made a submission on the August resolution may lodge an appeal against any amended proposal of the Council not later than 20 December 2003. It is important for the Council to note that community boards are given a statutory right to make an appeal if they have made a submission to the Council. An appeal must identify the matter to which the appeal relates and may only raise those matters which were raised in the appellant's submission.

If the Council has amended its decision then any interested person or organisation, again including a community board, who has not previously taken part in the process, may lodge a written objection to the amended proposal by 20 December 2003. Any objection must identify the matters to which the objection relates.

If the Council receives any appeal or objection then the Council must, not later than 15 January 2004, forward to the Local Government Commission the original August resolution, the public notices that it has given, submissions that it has received, any amended decision and every appeal and objection it has received, and information it holds regarding communities of interest and populations of the district, and wards.

The Local Government Commission will then consider the Council's resolutions, submissions, appeals, objections and information regarding communities of interest forwarded to it by the Council. The Commission may hold, but is not obliged to hold, meetings with the Council and the Commission must, by 11 April 2004, complete its decision on the Council's resolution and the appeals and the objections.

If there are no submissions on the August resolution then that resolution will become the basis of the elections for 2004. If there are no appeals or objections against any amended November decision then that amended decision will become the basis of election for 2004.

If there is a hearing and decision by the Local Government Commission, then the Commission's decision will form the basis of the 2004 elections.

In summary the proposed submission/objection/appeal process timetable is:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 28 August 2003 | The Council resolves on an electoral review proposal |
| 3 September 2003 | Public notice of the Council's proposal |
| 14 October 2003 | Last date for public submissions on electoral review proposal. (NB: If no submissions received, the Council's August resolution becomes basis of 2004 election) |
| 7 November 2003 | Hearing of submissions (if any) |
| 18 November 2003 | Last date by which the Council must have considered and heard submissions and publicly notified its decision on submissions |
| 20 December 2003 | Last date for appeals/objections to the Council's revised review proposals to be filed with the Council. (NB: If no appeals/objections filed the Council's November public notice becomes basis of 2004 election) |
| 15 January 2004 | Last date for the Council to send appeals/objections to the Local Government Commission |
| 11 April 2004 | Last date for the Local Government Commission to issue its determination which is the basis of the 2004 election |

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 – COMPLIANCE

Section 77 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires the Council, in the course of the decision-making process, to seek to identify and assess all reasonable practical options for the achievement of the objectives.

As noted above, in the course of this review process elected members have considered many options from the status quo to options put forward by the Commissioners in the 2000 review to other options brought forward at the seminar held on 21 June 2003. The options considered in detail by the Boundary Review Working Party and the advantages and disadvantages of those options are attached (Appendix 1).

Section 78 of the Act requires the Council to give consideration of the views and preferences of persons likely to be affected by or have an interest in the decisions.

While the Council is required to give consideration of the views and preferences of such people, it is not obliged to engage in public consultation prior to the Council resolving on a particular proposal. Also, as noted above given the time available since the voting system poll in May 2003 it has not been practicable to afford the public an opportunity to provide input into the electoral review process to this point.

As the preceding paragraph of this report shows, there is still a public process to occur where the public can provide input into the electoral review process. In light of the fact that this public process has still to be undertaken, and the relatively short time frame available for the review process, it is considered that the process adopted is an appropriate way to deal with the issue.

Section 79 of the Act provides the Council with a discretion to make judgments as to how to achieve compliance of sections 77 and 78 that is largely in importance of significance of the matter affected by the decision, the extent to which different options are to be identified and assessed, the extent to agree to which benefits and costs to be quantified, the extent and details of the information to be considered and the extent and nature of any written record to be kept.

The Council is required to have regard to the significance of all relevant matters including the principles relating to local authorities set out in Section 14 of the Act, the Council's resources and the extent to which the nature of the decision, or the circumstances in which the decision is taken, allows the Council scope and opportunity to consider a range of options or views and preferences of other persons.

Therefore the Council needs to reach a view as to whether the process it has followed in this Electoral Review, and the reason why it has not engaged with the public to date, meet the requirements of Sections 77 and 78 for the purposes of Section 79. In my opinion, the Council can fairly reach that conclusion based on the process to date.

ELECTORAL REVIEW OPTIONS

The Boundary Review Working Party produced, as requested at the 28 July 2003 seminar, three options (with three versions of the 8 ward option) in relation to the review of Council. These options were:

- (a) Option A - the current system, retaining the existing system of 12 wards with two Councillors each;
- (b) Option B - having 6 wards based on a combination of the current paired wards;
- (c) Option C - a system of 8 wards with three versions of this option.

These options were considered at a seminar, to which all elected members were invited, on Friday 22 August, and from that seminar the 12 ward option, the 6 ward option and version 8.2 of the 8 ward option have been included in this report. None of the options follow all of the Canterbury Regional Council boundaries.

(a) Option A - Current system of 12 wards and 6 community boards

The ratio of members to population under this option is:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Members | Population per Member |
|----------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Pegasus Ward | 23,856 | 2 | 11,928 |
| Burwood Ward | 29,109 | 2 | 14,555 |
| Papanui Ward | 28,623 | 2 | 14,312 |
| Heathcote Ward | 26,952 | 2 | 13,476 |
| Shirley Ward | 24,726 | 2 | 12,363 |
| Fendalton Ward | 26,145 | 2 | 13,073 |
| Waimairi Ward | 25,056 | 2 | 12,528 |
| Riccarton Ward | 27,918 | 2 | 13,959 |
| Spreydon Ward | 24,837 | 2 | 12,419 |
| Wigram Ward | 27,012 | 2 | 13,506 |
| Ferrymead Ward | 27,771 | 2 | 13,886 |
| Hagley Ward | 24,246 | 2 | 12,123 |

The ratio of community board members to population is:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Community Board Members | Population per Community Board Member |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Pegasus Ward | 23,856 | 3 | 7,952 |
| Burwood Ward | 29,109 | 3 | 9,703 |
| Papanui Ward | 28,623 | 3 | 9,541 |
| Heathcote Ward | 26,952 | 3 | 8,984 |
| Shirley Ward | 24,726 | 3 | 8,242 |
| Fendalton Ward | 26,145 | 3 | 8,715 |
| Waimairi Ward | 25,056 | 3 | 8,352 |
| Riccarton Ward | 27,918 | 3 | 9,306 |
| Spreydon Ward | 24,837 | 3 | 8,279 |
| Wigram Ward | 27,012 | 3 | 9,004 |
| Ferrymead Ward | 27,771 | 3 | 9,257 |
| Hagley Ward | 24,246 | 3 | 8,082 |

(b) Option B - 6 wards with 3 councillors per ward and 6 community boards

The ratio of members to population under this option is:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Members | Population per Member |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Burwood-Pegasus | 52,803 | 3 | 17,601 |
| Shirley-Papanui | 52,236 | 3 | 17,412 |
| Fendalton-Waimairi | 52,476 | 3 | 17,492 |
| Riccarton-Wigram | 54,930 | 3 | 18,310 |
| Spreydon-Heathcote | 51,942 | 3 | 17,314 |
| Hagley-Ferrymead | 51,864 | 3 | 17,288 |

This 6 ward option settled upon by the working party is based on the present six community boundaries and minor changes affecting Ouruhia, Merivale, Shakespeare Road and Avoca Valley. A list of the communities of interest and a map showing the boundaries for the 6 ward option are attached.

The ratio of community board members to population under the 6 ward option with 4 or 5 community board members is:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Community Board Members | Population per Community Board Member | Community Board Members | Population per Community Board Member |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Burwood-Pegasus | 52,803 | 4 | 13,201 | 5 | 10,561 |
| Shirley-Papanui | 52,236 | 4 | 13,059 | 5 | 10,447 |
| Fendalton-Waimairi | 52,476 | 4 | 13,119 | 5 | 10,495 |
| Riccarton-Wigram | 54,930 | 4 | 13,733 | 5 | 10,986 |
| Spreydon-Heathcote | 51,942 | 4 | 12,986 | 5 | 10,388 |
| Hagley-Ferrymead | 51,864 | 4 | 12,966 | 5 | 10,373 |

(c) **Option C - 8 wards (version 8.2) with 2 councillors per ward**

The ratio of members to population under this option 8.2 is:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Members | Population per Member |
|------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Pegasus | 38,076 | 2 | 19,038 |
| Shirley | 38,178 | 2 | 19,089 |
| Papanui | 40,575 | 2 | 20,288 |
| Fendalton | 42,390 | 2 | 21,195 |
| Riccarton | 42,450 | 2 | 21,225 |
| Hillmorton | 39,516 | 2 | 19,758 |
| Port Hills | 36,297 | 2 | 18,149 |
| Linwood | 38,769 | 2 | 19,385 |

The ratio of community board members to population with the 8 ward option is:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Community Board Members | Population per Community Board Member |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Pegasus | 38,076 | 4 | 9,519 |
| Shirley | 38,178 | 4 | 9,545 |
| Papanui | 40,575 | 4 | 10,144 |
| Fendalton | 42,390 | 4 | 10,598 |
| Riccarton | 42,450 | 4 | 10,613 |
| Hillmorton | 39,516 | 4 | 9,879 |
| Port Hills | 36,297 | 4 | 9,074 |
| Linwood | 38,769 | 4 | 9,662 |

A list of the communities of interest and a map showing the boundaries for the 8 ward option are attached.

The advantages and disadvantages of each of the three options are attached to this report (Appendix 1).

With all options the population that each Councillor and community board member represents is within the range of plus/minus 10 per cent in accordance with Section 19V of the Local Electoral Act.

The Local Electoral Act provides the decision arising out of this proposal will continue until altered by a subsequent proposal and decision. The Council must review its representation arrangements at least once 6 yearly after this decision.

It was moved by Councillor James, seconded by the Mayor *"That the Chair's recommendation be adopted"*.

Councillor Stewart moved by way of amendment:

1. *That the references to 8 wards and 8 communities be amended to 6 wards and 6 communities.*
2. *That the Council comprise 12 members and the Mayor.*
3. *That each ward elect 2 Councillors.*
4. *That each community elect 4 community board members."*

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Wright and when put to the meeting was declared **lost** on division no 1 by 8 votes to 4, the voting being as follows:

Against (8): Councillors Anderton, Austin, Condon, Crighton, Ganda, O'Rourke, the Mayor and the Chair.

For (4): Councillors Corbett, Harrow, Stewart and Wright.

Recommendation: 1. That the following proposal apply for the Christchurch City Council for the elections to be held on 9 October 2004 and subsequent elections until altered by a subsequent decision:

- (a) That the Council comprise 16 members elected from 8 wards, and the Mayor;
- (b) That the proposed boundaries of the 8 wards be as shown on the map attached;
- (c) That the 8 wards reflected the identified communities of interest attached to this report (Appendix 2).
- (d) That the names of each of the wards and communities be as follows (using the same numbers for the wards and communities shown on the 8 ward map attached):

| | | | |
|---|-----------|---|------------|
| 1 | Pegasus | 5 | Riccarton |
| 2 | Shirley | 6 | Hillmorton |
| 3 | Papanui | 7 | Port Hills |
| 4 | Fendalton | 8 | Linwood |

- (e) The population that each member will represent is as follows:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Members | Population per Member |
|------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Pegasus | 38,076 | 2 | 19,038 |
| Shirley | 38,178 | 2 | 19,089 |
| Papanui | 40,575 | 2 | 20,288 |
| Fendalton | 42,390 | 2 | 21,195 |
| Riccarton | 42,450 | 2 | 21,225 |
| Hillmorton | 39,516 | 2 | 19,758 |
| Port Hills | 36,297 | 2 | 18,149 |
| Linwood | 38,769 | 2 | 19,385 |

- 2. (a) That there be communities and community boards in Christchurch City;
- (b) That there be eight communities, one for each ward with the same boundaries and names as those of the 8 wards;
- (c) That each community board comprise four elected members;
- (d) That each community board have two appointed members, being the two councillors for the ward in which that community is situated;
- (e) That the community boards not be subdivided for electoral purposes;
- (f) That the population elected members of each community represent be:

| Ward | Population (2001) | Community Board Members | Population per Community Board Member |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Pegasus | 38,076 | 4 | 9,519 |
| Shirley | 38,178 | 4 | 9,545 |
| Papanui | 40,575 | 4 | 10,144 |
| Fendalton | 42,390 | 4 | 10,598 |
| Riccarton | 42,450 | 4 | 10,613 |
| Hillmorton | 39,516 | 4 | 9,879 |
| Port Hills | 36,297 | 4 | 9,074 |
| Linwood | 38,769 | 4 | 9,662 |

3. That the explanation as to the reasons for the proposed change represented by this proposal from the current system of 12 wards electing two members, together with six community boards, be:
 - (a) The 1998 and 2001 decisions of the Local Government Commission requiring the Council to carry out a comprehensive review of its basis of election and membership;
 - (b) The emphasis in the Local Government Act 2002 on councillors having a greater focus on governance issues;
 - (c) Representations from members of the public that the Council reduce its number of members.
4. That public notice be given of the proposals contained in this resolution.
5. That the Strategy and Finance Committee be delegated the power to hear any submissions on the Council's proposals and to make decisions on those submissions.
6. That, in the Council's judgment, the process followed by the Council in this electoral review meets the requirements of Sections 76 to 78 of the Local Government Act 2002.