COMMUNITY AREAS AND WARDS

A REPORT ON FUTURE OPTIONS TO CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
21 June 1999

PART 2 - BACKGROUND AND DETAIL

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (Cont'd)

PART 2 - BACKGROUND AND DETAIL

1.   BACKGROUND INTRODUCTION

1.1   Summary and Recommendations - Part 1

The executive summary of the Commissioners' report to the Council and their recommendations, are included in Part 1 of this report which is bound separately. The list of contents of Part 1 contains:

1.   Introductory Summary
2.   Frequently Asked Questions
3.   Terms Of Reference
4.   Sequence Of Investigation
5.   Communities Of Interest
6.   Community Boards And Communities
7.   Defining Suitable Community Areas And Boundaries
8.   Principles Of Representation
9.   Testing Electoral Options
10.   Community Area Options
11.   Possible 'Political Implications'
12.   Electoral Implications Of A Christchurch City-Banks Peninsula District Merger
13.   Preferred Option - Six Community Areas
14.   Implementation
15.   Recommendations

1.2   Background and Detail - Part 2

What follows in Part 2 is an expansion of the issues involved in undertaking these investigations and details with respect to communities of interest, defining suitable wards, community areas, the principles of governance, representational, statutory and implementation issues.

All these matters have been summarised in Part 1 and are further expanded here for completeness, background and the record.

Our recommendations are contained in Section 15 of the Part 1 report.

1.3   Supporting Information

During the course of these investigations much material has been supplied to the Commissioners and many excellent background papers prepared.

A list of this material is included at the back of this Part 2 as Attachment 1. Attachment 2 is a list of the Commissioners' meetings and submitters.

2. COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST AND COMMUNITIES

2.1 Communities of Interest

There is little literature or accepted practice on the definition of 'communities of interest', 'communities', and the perceptions of people relating to communities that helps to define these terms for local government purposes.

Section 37K of the *Local Government Act 1974* includes the following amongst the purposes of local government:

- *Recognise different communities.*
- *Recognise identity and value of communities.*
- *Recognise communities of interest*
- *Participation of persons in local government*

While discussing 'community of interest' in their reports and decisions, the Local Government Commission does not provide a precise definition for this.

Communities are a form of collective identity where members have common interests, which may be different from other communities, and also have common visions and aspirations.

Community can refer to groups of people connected through:

- Shared experiences such as social networks, political activity, cultural activity or religious beliefs.

- Living in the same neighbourhood.

- Using the same community facilities such as community centres, schools, shopping centres and sports fields.

- Sharing a concern for their local environment, for example the Friends of the Estuary group in Christchurch.

Residents can belong to different communities at the same time, for example a cultural community, a school community, a church community and a recreational community.

Communities of Interest are larger, more loosely structured communities where people living in a large area feel connected through a shared understanding of geographic, social, cultural, economic or political factors. Communities of interest, therefore, can be large and potentially powerful social phenomenon which, despite artificial divisions or boundaries, persist because of some shared physical and/or cultural associations.

In the context of local government in Christchurch communities of interest should be reflected in the definition of community areas and ward boundaries. At present a community area comprises two paired wards overseen by a community board.

At present six communities make up the city of Christchurch each with a population of just over 50,000. These pairings of wards were determined, with forethought, for the city in 1989, to meet the needs of fair representation under the Local Government Act.

In their 10 years of operation the community boards have begun to create a community identity, albeit on a larger scale, within their areas of influence.

2.2 The Nature of the Christchurch Community

Christchurch has a population of 309,027 (1996 Census). It is the second largest of New Zealand's territorial local authorities. The city's population is predominantly of European descent (86 per cent) with Maori being the next largest grouping at 7 per cent. There are smaller groupings of people from Pacific Island and Asian countries. The Asian population tends to be clustered the Waimairi, Fendalton and Riccarton wards and Maori in the Pegasus ward. Since 1991 approximately 400 refugees have moved to Christchurch, most from Somalia, with a smaller number from Croatia, Egypt, and Iraq.

The median age of the population by census area units is illustrated in Figure 9. Christchurch has an ageing population; 17 per cent of residents are over 60 years of age compared to the national average of 15 per cent.

The percentage of preschool children in the city is 6.5 per cent compared with an average of 7.7 per cent nationally (Figure 7). A larger percentage of older people live in the outer eastern, northern and southern areas of the city, while the larger percentage of children live on the urban fringes and in the more eastern area of the city (Figure 8).

There are marked differences in family income across the city. Families living to the east and south of the city centre and west along the major arterial road corridors tend to have the lowest incomes while families in the hill suburbs and the north west have the highest family incomes. (Figure 10)

In line with this, in 1996 the Hagley ward had a higher percentage of unemployed residents seeking work than the other wards. At 13.5 per cent Hagley's unemployment rate was more than double the city's average. Pegasus ward at 9.1 per cent had the next highest level of unemployment.

The Council's poverty monitoring programme has found that while poverty and hardship are occurring throughout the city, there is a clustering effect with a concentration of people experiencing multiple forms of hardship in the areas of: inner city east, Hornby/Hei Hei, Sydenham/Addington/Rowley, Aranui/Wainoni, Bishopdale/Casebrook, and Bryndwr/Aorangi.

2.3 Community Development

While community boards are not directly involved with community development some of their activities do promote community development. They help to empower local people which is an essential element of community development.

Community development begins by acknowledging that some people are more advantaged than others and that the disadvantaged need help to achieve equality of resources and opportunity. This usually entails working with people affected by problems such as poverty, poor housing and poor health, many of which are exacerbated by government policies or by neglect.

The need for community development work in Christchurch is accentuated by the increasing mobility of the urban population which means residents spend less time in their neighbourhoods and often do not know their neighbours. They identify with groups outside their local areas and have less involvement with local issues.   It requires active intervention to change this trend towards increasing isolation between neighbours.

Complex bureaucratic systems such as the Council are more easily accessed by people with knowledge of how they work. When residents are unaware of how the Council affects their lives they are disadvantaged. They are not able to participate in civic life and the Council misses out on their wisdom, experience and concerns.

Empowering the disadvantaged and bringing about change requires intervention from someone or some group with knowledge of how the Council's systems work. This empowerment has to take place at a pace that makes sense to those affected. This may take months to set in place and years before results are seen.

Community boards have begun this process and they can make a powerful contribution in encouraging empowerment in their community areas.

2.4 **The Role of Community Boards**

With their part time membership and dependence on the Council's community services to carry out much of their actual community work, community boards are limited in the range of influence they can have in their areas. All community boards rely on their local Council Community Activities Officers to carry out community development work in their area. Some Boards work in partnership with other agencies, such as Anglican Care's community development group, to undertake specialised community development work.

Community boards are well placed to strengthen the social interactions within their community as they bring people together around local issues. To do this well, community boards need to have a good understanding of the resources available in their community such as expertise, leadership potential, facilities, finance and volunteers so that they can be drawn on when needed. They also need to be well informed about Council processes, planned projects and community concerns.

Community boards, with their informal, accessible processes, their funding for small local projects and their local membership, are able to undertake the role of empowering people.

An important role for community boards is to develop an effective and efficient communication flow from Council to residents and from residents to Council. To do this the Boards have to maintain links with their residents and have effective reporting links to Council.

2.5 **10 Years Experience of Community Boards**

Community boards in Christchurch have set in place a foundation for growth in community identity. Their members can translate the Council's processes to the local people and the peoples' concerns to the Council. They can either deal with local concerns at a Board level or, where necessary, take them up with the Council.

The Boards put residents in touch with the appropriate Council officer so they themselves can follow up on their concerns.

The residents they have dealings with, whether for funding or Council consultation issues, are becoming more familiar with their local community board and as a result are beginning to recognise the community they live in.

Through their funding of local community initiatives the community boards have started to build relationships with a wide variety of groups in their area ranging from out-of-school programmes, community centres, employment programmes, garden shows to Neighbours Week.

Most community boards have been pro-active in setting up residents groups which means they have defined smaller communities of interest covering particular areas in their wards. At present there are 83 residents groups in the city compared with 41 in 1991. There is generally a close mosaic of these groups in the older inner, eastern, north and southern suburbs. Attached is a map of the residents' group boundaries (Figure 11). A map of the commonly used suburb names is also shown (Figure 12).

Community boards have undertaken projects improving the physical environments of neighbourhoods in lower socio-economic areas. This is an important step in improving the sense of well being for residents in these areas.

All of this activity brings the community boards into closer contact with a greater number of residents in their area and helps to raise the profile of the Board and its members as part of the Council's structure. Over time these relationships will continue to develop and this in turn will increase people's awareness of the community in which they live.

In recognition of the important role community boards can play in the city, the Council strengthened the role that Boards will have in the city when it added the following to the terms of reference for community boards at its inaugural meeting in November 1998:

9. *Development of programmes and plans for achieving community development, social well-being and community safety outcomes at the local level, within the framework developed by the City Council.*

The fostering of a sense of belonging to communities is an essential part of community safety and well-being. People need to feel connected to their neighbours and wider community so they will take an interest in the condition of their surroundings and the people who live there.

2.6 **Advantages of The Present Community Board Structure**

Community boards have, through their informal, accessible processes and their funding for small local initiatives, begun to develop and maintain communities in Christchurch.

The Boards are better positioned to address grass root concerns than the Council itself. Board members usually live within the ward they represent and can recognise and act on the concerns of residents at a neighbourhood level.

The value of the present community structure in Christchurch was acknowledged in 1998 when the Police redefined the boundaries of their suburban stations to match those of the six community board areas. This enables neighbourhood work to be undertaken in partnership between Council and the Police.

All but one of the 31 submissions which we received in the May period favoured maintaining the present community board structure and strengthening it.

Four main themes emerged from the submissions we received:

Responsiveness to the Community

- *Community boards inform the Council about residents issues and inform the residents about Council matters.*
- *Community board meetings provide a forum for the public to air their concerns, they feel listened to.*
- *Community boards have specialist knowledge of people, problems and potential.*
- *Councillors are well briefed about local issues.*
- *Purely local issues are delegated to community boards and do not reach the Council Agenda.*

Accessibility

- *Community board meetings are low key, accessible, informal. They take minor issues off Council. The huge Council bureaucracy disempowers people.*
- *Community boards enable a closer relationship between residents, ratepayers and related groups.*
- *The Community board structure, where residents associations can make submissions directly to them, is an important element in encouraging citizen participation in the city and a sense of ownership.*

Diversity

- *Community boards provide an opportunity for a diversity of views to be heard,*
- *Riccarton/Wigram is ethnically diverse and therefore there is great need for low level, more informal contact between Council agents and the people.*

Development of Community Identity

- *It has taken several years for the public to become familiar with the current system of Wards and community boards, and there is no demand for change. The 1997 review showed very strong support for the status quo.*
- *Residents are only now becoming familiar with the current ward boundaries. To encourage public participation in their local government affairs they must be reasonably familiar with how the city works. Stability is important in the development of community awareness.*
- *The feeling of community is always fragile and requires fostering to be maintained. Changing boundaries risks damaging that sense of belonging. Reduction in community identification generally increases crime and the displacement of individuals, imposing significant social and monetary costs on society.*

We are impressed with these submissions and we support the continuation of the community board structure.

2.7 **Implications for Change to Established Community Areas**

- The Police have recently aligned their suburban area with the Council's six community board areas. There are some suburban stations eg Papanui which cover combined areas now. With the exception of Brighton the changes here proposed will generally fit these arrangements. The central community area suits the Police since they have to do a lot of their work in that central area. Some station staff may have to work in collaboration with two community boards depending on how the Police decide to adjust their own future boundaries. Other agencies, including WINZ, have not changed their boundaries so they will be unaffected.

- With the reduction from 6 to 5 suburban community areas recommended here the present Fendalton/Waimairi, Shirley/Papanui and Riccarton/Wigram community areas are proposed to be redefined in two community areas instead of the previous three.

- At a neighbourhood level 11, of 84, of the residents' group areas will be affected by new community boundaries, with some groups being more affected than others. Those affected may choose to continue to operate across community area boundaries, as the Richmond Neighbourhood Cottage does under the present boundaries, or they may choose to redefine their areas to coincide with the new boundaries recommended.

- We note that submissions from the Deans Avenue Precinct Society and the Rastrick Area Association said that they did not see themselves as part of the city centre, however the recommended changes place them in the central city community area.

- The sense of community that is beginning to form amongst residents who have contact with their community board may be weakened temporarily in a few neighbourhood groups. Overall the proposals should increase their community identity and strength.

- The demand for change has not originated from the residents of Christchurch so there is a risk of cynicism developing and a risk of increasing mistrust of Council. Assuming the new arrangements are equal or better than those of the recent past it may still take the new community boards time to regain this trust.

2.8 **Advantages of Future Community Area Changes**

- A long term, stable community area structure will be set in place allowing community identities to flourish in the city. The 10 years of residents' experience with community boards can be galvanised in the clearer definition and development of more readily identifiable communities in the city.

- With a central city ward there will be a stronger advocate for central city and inner suburb town house and apartment residents.

- A central city community board will help create a central city community. There are common issues of concern for residents in the heart of the city, such as noise, increasing density of housing, increasing traffic, and loss of housing for lower income people which a community board can address.

- The simpler names proposed for the new communities will help people to remember which community they live in. This is an essential part of developing a sense of community.

- At the neighbourhood level 76 of the residents' group areas will be unaffected by the changes to community area boundaries and should welcome future strengthening of community boards.

- The present residents' groups and their neighbourhood boundaries are generally in alignment with the more stable boundaries we have chosen.

- While we heard a submission that Westmoreland and Halswell, adjacent to the former Wigram airfield, belong in the Riccarton community, we feel the southern motorway is a more logical and stable boundary for the proposed Heathcote ward.

- The Aranui/Wainoni area is now linked to the Linwood area with which it shares a strong community of interest and the city's major concentration of Maori and Pacific Island peoples will be united in one community area.

- The community with the Ilam University as its focus is now in one community area, focusing on Riccarton.

- The Council's Community Action plans, which aim to increase the community boards' community empowerment role, are still in their initial stages so any boundary change is better to be done now rather than in the future.

- The community area boundary definitions now proposed are a refinement and improvement to the pattern adopted in 1989. They build on the community area's identity, to provide greater stability for the future.

- Given the opportunity and time to fully explain the proposals and to enable time for adequate consultation, the Council should be able to treat the proposed evolution of the community areas and proposed boundary refinement as an opportunity to further strengthen the role, functions and effectiveness of community boards.

- In its submissions to the Local Government Commission the Council should seek time to now undertake a more extensive consultation with the community boards and their resident groups. In this way the community at large can contribute to this phase of local government development and hopefully secure a wider acceptance and ownership of the proposed boundaries.

3. DEFINING SUITABLE COMMUNITY AREAS

3.1 Principles

The historic growth of Christchurch has been subject to restraints of soil type, drainage and the provision of utility services on the one hand and the initiatives of the historic units of local government to address these issues and provide an attractive suburban development on the other.

In its simplest form the growth has taken the pattern of consolidation within the original four avenues (town belts) and the growth of satellite boroughs and district councils in the surrounding what were formerly rural and seaside resorts.

This physical growth pattern is illustrated in Figure 13 with the central town core and its radiating main roads gradually expanding. Then with the advent of the trams in the 1920s moving into a circular city which has grown in that general manner since that time.

While the restraints of the provision of bridges, drainage and public services greatly affected development patterns in the past these issues have, with increased prosperity and technology, been largely overcome.

Development in the 1990s and through into the Millennium have tended to be market led and real estate oriented. The recent publication of the reviewed District Plan responds to many of these pressures with additional peripheral growth at several locations around many parts of the main metropolitan area.

In undertaking this review of the boundaries of wards and community areas we have been conscious of both the historic and the future growth pressures on the accommodation of population and other land uses in the metropolitan area.

The following principles have emerged as the basis for defining community areas and boundaries:

(i)   Population distribution and demographic characteristics including the age and trends in population growth.

(ii)   Age of housing development and potential for renewal and infilling.

(iii)   Consideration of edge development and 'broad acre' subdivision within the district surrounding the city's urban area.

(iv)   The provision of utility services and their system extension.

(v)   Major arterial roads and transport corridors.

(vi)   The identification of natural features such as hills, rivers and extensive open space systems.

(vii)   The rural character and contrasts between the soil types and activities in the differing sectors of the topographic rural areas surrounding the urban metropolitan area.

(viii) The location of existing and growing community and shopping centres.

(ix)   The overall provisions of the District Plan to protect rural areas, avoid skyline developments on the Port Hills, protect the airport and make provision for metropolitan recreation areas and open spaces.

In addition the electoral boundaries should:

(x)   Establish a pattern of boundaries that are stable into the next 12-15 years.

(xi)   Meet the electoral representational issues of equity and accountability.

(xii)   Provide an appropriate group of boundaries for:
        Councillor wards for election
        Community board community areas and sub-communities for electoral units
        A permanent basis for the number of community boards
        A reconciliation, as far as practicable, with residents associations and neighbourhood areas

3.2 **Purposes of Boundaries**

As already explained in Part 1 of this report, while this review of community areas and wards is primarily to provide an improved electoral and administrative basis for local government in Christchurch this is to be based on communities of interest.

The successful placing of these boundaries could be expected, over time, to greatly enhance the perceptions of place, resident satisfaction and empowerment for those living in Christchurch.

The boundaries fall generally into two groups. Those of separation in contrast to boundaries of collaboration. While the definition of community areas must focus on the centres of community interest and their overlapping nature this generally leads to a desire to establish boundaries of separation. While such boundaries must be placed for electoral and administrative purposes this results in the identity of an area and its separate ability to be governed as an entity. Such an entity will, of course, establish collaborative relationships with its neighbouring community area and community area board.

Boundaries of 'collaboration' commonly exist in government activity. In these situations there is obviously a need for cross boundary arrangements to be established and generally these are provided at the administrative level as a matter of normal process.

A boundary of 'collaboration' brings with it additional joint consultant and resource requirements in the two abutting areas. The maintenance of an ongoing co-operative arrangement between community boards and the political, administrative and service levels amongst both Councillors and officers should be taken for granted between all of the community areas.

For the central area, in particular, all of the boundaries require consideration of mutual problems on the west with the Sockburn Community Board area, on the north with both the Papanui and Pegasus Community Board areas and on the east with the Ferrymead Board area. There will also be a need for occasional contact and the development of mutual programmes with the Heathcote Community Board area on the south but this will be less frequent. This follows because the railway boundary parallel to Moorhouse Avenue and through the industrial area is probably the best example of a boundary of separation around the central core.

The collaborative programmes and projects which will be shared in common will include issues related to high density residential zones, residential redevelopment patterns, landscaping issues associated with suburban enhancement programmes, community development programmes, safety and welfare and shared programmes for traffic management and community upgrading.

A boundary of collaboration need not be an impediment to good local government. It does have to be 'worked at' and would result in a greater degree of exchange of information and officer time than would be the case with boundaries of 'separation'.

3.3 **Alternative Scenarios**

As part of the investigations, we were able to draw on a large number of scenarios which have been developed, including:

- The scenarios developed as part of the 1998/1989 local government reforms, and the associated transitional committee considerations.

- The more recent scenarios developed during 1997/98 for discussions with the Local Government Commission (these comprised seven scenarios with ward numbers varying from 13 to 8 (including Banks Peninsula) and the number of Councillors varying from 20 to 24).

- The array of broad options prepared for consideration by the local Commissioners as part of the current 1999 review.

In all, eight scenarios were presented for consideration by the Commissioners, as illustrated in Figures 34 to 41 attached. These varied greatly, some with and others without central wards. Some options included extensive rural wards in the north-west and along the Port Hills in the south.

Some of these options endeavoured to create community areas of equal size and with an equal number of residents, whilst others provided for the creation of wards and community areas with greatly varying sizes and representation.

From all this material considered as part of the current review carried out during April and May 1999, and in consideration of the principles we adopted, a more precise definition of options was developed for this investigation.

They were divided into the following groups:

A   Existing ward and community area arrangements, ie 6 areas, 12 wards and between 16-30 Councillors

B (1 to 4) Amended 6 area boundaries inner group/outer group and between 18-24 Councillors

C (1)   3 areas only - wards 3 to 12 and between 16-22 Councillors

D (1 to 4) 4 or 5 areas and between 16-22 Councillors, representation between 1:14,000 to 1:20,000

E (1 to 3) Five or six areas with or without a central city ward - 22 Councillors

These alternative arrangements were researched in detail in respect of communities of interest, natural and physical boundaries and representational issues.

From these feasible options an initial selection process, outlined in Part 1 of this report, considered:

Option I	6 community areas		24 Councillors
Option II	4 community areas		20 Councillors
Option III	5 community areas		22 Councillors
Option IV	5 areas (central ward + 4 additional wards)	22 Councillors
Option V	6 areas (central ward + 5 additional wards)	22 Councillors

As a result, and as explained elsewhere, Option V was preferred and this initial proposal, considered in May, had a ward system of:

Ward 1	City Centre	2 Councillors
Ward 2	Pegasus	3 Councillors
Ward 3	Papanui	5 Councillors
Ward 4	Sockburn	4 Councillors
Ward 5	Heathcote	4 Councillors
Ward 6	Ferrymead	4 Councillors

It was also found that Ward 6 met the representational criteria with or without the population of the Lyttelton Harbour Basin included.

These first five options were considered by the Council in a preliminary manner at its meeting on 27 May 1999. As a result of that meeting we were requested to continue our investigations including further discussions with community boards and Community Board members and City Councillors. We also included selected agencies such as the Police, the Community Advocates and other senior Council officers.

The opportunity was taken to hold three meetings with the community board and a further two days of submission.

As a result of these continued discussions it was agreed that we should investigate three further options as part of the preparation of a preferred option for the Council. These three options included:

Option VI - Six areas (central ward plus five additional wards) with 24 Councillors elected and the central ward increased in size to provide a population adequate for equal representation of the four additional Councillors.

Option VII - Five community areas with the city centre included in Ferrymead. Each community area would be represented by four Councillors yielding 20 Councillors.

Option VIII - Six areas (a central ward plus five suburban wards) with the central ward electing 2 Councillors and the suburban wards (including the Lyttelton Basin) electing 4 Councillors yielding a total of 22 Councillors.

Having made the decision to pursue an 11 ward system of election of Councillors it was then necessary to undertake the more detailed work of establishing two wards in each suburban community area.

This work has now been completed and is included in these reports to Council as the basis of our preferred option. The balance of this section of the report considers the issues of boundaries and centres in the definition of community areas in more detail.

3.4 **Physical and Planning Factors**

Much is known about the physical and planning situation in Christchurch and these have been focused with the recent review of the District Plan. The attached Figure 14 illustrates the general zoning provisions.

The residential densities vary greatly from suburb to suburb and area to area within Christchurch. While there is a tendency for infill and increasing densities especially in the older inner areas, this is proceeding at a modest and readily managed way. We understand that the population potential within the existing urban area, taking into account the District Plan provisions for redevelopment, could be two or three times the present population.

In addition to the redevelopment and renewal within the existing suburban situation there are, of course, additional areas which have been added through an extension to the 'urban fence'. These are illustrated in Figure 15.

Overall the patterns of development are relatively equally placed around the periphery of the main urban area. Additional growth is anticipated, however, in the Halswell and western Cashmere Road areas. This is also illustrated generally in Figure 15.

As already outlined in Part 1 of this report and illustrated in Figure 3 a group of boundaries have been established that are based on well defined physical boundaries both natural and man-made.

Dominant amongst these boundaries are:

- the railway and industrial corridor parallel to Blenheim Road, Moorhouse Avenue and then leading towards Heathcote and the Tunnel Road
- the rivers including in particular the Avon River from Fitzgerald Avenue to the Estuary and the Heathcote River around the southern margins of the Port Hills

Amongst the man-made features are major limited access or controlled access roads such as:

- the proposed southern arterial from Curletts Road through to beyond Templeton
- Memorial Avenue-Fendalton Road
- the northern outlet and urban edge of Belfast and Redwood
- the Northcote-New Brighton expressway

In addition there are extensive open space areas such as:

- McLeans Island
- the Bottle Lake Plantation
- the Bromley lakes and sanctuary linked to the Estuary
- the extensive Port Hills skyline
- the airport and open space surrounds providing a logical edge to the urban area in the north-west
- private open spaces including golf courses and race courses

which all provide a broad setting for the consideration of boundaries

Community boundaries have, in the past, tended to run along principal roads, many of which were central to the locality. Frequently these main roads have become filled with retail, commercial and community activities as a ribbon of development lying central to a community of interest area. In this way roads such as Riccarton Road, Ferry Road, Papanui Road and Colombo Street have ceased to be the main through highway and become intensively used community or collector roads within the local urban fabric. Such roads are no longer appropriate as a basis for defining boundaries between major community areas. They are essentially roads lying 'within' the communities of interest and the community areas which have become well established within Christchurch.

The District Plan correctly identifies major arterial roads (Figure 16) which tend to pass between community areas and also provide logical corridors for through traffic movement free from community attracting frontages. Some of these major arterials are, of course, 'limited access roads' and will therefore have a permanent traffic corridor function in the future and can provide a logical means of passing between suburbs and providing access, through their main intersections, to the edges of suburbs and communities.

It is for these reasons that roads such as Papanui Road, Riccarton Road, Marshlands Road and Ferry Road have not been selected as boundaries for the wards and major community areas.

In some locations minor arterials and collector roads can, however, with the associated meshblocks, be used for convenient definition of localities suited to sub-community areas for board election purposes only.

Overall, therefore, it has been found possible bearing in mind all these physical and planning factors to broadly define four, five or six community areas where significant and recognisable permanent boundaries can be identified and used in this review of community areas and wards.

3.5 Community Centres

The creation (or re-creation) of communities within the main Christchurch area depends on defining both the boundaries and the centres of such communities.

An analysis of the shopping centres of Christchurch illustrates the dramatic growth over the past 20 years of the dominant centres such as Riccarton, Papanui, Shirley and Linwood.

In fact some of the previous dominance of locations such as the City Centre, New Brighton and Sydenham have been eclipsed by the growth in the new locations.

For a community area to have a successful community of interest it is desirable to identify the locations of strong retail and community centres lying within them. The scale of the present centres is illustrated in Figure 17.

As part of the definition of communities and communities of interest we have therefore identified the following centres as being the most significant in the five or six community areas that comprise the Christchurch metropolitan area. They include, and in order of dominance:

The City Centre
Papanui/Northlands
Riccarton
Sydenham
New Brighton
Church Corner
Hornby
Linwood
Merivale
Shirley

Identifying the community areas and their associated shopping centre will reinforce attitudes of residents as to their place in the Christchurch metropolitan area and could well bring additional advantages and enheightened the selected centres.

In some cases, for example the Riccarton, Church Corner and Hornby corridor, these centres tend to act in consort and reinforce each other. Similarly in cases such as Merivale and Papanui. On the other hand, at this stage, a centre such as Shirley or Linwood, which are logical focal points in the eastern area, could be expected to grow significantly during the next 20 years thereby increasing their dominance in the years ahead.

On the basis of these retail and community focal points the recommended options for the revised community areas would recognise the primacy of the following centres:

Ward 1 - The City Centre

Ward 2 - Shirley and Brighton

Ward 3 - Papanui and Merivale

Ward 4 - Riccarton, Church Corner and Hornby

Ward 5 - Sydenham

Ward 6 - Linwood

In general terms it could be expected that the growth of community activities in these six wards could be expected to both reinforce and be assisted by these major centres.

3.6 Special Areas

3.5.1 *The City Centre*

The city centre is the most complex area for definition and description in the whole metropolitan area. In essence it is the focus not just of Christchurch but also Canterbury and the whole of the South Island. It is also a tourist focal point and destination and combines a wide range of cosmopolitan, metropolitan, business and cultural functions.

The definition of the boundaries of the city centre for different purposes is itself complex. There is obviously an inner core which is the central commercial area bounded by the one ways streets and Moorhouse Avenue.

There is historically the larger city centre bounded by the four avenues which contains some 7,000 residents at present.

In addition there are the transitional areas of the inner suburbs of Linwood, Shirley, St Albans, Merivale and Riccarton where residents have the opportunity and take advantage of the great range of services, interests and activities provided in the city centre. The area that has been identified as a suitable community board and ward area is defined on Figure 18.

The city centre is also an area of complex relationships between the Council, the business and commercial interests and residents.

Many aspects of city centre development are essentially metropolitan eg the redevelopment of Victoria Square and the City Mall. The encouragement of tourism and Christchurch as an attractive destination. The whole transportation system touches on the city central area and through the one way streets provides access to extensive parking areas many of which are owned by the Council. Associated with transportation are the needs of public transport to have a common transfer position in the city centre as well as the Shuttle Bus and taxi services etc.

From a community board point of view there are clear areas of concern and activity which the board could undertake on behalf of residents occupying the city centre and nearby suburbs. These relate to issues such as:

- Local transport effects on local needs
- Local shopping for local needs
- Landscape enhancement programmes
- Pedestrian and cycle facilities
- The edges of the central city, fringe parking
- The effects of parking on local residents
- The encouragement of additional inner city living
- The relationship between inner city dwellers and the many restaurant, cultural, recreational and entertainment facilities

At various times the City Council has appointed special committees to deal with particular projects and developments in the city centre. However with the city centre population increasing due to apartments and renewals it is appropriate that the community board type structure have a distinctive relationship for the city centre residents with the City Council.

The city centre is also a major focus of employment and in 1998 29% of the total employment in metropolitan Christchurch were employed within the four avenues. Within those four avenues there was also 77% of the total office and retail floorspace.

Central Community Area Defined

The existence of a community board for the city centre would provide the third corner in a triangular relationship between the Christchurch City Council, residents and the commercial/cultural and other focus groups who also seek to make submissions and be involved from time to time.

We recommend that a city centre community board and community area be identified (Figure 18) and that it should be robust to the extent that it covers both within the four avenues and the abutting areas on the west, north and east of the city centre. Such a community area would contain, in the immediate future, about 26,000 residents and this might well increase to over 30,000 in the 12-15 year period which is our horizon.

Figure 19 illustrates the residential location of those employed in the city centre. It is noteworthy that outside the four avenues the immediate contributions are greatest from the St Albans and Merivale area and this, in itself, is a good reason to include this fringe of St Albans and Merivale within the city centre community board.

To define an appropriate boundary for the community board area in the city centre is not easy. It is suggested that the boundary of the area should be within convenient walking distance of Cathedral Square.

In this respect we have recommended Wairarapa Terrace, Rugby Street, St Albans Street, Canon Street and North Avon Road as the boundary on the northern edge of the inner St Albans area best associated with the city centre.

From Rugby Street through to Wairarapa Terrace is a boundary that draws a general line between those who can walk or regularly proceed to the city centre for employment, recreation and shopping in contrast to those who move further north and to other locations.

We are conscious of the concerns of the Richmond people that their area should not be divided by North Avon Road. However we have been compelled to retain this boundary so as to link from Canon Street and leave sufficient resident population in the proposed Shirley Ward.

In the east, because Stanmore Road has so much local community activity focused along it, we have chosen Linwood Avenue, Olliviers Road and Ferry Road and Ensors Road as the eastern boundary. This is a good watershed position leaving a margin of housing in the Linwood Avenue (Ferrymead Community Board) area.

On the west the Riccarton railway line provides a logical western boundary between those living in the Deans Avenue neighbourhood area who are involved in townhouse and apartment development, redevelopment and focus on Hagley Park and the city centre for their main vocational and recreational activities.

Thus we have developed a boundary which, subject to further consultation and negotiation and submission, could be seen as defining a logical area where there is a high level of local residential community of interest in the functions and facilities of the city centre.

3.5.2 *Lyttelton Basin*

The terms of reference for this investigation did not require detailed work to be undertaken on community of interest issues within the existing Banks Peninsula area. However should there be a merger between Banks Peninsula and Christchurch City to form a new City Council the association of the Lyttelton Harbour Basin with the main metropolitan area is to be considered. This includes the proposal for the linkage of the Lyttelton Basin with Metropolitan Christchurch for ward elections, as set out in the draft reorganisation scheme.

The Local Government Commission in its decision of 19 February 1999 considered that *'The inclusion of the area of the present Lyttelton-Mount Herbert Ward with an adjacent urban ward of the city'* was appropriate and *'The continuation of the present Lyttelton-Mount Herbert community with a community board comprising four elected members and two members of the Council elected from the ward in which the community is situated'* is also appropriate.

It also considered that *'Service centres remain at Akaroa, Little River and Lyttelton at least until 2004'.*

As mentioned elsewhere we do not consider that the election of a ward member from the Akaroa/Wairewa part of the Banks Peninsula area can be appropriately integrated into the ward system for the Christchurch metropolitan area and it will have to remain separate as a special case.

For the reasons that follow we are satisfied that the Lyttelton Basin area could be conveniently associated with the Ferrymead Ward of the Christchurch metropolitan area.

The Lyttelton Basin area comprised in the 1996 Census a population of 4,996 residents. We understand that while this population could steadily increase over time it is unlikely to grow as rapidly as other parts of the metropolitan area and such increase would not affect the balance of this modest population with that of the adjacent wards in Christchurch City. In any case the more attractive areas for development are on the Diamond Harbour/Mt Herbert slopes and these are, in transport distance terms, relatively remote from Christchurch taking about three quarters of an hour to reach that location.

The urban areas within the Lyttelton Basin are compact and the centre of the town of Lyttelton is well served with community facilities, retail, business and industrial activities.

There is, of course, an adequate local government office and we support the continuance of that arrangement as a service centre in any merged local government unit, as being appropriate.

We have considered the matter of the employment patterns between the Lyttelton Harbour Basin and Christchurch and note that about 1,300 residents work in Christchurch. About half that number pass from Christchurch to the Lyttelton Basin for employment purposes each day. This information is set out on Figures 20 and 21.

We considered the linkage of the Lyttelton Basin either in total or in part with both the Ferrymead and Heathcote Wards. We conclude that integration of the Lyttelton community area and the ward of Ferrymead is preferable to any other arrangement.

While it is acknowledged that there is an extensive rural hinterland within the harbour basin it is not intensively subdivided or likely to be more densely populated in the future for its rural purposes.

As illustrated in Figure 22 the Census area units have a population of:

Lyttelton   3,091
Governor's Bay   704
Diamond Harbour   1,071
Port Levy   81

We believe that three of these components, together, make up the Lyttelton Harbour Basin and all would have a strong community of interest association with the harbour and the geographical features of the basin. In fact this aspect of landscape is probably the greatest magnet attracting further settlement in the area.

Port Levy might appropriately remain included with the Wairewa and Akaroa Ward.

Having considered the matter we are of the view that there is no case to split this relatively small population into two parts for electoral, ward or community board purposes.

Furthermore the opening of the Lyttelton road tunnel in 1964 has enabled that community to have ready access to Christchurch and it is now many years since there was a toll on that route. There is, therefore, no impediment to the continued development of the harbour basin with its direct linkage to Christchurch.

From a ward and electoral unit basis the association with Ferrymead and in particular with the proposed Mt Pleasant Ward unit can readily be accommodated and would be the appropriate means of establishing the long term relationship with the Lyttelton Basin and the metropolitan area.

The name for this ward, Mt Pleasant, is suggested as being most appropriate being the highest peak on the Port Hills and visible equally from both the Lyttelton and Ferrymead side.

4. PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNANCE

4.1 Role of Councillors and Board Members

In the process of submissions and discussion with Community Board members and Councillors we have become conscious of the need to more clearly establish the relationship between City Councillors, Community Board members, the executive staff, and the functions of local government. This is referred to in Part 1 where Figure 6 outlines the relationship.

Much has been written on leadership in local government and governance in local government.

There has been, in the past, a tendency for elected members to have a 'reactive' orientation in their work so as to respond to the frontage, road and servicing needs brought to their attention by constituent members and ratepayers.

Local government is essentially an industry of communication between the whole population and the provision of basic services and the functions of leadership within the community.

We are aware of the information services which are currently being placed in the 17 libraries and endorse such moves of communication with the Council's communities.

Because of the breadth and extent of local government activities it becomes even more important that elected members at Council and community board levels and the officers clearly understand the relationships that exist between the different components. There is a difference between the Councillors policy making and the executive implementation and management functions of the City Council.

It is not the purpose of this investigation to identify how to further enhance and improve the effectiveness of community boards and their relationships with the Council and with its administration. We did hear, however, from several Community Board members and Councillors that they would like to see some form of 'job description' to help them in their respective roles. There was also a view that the role of support to community boards from service centres should not be eroded.

It would be hoped that the opportunity will be taken in the process of refining the structure of community areas, community boards and the wards for Council election to clarify these roles. This review may assist to clarify the relationships between the different parts of Christchurch local government and further develop its effectiveness.

4.2 Delegations to Community Boards

The delegations to community boards are set out on the Council's handbook in the following terms:

1. *All matters requiring elected member consideration referred directly to it unless there is a clear metropolitan reason for not doing so.*

2. *A continuing involvement in the functional areas of streetworks, local traffic engineering, refuse collection, elderly persons housing, local parks, community activities, recreation activities and monitoring of regulatory functions.*

3. *The right to act as a resource consents hearings panel.*

4. *A policy and monitoring overview of local aspects of streetworks, parks, traffic, engineering, community activities and regulatory functions.*

5. *The right to approve by way of recommendation an annual submission to the central budget process, and to determine matters relative to the discretionary local budget lump sum provision approved by the Council.*

6. *The right and duty of active liaison with residents/business/special interest groups in the community, with the particular objective of expanding the existing resident groups programme.*

7. *An ongoing obligation to keep the Council informed as to community aspirations and level of satisfaction with the service provided.*

8. *Advice to Standing Committees on local implications of all metropolitan projects which have particular impacts in the community in question.*

9. *Advice to standing Committees on local implications of such metropolitan projects which have city-wide impacts as are referred to community boards for comment.*

10. *Development of programmes and plans for achieving community development, social well-being and community safety outcomes at the local level, within the framework developed by the City Council.*

In addition there is a reporting sequence which, at the request of the Council, may refer matters to Community Boards for reporting prior to the matter being further considered by the Council.

We would observe that this is obviously a two-way process and it is appropriate for both the Community Boards to draw matters to the Council's attention as well as the reverse. During the submissions we received there were several community boards who indicated a willingness to take more responsibility for Council functions in the future. While this was explored during our meetings no clear view emerged as to which functions those boards sought to further influence.

It is apparent, however, that issues such as community development, social and community safety matters are appropriately dealt with at community board level within the broad policies and overall guidance of the Council.

4.3 **Management and Service Centres**

It is understood that the service centres are part of the Council's administrative arrangements in order to more effectively carry out its functions and have closer contact with the community. The service centres are not, we are told, to be seen as the office for the community board. Nevertheless the community boards will continue to expect the officers at the service centre to respond to their local enquiries in the first instance. They will continue to make the service centres their 'first port of call'.

This relationship is further confused because of the two levels of service centre which exist ie service centre A with a wider range of professional services compared with service centre B which is providing an information and 'mailbox' type service only.

Parallel with the boundary rearrangements recommended by us we do consider that these issues of levels of service centre activity should be further addressed during the processes of refinement and change leading up to the 2001 election.

5. REPRESENTATIONAL ISSUES

5.1 **Principles of Representation**

Following a review of the literature on representation, we have identified seven principles which are generally accepted as providing a sound theoretical basis for determining democratic representation. These divide into two groups: principles based on technical considerations and principles impacting on electoral outcomes. Their purpose is to ensure that representation is fair and equitable. This may be defined as ensuring that all people have the same opportunity to influence the decision-making process.

The principles on which New Zealand's parliamentary representation is based are well established. All electorates (constituencies) must have the same number of inhabitants subject only to a tolerance of ±5 per cent. Other factors - the boundaries of the current electoral districts, community of interest, communications links, topography, and projected population changes during the life of the districts - may be taken into account but only to the extent that the mandatory arithmetical criterion is not breached. [*Electoral Act, 1993*, s35(3)(f)]

The principles on which territorial local authority representation are based are much less clearly defined. Section 101L of the *Local Government Act, 1974* requires only that the Local Government Commission must be satisfied that any proposed plan provides for the 'effective representation of communities of interest' [s.101L(2)(a)], and that electors have '…fair representation having regard to the population of every constituency or ward … and if the circumstances so require, the rateable values, area, or other relevant characteristics … ' [s.101L(3)]. No precise definition exists for the phrases, 'effective representation', 'fair representation', or 'communities of interest.'

5.1.1 **Principles based on technical considerations**

(a) **Numerical equality** is grounded in the modern democratic principle that each vote cast should carry approximately the same value (i.e. one person, one vote, one value). This, however, raises two questions:

   − On what basis should population numbers be determined: total population, adult population (i.e. eligible electors), or registered electors? [New Zealand's electoral law has overwhelmingly been based on total population on the grounds that those who are elected represent all constituents, not just those of voting age or who are registered as electors. Thus, while electoral units may be nearly equal in terms of their total population numbers, significant variations may exist in the number of registered electors (and therefore voters) included within their boundaries.];

   − Since it is not possible to define electoral units so that they contain exactly the same numerical population, to what extent should they be permitted to deviate from the established quota? [While minimising the opportunity for gerrymandering, a narrow tolerance enhances the primacy of the numerical criterion and so reduces the opportunity for incorporating other criteria.];

(b) **Communities of Interest.** Historically, representation was centred on communities and even today this is regarded as a very important principle. There is, however, wide scope for argument about what constitutes a natural community and how it should be defined:

   − *Communities are often defined in terms of historic boundaries.* The socio-economic, political or other character of communities based on historical boundaries may, however, change over time; nor may they coincide with other kinds of communities such as neighbourhood communities or ethnic communities, or even occupational groupings or housing types;

- *One theory of representation recognises the importance of representing the interests of groups and communities in a district, and not just individuals. What, then, is the role of a representative?* Is he/she a **delegate,** or a **representative** who exercises his/her own independent judgement?
- Acceptance that elected persons are **representatives** infers that the system of representation adopted should be an 'at-large' one and the entire unit is a single community of interest;
- On the other hand, accepting that communities of interest should be represented implies that representatives are **delegates** who should, therefore, fairly reflect the distinct interests that go to make up their districts. From this, it follows that when those elected meet together as a representative assembly, that body should fairly reflect the diversity interests found across the larger political unit;
- While the representation of communities enables local common interests to be argued in the Council arena, there are no clear answers because, at the end of the day, any defined boundary is arbitrary.

(c) **Topographic features** such as hills, rivers, roads (especially main arterial routes), and open spaces create physical frontiers which may seem to identify and delineate geographic areas as distinct communities. While they undoubtedly influence population movements, they may not, however, be recognised as barriers by the communities themselves.

(d) **Compactness.** It is generally accepted that large, sprawling districts make it more difficult for representatives to carry out their accepted functions. However, if communities of interest and topographic features are observed fully, compactness may be very difficult to achieve.

5.1.2 Principles impacting on election outcomes

(a) **Fairness to organised political groupings or parties.** It is a basic principle of modern democratic theory that there should be a fair division of representation among the competing political groupings or parties (i.e. the party or political grouping winning the greatest aggregate number of votes in an election should also win most seats in the assembly). This principle is derived from the principle of popular sovereignty;

(b) **Ethnic fairness.** Electoral units should be drawn in such a way that significant racial and ethnic minority groups have a reasonable opportunity to elect representatives from their own group to represent their interests and concerns in the assembly. To achieve this, however, such groups need to be concentrated in distinct neighbourhoods;

(c) **Competitiveness.** Any system of representation should be responsive to changes in electoral opinion because changes in voter preferences should result in changes in policy. The more competitive an electoral contest is, the more responsive the system will be to changes in opinion.

In any redefinition of area and ward boundaries it is inevitable that choices and trade-offs will need to be made between competing principles. For example, should acknowledged natural community boundaries be breached or compactness set aside to preserve numerical equality?

5.2 Present and Past Electoral Experience in Christchurch

5.2.1 The Current Electoral System - City Councillor Elections

- Since the restructuring of local government in 1989, Christchurch City has been divided into 12 wards, each electing two Councillors. The criteria for determining ward boundaries initially included the requirement that no ward should have a total ordinarily resident population that varied from the overall mean by more than ±10 per cent. This requirement was subsequently repealed. Despite this added flexibility, however, near equality of *total* population continues as a major determinant when ward boundaries are reviewed. Currently, the average total ordinarily resident population per ward is 25,757 (1996 census);

- The four **City Council elections** since 1989 have been contested by three main political groupings (Labour and its associated groups [under the 2021 umbrella since 1995], Citizens and its variants [United Citizens and Citizens Action], and the Alliance) and a range of independents, some of whom have grouped together to contest elections in a single ward. Overwhelmingly, seats have been won by candidates representing organised political groupings — only three of the 96 seats contested have been won by candidates not formally associated with such groupings, and in two of these three instances the candidates' names were well-known throughout the wider Christchurch community;

- With the notable exception of the 1989 election (the first held under the present structure), the political grouping winning the most votes overall also won the most seats in each election. Although the 'block vote' electoral system used in local authority elections is not a proportional one, the share of Council seats won by each political grouping has broadly reflected the overall proportions of the vote won;

- An analysis of the four community board elections (1989–98) reveals a 36 per cent decline in the number of candidates offering themselves for election over this period (possibly reflecting a realism of electoral probability following the enthusiasm and euphoria of change in 1989).

5.2.2 Current Electoral System - Community Boards

- Each **Community Board** comprises two adjacent wards. Each ward within the Community Board area elects three Community Board members. Thus, each Christchurch City Council ward within a defined Community Board area is also a ward for the purposes of electing representatives to that Community Board. Three further members are appointed by the City Council. Each Community Board, thus has a total membership of nine;

- Community Boards are often seen as providing an opportunity for citizens who are not aligned with any political party or grouping to offer themselves as candidates with some expectation of success. An analysis of Christchurch Community Board elections between 1989 and 1998 suggests, however, that this is not so;

- In 1989, 146 candidates stood for the 36 seats available. Since then the number of candidates has declined steadily to 120 in 1992, 116 in 1995, and 94 in 1998;

- Over the past 10 years out of a total of 477 Community Board candidates (including those who stood in more than one election), 336 (70.4%) represented political parties, 30 (6.3%) classified themselves as 'Independents' but qualified this with second identification label (e.g. Independent for Papanui, Independent [Aranui community], Independent, Hagley Combined Neighbourhoods, or Independent Citizens, or Independent Labour), 84 (17.6%) classified themselves as 'Independent without any qualifier, while 27 (5.7%) did not use any party, political grouping, or other label. Twenty-four of the 27 candidates without any label stood for election in 1989;

- An analysis of these four Community Board elections shows that:
  - The proportion of candidates standing for a recognised party more than doubled between 1989 and 1995. Although the number declined in 1998, candidates from recognised parties still account for more than three-quarters of all candidates, and win a higher percentage of Community Board seats;
  - Organised groupings of 'independents' won a greater percentage of seats than their proportion of candidates. These groupings are akin to mini-parties contesting seats in selected board areas;
  - The number of candidates standing as 'independents' (including those without any identifying label) declined substantially from 51.7 per cent in 1989 to 4.3 per cent in 1995. Although the number of candidates in this category rose to 20.2 per cent in 1998 they won only 11.1 per cent of all Community Board seats.

These data indicate that some kind of party label - preferably associated with a recognised political party or grouping, or an organised 'Independent' grouping - is highly desirable for anyone who has aspirations to office as a Community Board member.

5.2.3 Past Representational Structures

- **Ward System, 1974–1986** (see Figure 29):
  - In every election during the period examined (1962–98) the political groupings or parties which won a plurality of the popular vote also won the greater number of Council seats. Further, with two exceptions, since the introduction of wards in 1974 the number of seats won by each political grouping or party broadly reflected the proportion of the total vote that they won.
  - Between 1974 and 1989, Christchurch City was divided into five wards, the boundaries of which were reviewed before each election and, at times, amended;
  - The principle determinant for these revisions appears to have been the number of registered electors in each ward. The average deviation from the mean was across all wards for all five elections was 4.4 per cent. In only one ward at one election did the deviation exceed 10 per cent, and on only two other occasions did the deviation in individual wards exceed 5%;

- In each of the five elections held between 1974 and 1986, two parties (Citizens and Labour) were dominant. Out of the 25 ward contests during this period all seats were won by one party in 11, while in another 12, one party dominance was broken only by the presence of a prominent candidate from the other party. Nevertheless it must be noted that, overall, the party winning the greatest share of the vote also won a majority of Council seats and, apart from the 1980 election, the percentage of seats won was broadly proportionate to their overall electoral support.

- **'At Large' Electoral System, pre 1974** (see Figure 30):
   - We noted that in the period prior to the introduction of wards the results of the 'at-large' electoral system then in use was much less proportional than the elections conducted in wards. The geographic distribution of Councillors was also much less evenly spread throughout the then city, and there were areas of significant size without any elected Councillor resident.
   - Between 1962 and 1971 (the last four elections before a ward electoral system was adopted) the number of candidates vying for 19 City Council seats averaged 44. In each election both the Citizens and Labour political groupings nominated full tickets (19 candidates) while the number of independent candidates varied between three to eight;
   - All seats contested were won by either Citizens or Labour candidates. With two exceptions all other candidates polled poorly, well below unsuccessful party candidates. (The two exceptions were where candidates who had previously been Councillors as members of either the Citizens or Labour political groupings, stood as independents);
   - In each of these elections the party winning a plurality of all votes cast also won a majority of Council seats and, therefore, control of the Council. To this extent, the election results may be considered to be 'fair' to the parties contesting these elections. Nevertheless a marked discrepancy between vote share and share of Council seats was apparent — a common characteristic of 'at-large' elections;
   - These results lead us to conclude that party labels were a dominant factor in electoral success or failure in these elections. We note that 'at large' electoral systems encourage block voting which, in turn, frequently accentuates the disproportionate character of non-proportional electoral systems.
   - Figure 30 locates the residential addresses of Councillors during this period. It reveals a marked and consistent absence of local representation of a number of eastern suburbs (Bromley, Linwood, Phillipstown, Waltham, Woolston and Opawa) and over-representation to the north-west of Hagley Park (Merivale, Bryndwr, and Fendalton).

We have concluded that the electoral structures in place since 1974 have recognised the principle of one person, one vote, one value, have been robust, and have generally delivered a fair result. On the other hand, the 'at-large' electoral system used prior to 1974 contained distortions, both in terms of the fairness of outcome and in the geographic distribution of those elected.

5.3 Recent Determinations of the Local Government Commission

We were able to study a number of recent determinations by the Local Government Commission relating to appeals against various councils' proposals for membership and basis of election. These were helpful in providing us with some indication of the Local Government Commission's approach to representational issues. The determinations which were particularly helpful were those relating to the Christchurch, Auckland, and Manukau cities made prior to the 1998 Local Authority elections.

In each of these determinations the Local Government Commission noted that, in reaching its decision as to whether Councillors should be elected 'at large' or through wards, s.101L(2) of the *Local Government Act* provided that the only criterion was 'the provision of effective representation of communities of interest within the district …'. In its decision on the 1998 Christchurch appeal it noted that the city had a number of communities 'which are sufficiently disparate to require the constitution of wards for their effective representation.' Similar conclusions were made in respect of Auckland and Manukau cities.

The Local Government Commission also noted that 101L(3) of the Act states that when determining the number of Councillors to be elected from any given ward, the sole criterion is that of 'fair representation.' It interprets this as referring primarily to the population of each proposed ward ('population must constitute the predominant factor') although 'if this factor alone does not, in the opinion of the Commission, achieve fairness …' other factors such as rateable value, area, or other relevant characteristics may be taken into account. Arithmetical calculations should, therefore, be seen as a guide to representational fairness, albeit a highly important one.

In the case of the determinations in respect of both the Auckland and Manukau cities, the Local Government Commission produced tables setting out proposed ward populations and their statistical entitlement to representation. Its approach appears to have been:

- identification of broad communities of interest (wards);
- consideration of a range of scenarios for the total Council membership and each proposed ward's proportion of that membership (to 2 decimal places) based on its proportion of the total ordinarily resident population;
- deciding the most appropriate number of Councillors;
- rounding the calculated seat entitlement for each ward to the nearest whole number which then became the number of Councillors allocated to each ward.

Analysis of the Local Government Commission's calculations in respect of Auckland City — after setting aside the Hauraki Gulf Islands ward as a special case — reveals that it approved variations from the average total population per Councillor of from –7.8 per cent to +10.1 per cent.

The determination in respect of Manukau City, with its large semi-rural and rural component, reflected a wider range of considerations and resulted in it accepting a much wider range of variations from the average total population per Councillor. If the semi-rural and rural Clevedon ward (61.0 per cent below quota) is set aside as a special case, the total population variations between the remaining wards ranged from −11.8 per cent to +15.6 per cent. This wider tolerance range appears to reflect a greater than usual weighting given to factors such as rateable value and area.

By way of comparison (although not specified the Local Government Commission's 1998 Christchurch City determination) calculations show that it accepted variations from the average total population per Councillor of between −4.6 per cent and +5.9 per cent.

5.4 Submissions Relating to Representation Issues Round 1 - May 1999

We received a total of 31 written submissions from individuals and groups, 20 of whom also appeared before us in person. In addition, the Mayor and 11 Councillors met with us to discuss a range of issues relating to community identification, representation, and Councillor workload.

Of the 20 individuals or groups who appeared in person, 15 supported the status quo with minor qualifications and/or minor adjustments to existing ward and community board boundaries. Five proposed significant changes, most relating to a reduction in the number of Councillors (and, therefore, wards). All of those who made written submissions only, supported the status quo or proposed only minimal adjustments to existing boundaries.

Five main themes emerged from the written submissions and the accompanying discussions:

1. 'At large' *versus* ward electoral systems;
2. The appropriate number of wards for perceived representational needs;
3. The optimum number of Councillors;
4. Membership of community Boards;
5. Representational fairness.

5.4.1 At large versus ward electoral systems

- The great majority supported the retention of wards and argued that:
  - ensured a fair distribution of Councillors across the city,
  - encouraged Councillors to maintain close links with the communities they represented,
  - made Councillors more accessible to residents and ratepayers,
  - helped guard against interest groups capturing the City Council,
  - were more democratic, fair, and responsive to local concerns,
  - simplified voter choice and curbed excesses of 'party'.

- The few who supported an 'at large' electoral framework contended that —
  - 'at large' electoral systems minimised the problem of partisan divisions which override considerations relating to the competence of a candidate to promote the interests of the city as a whole,
  - enabled voters to evaluate and pass electoral judgement on all candidates, not just those standing in their ward; in this way, greater accountability could be achieved and voters would thus have more effective representation.

- Conversely, the majority who were opposed to an 'at large' electoral framework argued that:
  - it would have a detrimental effect on 'local' representation,
  - it could result in an unfair distribution of Councillors and, therefore, parts of the city being under-represented,
  - it could encourage the election of less effective and active Councillors;

- In its submission the Canterbury Regional Council indicated its preference for the substantial maintenance of the status quo because it envisaged administrative difficulties in the conduct of its elections if it was required to re-establish separate constituencies for its own elections if Christchurch city's ward structure was significantly altered.

  While we acknowledge this concern we believe that several different approaches to providing Regional Council representation for Christchurch City are available to the Canterbury Regional Council and that this issue is incidental to our main task. We believe, however, that our preferred option will be able to be used as the basis for establishing coherent constituencies that will meet the needs of the Regional Council.

5.4.2 **Number of wards**

- Most of those who made submissions supported the retention of the 12-ward structure because:
  - it appears to have worked well to date,
  - any reduction in the number of wards would make it more difficult for Councillors (and Community Board members) to service their areas,
  - fewer wards could hinder the representation of the diversity in the community, especially for community board purposes,
  - large wards are open to a similar objection to 'at large' elections; namely that they might result in some loss in the quality of representation and accountability. Again this relates particularly to community board elections.

- One submission advocated that there should be a minimum of nine wards to prevent gerrymandering. Another argued that there should be a maximum of three wards because this would ensure greater accountability of Councillors to electors.

- A small number supported some reduction in the number of wards. Most of these contended that if a reduction was required by the Local Government Commission the number of wards should be set at six and that their boundaries should be conterminous with those of the Community Boards.

5.4.3 Number of Councillors

- Most submissions opposed any reduction in the present number of 24 Councillors. In summary, these submissions contended that a reduction would:
  - make it more difficult for Councillors to maintain close contact with their constituents and it would reduce their accessibility; effective representation would, therefore suffer,
  - risk the 'fair representation' principle required by the Local Government Act,
  - compromise the quality and diversity of representation,
  - significantly increase Councillors' workload,
  - bring about an increase in the number of full-time Councillors and that this, in turn, would mean that the Council would have less contact with its community,
  - reduce effective liaison between the Council, Community Boards, and residents' and community associations,
  - make it more difficult to absorb newly elected Councillors into the Council,
  - give more power to individual Councillors.

A number of those who appeared before us believed that it would not be possible to compensate for any reduction by increasing the delegations to Community Boards.

- One Councillor believed that effective representation would be lessened if the Council had fewer than 20 members;

- A small number of submissions advocated that the number of Councillors should be reduced. Some advocated a reduction to 18 Councillors with three Councillors being elected from each of six wards. Others supported a reduction to between 12 and 18, while one submission argued that 12 Councillors would be sufficient for a city the size of Christchurch. Arguments put forward in favour of a reduction in the number of Councillors were:
  - larger councils are less effective (no evidence was put forward in support of this assertion),
  - the city is akin to a large business; as such it should be overseen by a body similar to a company's board of directors,
  - fewer Councillors would force members to focus on policy issues and not get involved in detailed, day-to-day management of the Council's business,
  - fewer Councillors would 'greatly' reduce the costs of running the Council and provide welcome relief to ratepayers (again, no empirical evidence was put forward to support this view).

5.4.4 Membership and role of Community Boards

- There was strong support for Community Boards, many submissions advocating that their status and functions should be enhanced;

- Some of submissions supported a modest increase in the size of Community Boards on the grounds that:
  - most Community Board members have a heavy workload; they are the practical interface between their community and the City Council,
  - all Councillors elected from the wards comprising the Community Board should be members of that board as of right; some submissions supported this even if this meant increasing the number of elected Community Board members to preserve the present 2:1 ratio but this view was by no means universal,
  - larger Community Boards would increase constituent accessibility;

- A small number of submissions advocated a reduction in the size of Community Boards, in one instance to 7 and in another, to 4;

- Many submissions advocated that Community Boards should be delegated more responsibility. Two saw this as a means of compensating for a reduction in the number of Councillors;

- A number of submissions, principally those from Community Boards, suggested that the name 'Community Board' should be changed to 'Community Council' and that 'Community Board Member' should become 'Community Councillor' because this would help electors identify City Councillors with metropolitan issues and Community Board members with local community issues.

  We do not favour this suggestion but in any case it falls outside our terms of reference.

5.4.5 **Representational fairness**

- When questioned, those appearing before us made the following observations:
  - total ordinarily resident population, not adult population or registered electors, should be the basis for any arithmetical calculations of ward size because Councillors represent all citizens in the ward, not just adults or those who vote;
  - It is more important for all wards to have the same number of Councillors than for them to have exactly the same total population;
  - communities of interest over-ride population fairness;
  - most of those who appeared before us accepted that the need for flexibility in establishing ward and Community Board boundaries but that any variation from the overall ratio of population to representative should not normally exceed ±10 per cent. A minority view was that the variation from the established mean should not exceed ±5 per cent to ensure that all wards were of similar size in terms of population;
  - wards should contain similar population numbers except where geographic, topographic, or communications considerations heavily outweigh representational fairness based on population numbers.

5.5   **Submissions Relating to Representational Issues, Round 2 - June 1999**

A total of 24 groups and individuals responded to our invitation to comment on the preliminary report. Most submissions traversed again the issues that had emerged during the first round. Regrettably, a small number merely reiterated what they had said in the first round, while a few were couched in somewhat intemperate language and showed little real understanding of the issues involved. In summary the points raised by these submissions were as follows:

5.5.1 **Number of wards**

- There was strong support for maintaining the number of community areas at six, while a number wished to see the existing structure prevail with only minor adjustments.
- There was considerable (though not unanimous) support for our proposed centre city community area surrounded by five suburban community areas.
- The Canterbury Regional Council sought the retention of a structure that would allow it to use the city's wards as building blocks to define four equal-sized constituencies.

5.5.2 **Number of Councillors**

- Most submissions implicitly accepted our proposal to set the number of Councillors at 22. Only one submission argued that no changes, apart from very minor adjustments, should be made until the issue of whether Christchurch City and the Banks Peninsula District should be merged had been resolved.

5.5.3 **Membership and Role of Community Boards**

- Opposition was voiced to our proposal that community areas should be divided into three sub-communities for the purpose of electing members to Community Boards. There was strong support for the present arrangement whereby each of the two wards making up a community board area elected three members to its board.
- A commonly expressed view was that all Community Boards should have the same number of Board members, even where a community area/ward - such as our proposed central city ward - was smaller than other wards.

5.5.4 **Representational Fairness**

- Considerable concern was voiced at our proposal that some wards would have more Councillors than others (despite the fact that in all wards we proposed, the ratio of total population to each Councillor fell well within the ±10 per cent tolerance). There was a strong, although not unanimous, view that all wards should be approximately the same size in terms of their total population and that each should elect the same number of Councillors. Supporters of the concept of a central city community area/ward acknowledged that such a ward would elect fewer Councillors and generally accepted this provided that the principle of equal representation was adhered to.

- Many submissions argued that we had ignored or divided communities of interest. Overwhelmingly, the focus of these submissions was at the micro-level although a small number raised issues of socio-economic likeness. Very few submissions, however, recognised the 'ripple-effect' of minor adjustments to boundaries and their potential for wider consequential impact.

5.5.5 Impact of the Number of Candidates on Informal Votes

- Concern was expressed in one submission that increasing the number of Councillors to be elected from each ward would mean that there would be more candidates seeking election in each ward. It was argued that this would result in voters having more difficulty in casting their votes and the number of informal votes recorded would therefore increase.
- In the light of this concern an examination was made of the pattern of informal votes recorded in the 1989, 1995 and 1998 Council elections (the 1992 election could not be included in this analysis because data on the number of ballot papers returned from individual wards was not available).
- Our research revealed that the percentage of informal votes cast averaged 1.5 per cent in mayoralty contests, 5.3 per cent in ward elections, and 8.6 per cent in community board elections. However, when the number of Council and community board candidates standing in each ward was correlated with the percentage of informal votes cast in those wards, a moderate *negative* correlation was found to exist in all but one instance. In fact, in only one case (the 1989 community board elections) was there a positive correlation, and it was so small (0.084) as to be without significance.

5.5.6 Miscellaneous Issues Raised

- A number of our suggested community area, ward, and sub-community names did not find favour because it was believed that they did not describe the geographic area concerned accurately enough. (We do not see the names we assigned as absolute but we believed that, by providing names as identifiers, we would assist the process of understanding our proposals.)
- Some submissions questioned our proposed boundaries on the grounds that at least some of those chosen were seen as boundaries of collaboration rather that boundaries of separation.
- Should the merger of Christchurch City and Banks Peninsula be consummated, it should take the form of an amalgamation, not an annexation.

5.6 Application of Representational Principles - Technical Aspects

5.6.1 Technical considerations

- We are very aware that communities of interest have always been a significant factor in the development of greater Christchurch and have played an important role in determining electoral units. Even though City Councillors take an oath to make decisions in the interests of the city as a whole electors appear to view their elected representatives as delegates representing their wards and perceived interests. It is likely, therefore, that many electors would object strongly to the formal abolition of communities such as wards and community board areas.

- We are also aware that over the past 15 or so years there has been a substantial increase in the number of City Councillors who view their elected position as full-time. Some Councillors expressed the view that there was a danger that full-time Councillors could lose touch with the communities they served.
- Although advocates of 'at large' elections argue that because electors are given the opportunity to pass judgement on all candidates, not just a small number, increased accountability results. We are not convinced that this outweighs the acknowledged disadvantages of 'at large' electoral systems, in particular:
  - the larger the electoral unit, the greater the difficulty electors have in 'knowing' their candidates. They therefore lean heavily on a number of primary cues (generally in descending order):
    * well-known 'name' candidates who have a high public profile;
    * 'party' (including political groupings) labels;
    * generalised perceptions of what each 'party' or group stands for;
    * campaign manifestos (which are rare at local authority level).
  This is a common characteristic of 'at large' elections;
  - The potential for mal-distributed representation (where some localities are over-represented while others remain under-represented or entirely without representation) is much greater than where a ward system exists. In these circumstances, partisan electoral fairness may be compromised;
  - in 'at large' elections where each elector has one vote for each vacancy to be filled, the known distorting characteristics of first-past-the-post elections are often accentuated.
  - For these reasons, your Commission does not support the establishment of an 'at large' electoral system to elect the city's Councillors.
  - However we do, long term, favour Council ward elections with the wards coinciding with community areas. This is not feasible for the 2001 elections.

5.6.2 Numerical equality

- Arithmetical equality is a cornerstone of modern representation. Historically, New Zealand has based this principle on total rather than adult population. Thus votes cast do not necessarily have the same value;
- Recent practice in Christchurch City has been for arithmetical equality to be treated as the primary factor in ward boundary determination. Since the establishment of wards in 1974 the variation from the mean ward size has, with rare exceptions, fallen well within a ±10 per cent tolerance based on total population;
- We examined the different ways in which numerical equality could be achieved, whether by using total population, adult population, or the number of registered electors as the bases for our calculations. We concluded that since it was commonly accepted that elected representatives represented all people living within the designated electoral area, the most appropriate basis was total ordinarily resident population. We are aware, however, that for a range of reasons (eg different age structures, differential registration as electors) some electoral areas with approximately the same total population may have significantly different numbers of registered electors. Further, although registration as an elector is compulsory, not all eligible people fulfil this legal requirement. We therefore concluded that adult population

numbers are an appropriate secondary check on the numerical size of electoral areas we investigated.

- However, when the adult population (i.e. population aged 18 and over) is considered wider variations are evident in a number of instances These are the result of differing numbers of people under the age of 18. While we accept that those elected represent all people in their ward, account should also be taken of eligible electors. It therefore recommends that wards should provide the basis for the election of City Councillors, and that the total population of each ward should lie within ±10 per cent of both the mean total population and, unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary, adult (18+) population.
- We accept that in utilising a ±10 per cent variation from the mean to the fullest extent will result in a wider variation in the size of wards than Christchurch has hitherto experienced. We are convinced, however, that by so doing we have been able to create electoral units that better reflect the communities we have identified and that we have been able to propose wards that should require only minimal, if any, amendment through a number of elections.

5.6.3 Community, topography, and communications links

- The generally subdued nature of the city's topography means that there are few clearly defined physical boundaries dividing the city into different communities. Urban development has meant that many historical communities no longer have definite boundaries; to an outsider one community merges imperceptibly into the next. This is not to say, however, that residents, particularly long-standing ones, do not have any sense of local identity;
- Some physical dividers do exist. While some of these create boundaries of separation, others facilitate the movement of people within communities;
- The ward and community board structure established in 1989 has created a sense of modern community to the extent that these are now generally accepted by many inhabitants. Many local community and residents' associations have now moulded to fit with the boundaries of the present wards and community boards.

5.6.4 Compactness

- The present City of Christchurch is reasonably compact; no part of the perimeter is significantly further away from the centre than any other part. Thus the arrangement of wards and community board areas in a way that ensures compactness is not a major issue;
- For the most part, the present ward structure adequately meets this criterion. A central ward, Hagley, is encircled by the other wards. The urban fringe wards of Ferrymead, Wigram and Papanui do not meet this criterion as well as the rest because they include substantial rural and semi-rural areas with less dense population.
- Should the present Christchurch City and the Banks Peninsula District be merged into a new Christchurch City, the Akaroa-Wairewa area of the present Banks Peninsula District will need careful consideration. We are of the view that it would be inappropriate to try to link this geographic area with any of the urban wards because the distance involved mean that the compactness requirement could not be met. Further, the differences in terrain and socio-economic character lead us to conclude that the Akaroa-Wairewa area is a special case and it should thus be treated in the same manner as Auckland City's Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward.

5.7 Application of Representational Principles - Electoral Outcomes

5.7.1 Fairness

- The *Local Government Act, 1974* requires that electors receive 'fair representation.' While not clearly defined, s.101L(3) and a number of recent determinations of the Local Government Commission, indicate that factors to be taken into account are population (the numerical equality factor) and — where considered necessary or desirable — rateable values, areas, 'or other relevant characteristics …';
- One aspect of 'fairness' is whether ward boundaries are 'fair' to competing political parties and groupings. In this regard, the two different ward systems that have been used since 1974 have substantially met this requirement;
- British Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, once described political parties as 'organised opinion.' Today, the concept of electoral accountability requires that electors are able to hold their elected representatives to account for their actions during the term of an assembly or Council. This is easier to achieve when political groupings exist to promote coherent policies at election time and through their pursuit when in office. Conversely, 'independent' candidates and representatives are much more difficult to hold to account because they can disclaim responsibility for decisions where these may be seen to be detrimental to re-election. For this reason, we see advantages in political parties and other organised political groupings promoting coherent platforms during local government elections.
- When considering different options we became aware that the larger a constituency (in terms of area and population) the more likely it was that voters would resort to party labels as their guide when casting their votes.

5.7.2 Ethnicity

- Christchurch is home to a number of numerically significant minority ethnic groups — Maori: c.22,200 (7.2 per cent); Pacific Islander: c.6,000 (2.0 per cent); and various Asian communities: c.13,000 (4.2 per cent).
- The 1996 census data indicates that these groups are relatively concentrated in their residential patterns. For example, Maori are concentrated in the present Hagley and Pegasus wards; Pacific Islanders in the Pegasus and Ferrymead wards; and Asians in the Riccarton, Waimairi and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Fendalton wards. (See Figures 31–33.)
- While these population numbers are too small for the different ethnic groups to elect one of their own to a seat or seats on the City Council, even if they all voted for candidates from their own ethnic group, an effort should be made to avoid splitting them between two or more wards where including them in a single ward is feasible. For example, large group of Maori or Asians included in a single ward are likely to be able to exert more influence on the political policy-makers than if they were dispersed through several wards.
- Numerically significant minority groups are more likely to develop a closer association with local Community Board members and therefore exert a greater influence on Community Board decisions.

5.7.3 Competitiveness

- One difficulty in achieving competitiveness within wards lies in the 'block vote' type of electoral system used. Since the present system is enshrined in the *Local Elections and Polls Act* this is well beyond our terms of reference.
- Our research has indicated that varying degrees of competitiveness exist across the present wards. While some wards are clearly uncompetitive (i.e. wards where both seats are won by one party or political grouping even though its aggregate of votes may be only marginally ahead of its nearest competitor), the overall election results have broadly reflected public opinion as recorded through the ballot box.
- We do not, therefore, see the provision of competitiveness as a major issue to be dealt with provided cognisance is taken of the different levels of partisan support are taken into account and that the wards delineated do not consciously drawn to provide a distinct advantage to one or another partisan grouping.

5.8   Adoption of Representational Principles

Based on the above study we recommend that the following principles be used to delineate City Council wards and Community Board areas in Christchurch:

- *That since the concept of community is deeply embedded in the Christchurch psyche, the starting point for any ward review should be the identification of discrete communities of interest. Factors to be taken into account are:*
  - *existing, self-identified sub-communities and communities,*
  - *significant topographic features such as rivers (and bridges giving access across river barriers) and major parks;*
  - *major and secondary shopping catchments and associated arterial roads;*
  - *historical community divisions; and*
  - *the broad social and economic characteristics of localities;*

- *In determining communities of interest, full account should be taken of the residential location of Maori and other ethnic groups;*

- *As there are likely to be many communities identified, they will provide the basic building blocks for the creation of wards and Community Board areas;*

- *Once possible wards have been identified, population numbers will be examined to refine proposed boundaries to bring the total ordinarily resident population of each ward to within ±10 per cent of the mean total population and, wherever possible, within ±10 per cent of the adult (18+) population for each member elected. By applying both total population and adult population the requirement for reasonable equality of representation should be met;*

- *Since communities provide the basic building block for wards and Community Board areas, wards need not have the same number of elected representatives. Provided the maximum variations set out in the previous paragraph are adhered to, there is no reason why different sized wards cannot have different numbers of representatives;*

- *The number of Councillors to be recommended should be based on the number of communities and wards proposed;*

- *As a general rule, the principle of compactness should be recognised. Ideally, all points on the perimeter of any ward or community area should generally be the same distance from the centre of the defined area. We accept, however, that in the real world, this is not always possible.*

- *Should there by any variation from one or more of these principles detailed reasons should be set down in the Commission's report to the Council.*

6. DEVELOPING AND TESTING ELECTORAL OPTIONS

6.1 Strategies

After the principles to be used had been established, developing and testing a range of electoral options took a great deal of our time. Throughout, our approach to the development of each scenario we investigated was an orderly and measured one and may be summarised as follows:

- identify possible community areas, including neighbourhood communities;
- identify positive separators using topographical, historical and planning data;
- examine the population mix of possible community areas;
- determine possible boundaries of communities areas and wards, and calculate approximate ordinarily resident populations for each area;
- determine the actual (1996 census) total ordinarily resident and adult (18 years and over) population counts for each area by aggregating Statistics New Zealand's meshblock[1] population counts;
- determine the appropriate number of Councillors for each proposed ward — and, therefore, the total size of the Council (each option was tested at each point within the range of 18 to 30 Councillors);
- refine proposed boundaries to improve their 'fit' in terms of population tolerances, community of interest, number of Councillors, and other criteria;
- test refined boundaries against our established criteria.

6.2 Option I - Adjustment of Present Boundaries

We began developing our options by examining the current Christchurch City ward and community board boundaries. All wards fell well within our ±10 per cent tolerance, and in all but one ward adult population (18 years and over) also lay within this tolerance. When, as proposed by the Local Government Commission in its draft Banks Peninsula District Review decision, the Lyttelton Basin is included in the Ferrymead Ward. However, the 1996 population variation from quota for that ward rises to +20.1 per cent, well beyond what we regard as an acceptable range.

---

[1] A meshblock is the smallest statistical unit defined by Statistics New Zealand. Normally there are up to c.200 people in each meshblock although there are exceptions. *The Local Government Act, 1974* requires that all wards follow meshblock boundaries. Meshblocks cannot, therefore, be split between two wards.

A number of those who made submissions proposed minor modifications to the existing boundaries of community board areas (and, therefore, wards). Our tests revealed that these modifications to existing boundaries resulted in population numbers in two of the wards rising above the ±10 per cent tolerance range.

When, however, we made minor adjustments to the present wards to try to meet the suggestions made during the first submissions phase, the changes made resulted in the variation from the mean size exceeded our ±10 per cent tolerance in two instances (Pegasus and Shirley), and in a third instance (Heathcote) the variation was right on the upper limit. In an attempt to bring these wards within our agreed tolerance levels the boundary between the Burwood and Pegasus wards was returned to its original line, but this resulted in making Hagley's population 17.4 per cent below the mean, but did not change the excess of population in either Shirley or Heathcote. A third round of adjustments involving changes to the boundaries between Hagley and Ferrymead, Heathcote and Spreydon, and Shirley and Papanui resulted in all proposed wards falling within our ±10 per cent tolerance. Interestingly, each set of changes to the existing ward boundaries left the Community Board populations inside the tolerance range.

When the existing community board boundaries were treated as wards (ie 2 existing wards = 1 ward), however, all fell well within the proposed tolerance range. (See Figure 5) Nevertheless, we concluded that this arrangement has the same disadvantages as noted above in respect of the existing structure.

We also examined the option of reducing the number of wards to six by treating each present community board area as a ward. Here again, we found all community board areas met the ±10 per cent tolerance, but when the Lyttelton Basin was included the population variation of one community board lay beyond the ±10 per cent tolerance range. We were, however, concerned that the present community boards (created in 1989 by combining adjacent wards) were largely artificial and did not, in our view, reflect the natural communities within the city.

While we accept that the present structure, for purely electoral purposes, could be retained for the next election cycle, we are far from convinced that it is the most appropriate form for the future representation of Christchurch citizens.

6.3 **Options II, III and IV Significant Changes**

We examined both three- and a four-ward/community area structures but it soon became apparent to us that neither was particularly suited to the representational needs of Christchurch because the population of each set of wards drawn ranged between c.60,000 and c.100,000, larger, in fact, than many present territorial local authorities.

The four-ward/community area option included here (Figure 37 - Option II) illustrates one possible structure. Although it meets the population tolerances and other representational criteria we have identified as being important, it is our unanimous view that such a community area/ward structure would present a

number of significant problems: their sheer size would, we believe, make it difficult for elected Councillors to meet the community's expectations of local service, the larger number of candidates that would stand for election, and number of Councillors that would need to be elected to provide fair representation for each ward, was likely to result in electoral characteristics similar to those which dominate 'at-large' elections, and that wards/community areas of this size might lead, ultimately, to demands for separate city status. On these counts we believe that a three- or four-ward structure would not adequately meet the representational needs of Christchurch.

Our examination of five-ward/community area options suggested that two were worthy of further investigation (Figures 38 and 39 - Options III & IV). Option III proposes a wagon-wheel format minus a hub which radiates out from the city's commercial centre and with each of the five wards electing four or five Councillors. Table 6.1 sets out the population data for this scenario:

Table 6.1: Population Data for Option III (no central ward Figure 38)

Ward ID	Population (1996 Census)	No. of Councillors	Ratio (Councillor: Population)	Variation from Mean
1	65538	5	13108	-6.7
2	57820	4	12132	+2.9
3	67817	5	15422	-3.4
4	57869	4	14467	+3.0
5	59984	4	14996	+6.8
Total	309028	22		
Ave. Per Councillor	14046			

This option provides a good definition of community areas and all wards fall well inside the acceptable range for both total and adult population.

When the population of the Lyttelton Harbour Basin is included in Ward 1 of our model the population data changes as shown in the following table:

Table 6.2: Population Data for Option III including the Lyttelton Basin (no central ward Figure 38)

Ward ID	Population (1996 Census)	No. of Councillors	Ratio (Councillor: Population)	Variation from Mean
1	70534	5	14107	-1.2
2	57820	4	12132	+1.3
3	67817	5	15422	-5.0
4	57869	4	14467	+1.4
5	59984	4	14996	+5.1
Total	314024			
Ave. Per Councillor	14274			

Again, the population data are a very good fit. Although Option III is not our preferred option, we believe that if our proposals involving the creation of a central city ward are not acceptable, this option warrants serious consideration.

Option IV, the second five-ward/community area model we examined in depth, is illustrated in Figure 39. In this model the unique characteristics of the central city are acknowledged by the creation of a central ward of just over 26,000 people (which would elect two City Councillors) surrounded by four larger wards each of which would elect between four and six City Councillors.   The community areas proposed by this option are, we believe robust though not ideal. The population data for this option is as follows:

Table 6.3: Population Data for Option IV (includes central ward Figure 39) (22 Councillors)

Ward ID	Population (1996 Census)	No. of Councillors	Ratio (Councillor: Population)	Variation from Mean
1	26260	2	13130	-6.5
2	66875	5	13375	-4.8
3	84803	6	14134	+0.6
4	56685	4	14171	+0.9
5	74405	5	14881	+5.9
Total	309028	22		
Ave. Per Councillor	14047			

When the Lyttelton Basin is added to Ward 5, however, that ward's variation from the mean moves well above the ±10 per cent tolerance, while all other wards have negative variations from the mean.   If, however, the number of Councillors is increased to 23 all wards fit comfortably within the recommended tolerance, as table 6.4 illustrates:

Table 6.4: Population Data for Option IV incorporating the Lyttelton Basin (23 Councillors Figure 39)

Ward ID	Population (1996 Census)	No. of Councillors	Ratio (Councillor: Population)	Variation from Mean
1	26260	2	13130	-3.8
2	66875	5	13375	-2.0
3	84803	6	14134	+3.5
4	56685	4	14171	+0.9
5	79401	6	13234	-3.1
Total	314024	23		
Ave. Per Councillor	13653			

Further testing showed that this option will also work well with 23 Councillors when the Lyttelton Harbour Basin is excluded. This option has a great deal to commend it. It envisages community areas that have coherence, its boundaries are well established and clearly defined, it meets a perceived need to provide

focused representation for the central city, and it meets our criteria in respect of numerical equality, reasonable compactness, and minority ethnic considerations. Its principal disadvantage is that two of the proposed wards would be required to elect six Councillors. We believe, however, that this sized ward will encourage electors to use party or political grouping labels as their principal cue when deciding for whom they will vote, and we are satisfied that this is not in the interests of open representation.

6.4 Option V - Six Community Areas Including City Centre (Varying Population)

Our preferred option at the end of May was Option V (Figure 40). It proposes the creation of six wards/community areas, five of them encircling a central city ward. As with the previous options the delineation of community areas has provided us with the starting point for determining the appropriate representational structure. Table 6.5 sets out the requisite population data for this option:

Table 6.5: Population Data for Option V (includes Central Ward Figure 40)

Ward ID	Population (1996 Census)	No. of Councillors	Ratio (Councillor: Population)	Variation from Mean
1	26260	2	13130	-6.5
2	44465	3	14822	+5.5
3	67103	5	13421	-4.5
4	56685	4	14171	+0.9
5	59984	4	14996	+6.8
6	54531	4	13633	-2.9
Total	309028	22		
Ave. Per Councillor	14407			

This option meets all of the criteria we identified as components of fair representation. All proposed wards fall well inside the ±10 per cent tolerance range for both total and adult population, the proposed ward/community area boundaries follow well-defined topographic and/or communications features, each community area has a clear focal point, compactness is observed, the central city is recognised as a distinct entity, and the distribution of the city's minority ethnic populations have been taken account of. Wards are not so large that Councillor representation is likely to become impersonal, and with ward representation ranging from two to five Councillors, electors will still be able to make their choice of Council representative on factors other than party or political grouping labels should they choose to do so.

One further advantage that this option has over the two previous options is that, as Table 6.6 demonstrates, the Lyttelton Harbour Basin can be accommodated comfortably within Ward 6 without any disruption to the proposed boundaries. Although its inclusion in Ward 6 is not so comfortable in terms of the principle of compactness, the establishment of a Community Board for the c.5,000 residents living in the basin (which we support) will go some way towards minimising the effects of distance.

Table 6.6: Population Data for Option V (including Lyttelton harbour basin Figure 40)

Ward ID	Population (1996 Census)	No. of Councillors	Ratio (Councillor: Population)	Variation from Mean
1	26260	2	13130	-8.0
2	44465	3	14822	+3.8
3	67103	5	13421	-6.0
4	56685	4	14171	-0.7
5	59984	4	14996	+5.1
6	59527	4	14882	+4.3
Total	314024	22		
Ave. Per Councillor	14274			

A balance sheet of the advantages and disadvantages of the many options has been prepared. This is in a qualitative rather than quantitative form. It is not possible to translate such a wide variety of issues which cannot be precisely defined in a manner that results in a numerical or financial costs versus benefits assessment. The balance sheet is included in section 7.4.

6.5 June Submissions and Four Councillor Community Areas

At its meeting on 27 May the Christchurch City Council requested that the Commissioners investigate further their preferred option with a view to considering the submissions of community boards and City Councillors that the number of Councillors elected from each community area should be the same and the present arrangements for the election of board members and City Councillors from wards covering half of each of the community areas be investigated further.

As a result of this request we have looked at the practicality of making each of the suburban community areas equal electing four Councillors from each area (ie 2 Councillors from each ward occupying half of a community area). Initially we considered the prospect of amending the boundary between the Pegasus and Papanui community areas so that the population was equal in both. This resulted in taking the equivalent of 14,000 people from the Papanui Board area by moving the boundary from our previous location of Hills Road across to Springfield Road. The result of this is, of course, that this section of St Albans and Shirley would become part of the Pegasus Ward.

While the arrangements now proposed and included in our preferred option meet the electoral symmetry required within this even ward arrangement in the suburban community areas it does not include the selection of our preferred boundary between Pegasus and Papanui. Nevertheless it is a workable boundary and it happens to lie along a boundary that has been used for election purposes in the period between 1977 and 1989.

This pattern eventually emerged in our preferred Option VIII.

The next investigation was the possibility of having all six wards, including the central ward, at a balance population to enable the election of four Councillors from all of the community areas resulting in 24 Councillors.

This investigation involved extending the central city area to the point where it contained a population of 44,491. This Option VI illustrated on Figure 41 represented a major intrusion of the central city community area into the adjacent community areas in particular on the north, the east and the south of the centre city.

The third proposal was called Option VII which reintroduced a 5 community area system with the populations of about 60,000 sufficient for each of the community areas to elect four Councillors yielding a Council of 24 Councillors. This required adjustment of the boundary between Ferrymead and Pegasus in Kerrs Reach, Avondale area.

We accepted in the investigation shown by Options VI, VII and VIII that the ward population figures would be such as to enable the integration of the Lyttelton basin with Ferrymead for electoral purposes.

This latter group of proposals also conformed with the present statutory provisions and no amendments to legislation is required to enable it to be put in place for the local authority elections in 2001.

6.6 Options VI, VII and VIII

Table 6.7: Population Data for Option VI (6 equal areas Figure 41) (Mean = 12,876)

Community Area ID	1996 Population	Number of Councillors	Number of People Per Councillor	Difference from Mean (%)
1 Hagley	44,491	4	11,123	-13.6
2 Pegasus	49,957	4	12,489	-3.0
3 Papanui	55,327	4	13,832	7.4
4 Sockburn	56,685	4	14,171	10.1
5 Heathcote	56,106	4	14,027	8.9
6 Ferrymead (+ Lyttelton)	46,462	4	11,616	-9.8
Total Christchurch	**309,028**	**24**	**12,876**	
Plus Akaroa-Wairewa				

This Option VI retains the general pattern of 5 suburban community areas from a position about 2 kilometres from the city centre. Within that area is the central city community area with a population of 44,491 yielding 4 Councillors.

The boundaries of this area have to extend in the north as far as Heaton Street and Warrington Street in the north and out to the Avon River at Gloucester Street and thence via Linwood Avenue and Aldwins Road in the west. Brougham Street would become the boundary on the south.

Table 6.8: Population Data for Option VI including Lyttelton Basin
(6 equal areas Figure 41) (Mean = 13,084)

Community Area ID	1996 Population	Number of Councillors	Number of People Per Councillor	Difference from Mean (%)
1 Hagley	44,491	4	11,123	-15.0
2 Pegasus	49,957	4	12,489	-4.5
3 Papanui	55,327	4	13,832	5.7
4 Sockburn	56,685	4	14,171	8.3
5 Heathcote	56,106	4	14,027	7.2
6 Ferrymead (+ Lyttelton)	51,458	4	12,865	-1.7
Total Christchurch	**314,024**	**24**	**13,084**	
Plus Akaroa-Wairewa	2,585	1	2,585	*Special Case*

The electoral balance in this proposal is satisfactory and falls within the ±10% margin. However several of the areas are close to 10%.

The Ferrymead community area can readily accommodate the addition of the Lyttelton Basin moving that variance from -9.8% to -1.7%.

Table 6.9: Population Data for Option VII
(5 equal areas no central ward Figure 42) (Mean = 15,451)

Community Area ID	1996 Population	Number of Councillors	Number of People Per Councillor	Difference from Mean (%)
1 Ferrymead (+ Lyttelton)	61,097	4	15,274	-1.1
2 Pegasus	66,168	4	16,542	7.1
3 Papanui	63,910	4	15,978	3.4
4 Sockburn	57,869	4	14,467	-6.4
5 Heathcote	59,984	4	14,996	-2.9
Total Christchurch	**309,028**	**20**	**15,451**	
Plus Akaroa-Wairewa				

In this Option VII an attempt has been made to reduce the number of community areas from 6 to 5 by leaving the inner city area within the four avenues linked with the Ferrymead community area.

In order to achieve a satisfactory balance it has been necessary to add the Avondale area to Pegasus. The end results of this framework are five wards varying in population from 57,800 to 66,168. Generally, with the exception of the Kerrs Reach Avon River length the suburban boundaries remain much as established in Options V and VI with the exception of the Avondale length of the Avon River from Kerrs Reach.

**Table 6.10: Population Data for Option VII including Lyttelton Basin
(5 equal areas no central ward Figure 42) (Mean = 15,701)**

Community Area ID	1996 Population	Number of Councillors	Number of People Per Councillor	Difference from Mean (%)
1 Ferrymead (+ Lyttelton)	66,093	4	16,523	5.2
2 Pegasus	66,168	4	16,542	5.4
3 Papanui	63,910	4	15,978	1.8
4 Sockburn	57,869	4	14,467	-7.9
5 Heathcote	59,984	4	14,996	-4.5
Total Christchurch	**314,024**	**20**	**15,701**	
Plus Akaroa-Wairewa	2,585	1	1,585	*Special Case*

The Ferrymead community area extending from Hagley Park through to the Tunnel Road can be extended to include the Lyttelton Harbour Basin satisfactorily. With the Basin included it has a variation of +5.2% which is quite satisfactory.

Obviously this community area with its length from the centre city to the far side of the Harbour Basin could be deemed as not meeting the requirements of shape and compactness. However it would be divided into two wards roughly on Aldwins Road, Pages Road which makes it more satisfactory.

The existence of a community board to cover the Lyttelton Basin would be essential for such a length and variety of land use and activities as it would be embodied in the Ferrymead community area.

**Table 6.11: Population Data for Option VIII - Recommended
(6 areas central ward Figure 43) (Mean = 14,047)**

Proposed Community Area Name	1996 Population	Number of Councillors	Number of People Per Councillor	Difference from Mean (%)
1 Hagley	26,169	2	13,085	-6.9
2 Pegasus	56,133	4	14,033	-0.1
3 Papanui	58,220	4	14,555	3.6
4 Sockburn	56,685	4	14,171	0.9
5 Heathcote	59,984	4	14,996	6.8
6 Ferrymead (+ Lyttelton)	51,837	4	12,959	-7.7
Total Christchurch	**309,028**	**22**	**14,047**	
Plus Akaroa-Wairewa				

Option VIII which is the preferred option has a good balance of ward populations and the community areas, with the exception of Hagley at 26,169, vary between 52,000 and 59,000.

From an electoral and representation point of view the populations all fall well within the ±10% adopted and in the case of Ferrymead commences with a -2.9% variation which could, with the addition of the Lyttelton Basin, lift to +4.3% which is still well within the agreed tolerances.

The population figures, including Lyttelton, follow in Table 6.12:

Table 6.12: Population Data for Option VIII - Recommended including Lyttelton (6 areas includes central ward Figure 43) (Mean = 14,274)

Proposed Community Area Name	1996 Population	Number of Councillors	Number of People Per Councillor	Difference from Mean (%)
1 Hagley	26,169	2	13,085	-8.3
2 Pegasus	56,133	4	14,033	-1.7
3 Papanui	58,220	4	14,555	2.0
4 Sockburn	56,685	4	14,171	-0.7
5 Heathcote	59,984	4	14,996	5.1
6 Ferrymead (+ Lyttelton)	56,833	4	14,208	-0.5
Total Christchurch	**314,024**	**22**	**14,274**	
Plus Akaroa-Wairewa	2,585	1	2,585	*Special Case*

6.7 Number of Councillors

During our consideration of different options it became apparent to us that most would work with a varying number of Councillors. Our testing showed however, that no models other than the 12-ward, 24 Councillor; 6-ward, 18 or 24 Councillor; or 4- or 5-ward, 20 Councillor options, would work satisfactorily with fewer than 22 Councillors. A number which worked well with 22 Councillors also worked satisfactorily with a range of numbers up to 28. Interestingly, our preferred option will only work with 22 Councillors, (although if the Lyttelton harbour basin is included it would also work with 27 Councillors ie 5 Councillors in each of the suburban community areas).

Based on our studies we believe 22 Councillors to be the optimum number to serve good representation for Christchurch City with the proviso that should the city and the Banks Peninsula District be merged the total number of Councillors should rise to 23 with the additional Councillor representing an Akaroa-Wairewa Ward which we regard as a special case.

6.8 Community Boards and Elections

In all our options we identified communities and used them as building blocks to establish community areas. We think it appropriate that the boundaries of community areas and wards should continue to be conterminous.

We have considered the representational issues surrounding the Community Boards and have reached a number of conclusions about their future structure. We have come to the view that each of the communities we have defined should have its own Community Board (or Boards in the case of the ward which includes the Lyttelton Harbour Basin); and all community areas should elect six Community Board representatives. For the 2001 elections we recommend that the 6 Board members be elected 3 from each ward, and the city centre elect 6 from the Hagley Ward.

However, for future elections we favour separating the community board electoral areas and seeking the Local Government Act be amended to enable the election of Board members from sub-communities. Then these representatives would be elected from three or four defined Community Board electoral units/sub-communities within each of the community areas we have defined. This would ensure that representation is fairly spread across the community board's area.

During our deliberations on this question we debated whether we should strive for numerical equality of representation (applying the ±10 per cent tolerance) at Community Board level across the whole city, or whether numerical equality should apply *within* but not *between* Community Board areas. While, initially, we were attracted to the idea that numerical equality at this level should apply across the city, we realised that the *Local Government Act. 1974* set the maximum size of Community Boards at 12, including appointed members whose number may not be more than one-half the number of elected members. This led us to conclude that, apart from the exception of the Lyttelton Basin, the number of elected Community Board members should be set at six even if this meant some variation in numerical ratios between community areas.

The boundaries of these Community Board electoral units/sub-communities could then be drawn to reflect associated neighbourhood communities. In delineating these sub-community boundaries, the same numerical equality principle would apply but within each community board area.

We understand that unless provision is specifically included in the Local Government Act it is, by implication, prohibited. Thus, in order to achieve the Community Board electoral units (ie sub-communities) we are proposing, it will be necessary for the Christchurch City Council to seek a legislative amendment to permit their establishment in the future beyond the elections in 2001.

If community board elections could be, statutorily, undertaken at the sub-community level then an arrangement of sub-areas for community board elections can be readily accommodated as a second level of definition within each community area. Community board electoral unit areas need not (in fact possibly should not) coincide with the wards for Councillor election. Board member elections should be made from smaller groupings or sub-community board electoral units. The process for achieving this change in statute has yet to be determined and it is recommended for future consideration beyond 2001.

6.9 **Future Trends**

Population projections for Christchurch city indicate that five community areas will grow relatively equally. The major exception for this population growth over the next 20 years or so is likely to occur in the community area we describe as Ward 5 Heathcote. Population projections data we have studied indicates that growth in Ward 5 of our preferred Option VIII may represent 31.9 per cent of all growth in Christchurch between the present and the year 2021.

Population growth of this magnitude, when concentrated in a single ward will inevitably require that ward/community area boundaries be reviewed to maintain fair representation. At present this Option VIII proposed ward has had a variation of 6.8% above the mean total population. Calculations suggest that when this variation from the mean population reaches +12.5 per cent the imbalance could be addressed by an allocating a fifth Councillor to the ward. In this way numerical equality would be preserved without major alterations to electoral/community board boundaries. It would, of course, lead to a 23 member Council again (24 with the Akaroa/Wairewa Ward Councillor).

Another option at that time would be to reduce this ward's population by taking some of the residential area at Waltham and Addington, north of Brougham Street, into the Central Hagley Ward. We do not favour this reallocation but it may be the only way in which the uniform pattern of 4 members per community area can be maintained.

The results of all this analysis leads us to the selection of Option VIII and its recommendation to the Christchurch City Council. Maps of this Option are included as Figures 1 and 2 in Part 1 of this report.

7.   COMMUNITY BOARD AREAS AND BOUNDARIES

7.1 **The Number of Community Boards**

We strongly recommend that the structure of community boards be retained so as to cover the whole of the Christchurch City district.

The past arrangement of six community areas each with their own board has worked reasonably well and, apart from adjustment of boundaries, we recommend that six boards continue.

The statutory requirements in 1988 led to the arrangements adopted of having 12 wards being in turn amalgamated to establish 6 community areas and 6 boards and this was the simplest and most expedient arrangement at that time. This statutory situation still applies and we have arrived at an 11 ward system with two wards making up the five suburban community areas and a smaller central area for the single city centre ward.

Our analysis has shown that the boundaries existing in 1998 do not best reflect the communities of interest and there is a marked advantage in reducing the suburban community board areas from 6 to 5.

Our analysis has explored arrangements of 3, 4, 5 and 5 community areas. For reasons we have already set out and the overall summary that follows we are satisfied that a six community area arrangement with five suburban areas (ie 5 spokes) and a sixth central city area (ie a hub) is superior to all other arrangements. This is our recommendation.

For the record the rest of this section summarises the key elements of Options I to VIII which have been investigated in detail. These options are illustrated in Figures 36 to 43.

7.2 Development of Options - May 1999

We have looked at a great number of combinations and about thirty that fell within seven major scenarios illustrated in Figures 28 to 35. Here we describe the first five options which have emerged as the 'real possibilities' from a much larger group which evolved during the sorting process. These options are those considered during April/May and Option V was considered by the Council on 27 May in our preliminary report. They all assume a varying number of Councillors in each area.

For convenience these are described more or less in the same sequence as our investigations revealed them.

Option I - Existing Six Communities Figure 36

This option is the existing arrangement refined to include all of the Sydenham area in Heathcote so it embraces this commercial and retail focus. There are also some other minor adjustments in the Richmond and Shirley areas. This is, of course, a six community area system with Hagley still linked to Ferrymead and 24 Councillors in all.

The number of Councillors could be reduced to 18, and this has had wide publicity. We do not recommend such an arbitrary cut in Council members and we have not found any justification for that reduced number.

As already explained in Section 6.2 there are real representation issues and variations emerging over time that require correction.

The existing boundaries of the wards are not ideal and do not reflect the major physical or land use divisions occurring in the city. This proposal is the 'do nothing' or minor 'tweaking' approach. While being a workable and accepted arrangement for electoral purposes there are several deficiencies in the definition of the communities and communities of interest and the lack of good fit with the boundaries. See Figure 36.

Option II - Four Communities Figure 37

This second option allows for 20 Councillors. It includes the central city with Linwood and the Burwood and Pegasus areas. There are only four community areas. The populations in these four surrounding community areas vary from 57,000 to 98,000 and there would be between four and six elected Councillors in the community areas. Area 2 encompasses the full frontage of the Waimakariri River whilst the southern boundary of area 4 is the full length of the Port Hills/Summit Road.

This proposal would assume that the central city metropolitan issues would continue to be dealt with directly by the City Council with indirect influence in the development of policies unique to the high density city centre areas through the Hagley/Pegasus Board. Lyttelton, in the event of a merger, would be linked with the Heathcote area.

The boundaries align better with natural and physical characteristics, both present and future, than the present ward boundaries. The boundaries follow Fendalton/Memorial Avenue in the north-west, the railway and Heathcote River in the south and the Wigram airfield's southern arterial route in the south-west. The community areas are extensive and their populations vary from 57,000 to 98,000 which in the case of Papanui is 1.75 times its present size.

Overall it is considered that this arrangement takes the threshold for community board activities to its upper limits and it could certainly be expected that, accordingly, there would have to be a greater transfer of responsibilities from the Council to the boards. This might require the boards themselves to be of larger size with possibly eight elected board members rather than six as in the previous arrangements. See Figure 37.

We also considered a three community area proposition with populations varying between 63,000, 109,000 and 136,000 respectively. This option was dismissed as having community areas that would not be reflecting communities of interest adequately and be too large, ceasing to be of a community based scale suited to the complimentary City Council and Community Board functions.

Option III - 5 Community Areas Figure 38

This option continues to leave the centre city with the Ferrymead sector and provides four other community areas giving five community areas in all and 22 Councillors. The community area population sizes are in the range of 59,000 to 67,000 range with between four and five Councillors associated with each community area. This is a better balanced proposal.

It has been found that the Lyttelton Basin can be attached successfully to Area 1, Hagley/Ferrymead in this arrangement. The arrangement shows a good coincidence with major community areas, physical and natural boundaries throughout the metropolitan landscape.

The five major spokes are the rural edge of Belfast/Northcote linking to Cranford Street, Fendalton Road/Memorial Avenue, the Wigram southern arterial extension to Springs Road, the railway toward Heathcote and the Heathcote River, together with the Avon River from the central city to the Estuary.

This arrangement would work reasonably satisfactorily, but does not provide for a specific community of interest area for the central city. See Figure 38.

Option IV - 4 Suburban Communities plus Central City Figure 39

In this option there is a central city community area with four surrounding community areas including an extended hills area covering the Port Hills in the south and the whole of the northern area covering the Waimakariri River frontage in the north. This pattern of community areas, excluding Lyttelton, provides for 22 Councillors with areas varying in membership from the central area at 2 members, north at 6 members, west at 4 members, while east and south have 5 members each. While such a proposal increases the population in community areas up to 85,000 it has the simplicity of being a north-south east-west division of the city. Generally the boundaries coincide with strong physical features such as the Avon River in the east, the Northcote/Belfast rural edge of the Marshlands area, the railway in Riccarton and from Sockburn to Opawa, the Heathcote River out to the Estuary, the new southern arterial route past Wigram Airport in the south-west and Memorial Avenue and Fendalton Road in the north-west.

In the event of the Banks Peninsula merger to create a new city, the addition of Lyttelton will result in the Heathcote Ward requiring an increase from 5 to 6 Councillors which would result in a 23 member Council. (With the Akaroa/Wairewa Councillor this would make a total of 24 Councillors.)

Unlike the other proposals, which retain many of the allegiances already established in the current community board pattern, this proposal would require the establishment of new community board relationships for Sumner with Heathcote, Linwood with Burwood/Pegasus and Fendalton with Papanui and Shirley. A small section of Fendalton would be included with the Riccarton/Yaldhurst area, which would also embrace the Airport. See Figure 39.

Option V - 6 Areas with Central Ward Figure 40

This contains a pattern of five suburban community areas with 3, 4 or 5 Councillors surrounding a central city ward of 2 Councillors. This yields 22 Councillors in all (23 if the Akaroa/Wairewa Councillor is included). From our analysis including both electoral representation and the evidence on the Council's present functions and activities we believe 22 is the optimum number of metropolitan Councillors.

It is proposed that a two member ward elected on the same general population ratio as the other areas, should apply to the central city Ward 1. The Lyttelton community board area would be included in the Ferrymead area for the election of that area's members to the Council. The boundary between Areas 2 & 3 is the western edge of the Marshlands rural area, along the line of the limited access length of the proposed northern arterial and Aylesford Street to Hills Road. The boundary between Areas 3 & 4 lie along Fendalton Road/Memorial Avenue, both of which are major arterial roads clear of retail, commercial and industrial activities. The boundary between 4 & 5 lies along the southern edge of the Wigram airfield lands where the southern arterial will pass out to Springs Road. These major roads will all remain as clear traffic throughways into the future. The Halswell area is also included with the Heathcote (Area 5). See Figure 40.

7.3 **Further Development of Options VI, VII and VIII - June 1999**

Option VI

This contains a pattern of six similar sized wards to enable the election of 4 Councillors per ward including the central city ward which is doubled in size from Option V.

This yields 24 Councillors in all (25 if the Akaroa/Wairewa Councillor is included).

While this proposal provides 4 Councillors for each of the six community areas a real difficulty emerges with the absorption of extensive areas of Papanui, Pegasus, Ferrymead and Heathcote having to be absorbed into this extended ward. In order to have sufficient population for the election of two additional Councillors 20,000 residents from the adjacent four community areas must be included in this central community area. It would of course be subdivided into two wards for election purposes. This could probably generally follow the Avon River from Antigua Street through to Gloucester Street in Avonside.

We are of the view that this degree of extension of the central ward would reduce the focus of the community board on the inner central high density residential areas within walking distance of the city centre.

With its northern boundary at Heaton Street and southern boundary at Brougham Street in the north-south direction and from the Riccarton railway to Linwood Avenue in the east-west direction results in a radius of approximately 2 kilometres from Cathedral Square. The preferred Options V and VIII have a north-south radius of about $1^1/_2$ kilometres from Cathedral Square and generally fit the land use pattern and community of interest issues more satisfactorily.

Option VII

This contains a pattern of 5 community areas and returns to the linkage of Hagley with Ferrymead. The population figures vary from 57,000 to 66,000 and as such are lifting above the threshold size deemed to be appropriate for community areas at this time.

While these five community areas would yield 4 Councillors from each area and the tolerances fall comfortably within the ±10% (with and without Lyttelton included) the Ferrymead community area is seen as being too extensive and too varied from the central city right through to Diamond Harbour for a satisfactory long term arrangement.

The proposal does reduce the number of Councillors to 20 Councillors (21 with Akaroa/Wairewa added) but the responsibilities for the community area boards at their inner ends adjacent to the central city would, in our view, cause tension in the long term between the boards and the metropolitan responsibilities of the City Council.

Option VIII (Preferred Option)

The preferred option includes a central ward electing 2 members with 5 surrounding community areas electing 4 Councillors 2 from each of the sub-wards within those areas. This yields 22 Councillors in all (23 if the Akaroa/Wairewa Councillor is included). From our analysis including both electoral representation and the evidence on the Council's and community boards' present and future functions we believe that this arrangement, with the symmetry of equal Councillors from each of the suburban community areas, is superior to all of the others previously investigated.

This option has the advantages of Option V in respect of the more most population ratios and community area populations as well as recognising a manageable situation for the central ward no 1. As mentioned elsewhere it is proposed that ward 1 would be represented by 2 Councillors who would both be members of a community board of 6 board members.

Regarding the Lyttelton Basin whilst the 5,000 population in that area would be added to the Mt Pleasant ward for election purposes it is also proposed that there would be a community area board established for the Harbour Basin area.

The membership of the Lyttelton Community Board would presumably be drawn from the 2 Councillors elected in Mt Pleasant together with 4 or 6 Board members elected from the Lyttelton Harbour Basin. (The Lyttelton sub-community would need to be established as an electoral basis for the board through the Local Government Commission's Order in Council.)

One aspect which has been raised is the inclusion of Port Levy in the Ferrymead Community Area. It would seem more appropriate for that area to now be included in the Akaroa/Wairewa ward as its community of interest appears to lie mostly with the rural areas of Banks Peninsula and with that association the Lyttelton Basin becomes a more compact community board area.

Regarding the central ward's shape our preferred option has emerged following a detailed consideration of ward and community area populations and boundaries. We have found it necessary to hold the northern boundary along the Pegasus frontage at Canon Street and North Avon Road. This is a little further south than we would have preferred and it is due in part to the need to provide sufficient population in the Shirley Ward. In the north-west the boundary is at Wairarapa Terrace and Rugby Street which is necessary to get a balance in populations between Papanui and the centre city. A more southerly boundary of Merivale Lane has been suggested but it does lie south of our preferred option of community area boundaries along Wairarapa Terrace and St Albans Street.

In the east the boundary traverses Linwood Avenue, Olliviers Road, Ferry Road and Ensors Road. This boundary is deemed to be the most satisfactory at this time giving both population and community of area interests. At this stage the boundary would pass through two neighbourhood areas in Linwood. It is possible, in the longer term, should Lyttelton be merged with the city that the boundary might shift to be the current ward boundary of Ensors and Aldwins Road at that time.

7.4   Balance Sheet Assessment of Six Options

The following balance sheet of the advantages and disadvantages of the many options has been prepared. This is in a qualitative rather than quantitative form. It is not possible to translate such a wide variety of issues which cannot be precisely defined in a manner that results in a numerical or financial costs versus benefits assessment.

Nevertheless the following table sets out the key issues we have considered and compares Options I to VIII and indicates in a general way the advantages and disadvantages of these eight proposals.

The most important conclusion is that, with the exception of a neat match on the community of area issues, Option VIII is obviously the best and consequently is recommended.

The decision between the next two options, Option V and Option VI, relate to political decisions in the following way. First Option V is the best fit to communities of interest areas but includes a varying number (3, 4 or 5) Councillors to be elected from each area. This is not deemed to be satisfactory by existing Councillors and Community Board members.

Option VI while having the simplicity of the same number of elected Councillors from each of the six community areas has the disadvantage that it does not reflect a balanced approach to defining suburban community areas. The central city community area is expanded to significantly affect the responsibilities and remnant functions for the suburban community areas.

In summary our ranking of the options is Option VIII, Option V, Option VI.

We do not favour options that omit the recognition of the central community area.

The balance sheet that follows includes the five viable options comparing them with the existing status quo Option I:

	Option I Existing	Option III	Option V	Option VI	Option VII	Option VIII
Description						
Figure No	Figure 36	Figure 38	Figure 40	Figure 41	Figure 42	Figure 43
No of Community Area	6	5	6 (incl central)	6 (incl central)	5	6 (incl central)
Community Area Population Ranges	47,000-56,000	59,000-68,000	44,000-67,000 plus centre 26,000	49,000-56,000 plus centre 44,000	59,000-60,000	53,000-58,000 plus centre 26,000
Number of Councillors	24	22	22	24	20	22
Number of Councillors per Community Area	4,4,4,4,4,4	4,5,4,4,5	3,5,4,4,4 +2	4,4,4,4,4 +4	4,4,4,4,4	4,4,4,4,4 +2
Number of Wards for Elections	12	5	6	12	10	11
Community Area Definition						
Communities of Interest Fit	Fair	Fair	Excellent	Satisfactory	Fair	Very Good
Planning and Future Fit	Poor	Fair	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Excellent
Physical and Natural Fit	Poor	Fair	Excellent	Fair	Fair	Very Good
Centres and Facilities Fit	Fair	Satisfactory	Excellent	Fair	Satisfactory	Excellent
Social/Community Development Fit	Fair	Fair	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Very Good
City Centre Recognition	Poor	Poor	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor	Very Good
Integration of Harbour Basin	Poor	Poor	Excellent	Very Good	Poor	Excellent
Community Areas Overall	6th	4th=	1st	3rd	4th=	2nd
Representation issues						
Numerical Equality	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good	Very Good	Satisfactory	Very Good
Communities of Interest	Poor	Fair	Very Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Very Good
Compactness/Shape (Community Areas)	Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Very Good	Fair	Satisfactory
Ethnic and Social Fairness	Fair	Satisfactory	Very Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good
Number of Councillors Same all Wards	Very Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good
Representation Issues Overall	6th	4th	2nd	3rd	4th=	1st
Governance and Management						
Potential Enhancement of Functions Councillors and Board Members	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good
Service Delivery Potential	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Very Good	Very Good	Satisfactory	Very Good
Community Development Potential	Fair	Fair	Very Good	Very Good	Fair	Very Good
Governance Issues Overall	4th=	4th=	2nd=	3rd	4th=	1st
OVERALL RANKING	**6th**	**5th**	**2nd**	**3rd**	**4th**	**1st**

7.5 **Definition of Community Areas in Preferred Option**

In considering the boundaries for these areas it is necessary for them to align as far as possible with urban statistical units and in particular to take advantage of existing meshblock boundaries. A map of the preferred option showing community areas and proposed wards is included as Figure 44. These will, of course, be subject of publication, submission and determination by the Council in due course.

In the meantime they can briefly be described as follows:

Community Area 1

Proposed Name: Hagley
This area embraces the city centre between the four avenues together with some inner areas of Linwood, St Albans, Merivale and Riccarton.

Description: Its southern boundary is the railway parallel to Moorhouse Avenue. Its eastern boundary generally lies along Ensors Road, Olliviers Road, Linwood Avenue and the River Avon. Its northern boundary is along the line of North Avon Road, Canon Street, Rugby Street and Wairarapa Terrace. Its western boundary lies along the railway through Riccarton.

Community Area 2

Proposed Name: Pegasus
Pegasus embraces the commercial centres of New Brighton and Shirley.

Description: The southern boundary from Springfield Road via Canon Street to North Avon Road to the Avon River which it follows to the Estuary. Its eastern boundary is the coastline. Its northern boundary is the Waimakariri River from the sea to Chaneys. Its western boundary is the rural edge of Marshlands abutting the urban areas of Belfast and Northcote thence across to Cranford Street to Rutland Street and Springfield Road.

Community Area 3

Proposed Name: Papanui
This area embraces Papanui Road including the Merivale and Northlands shopping centres and Belfast.

Description: Its southern boundary with Area 1 lies along St Albans Road, Rugby Street and Wairarapa Terrace. Its eastern boundary lies along Rutland Street and the eastern urban edge of the Northcote and Belfast urban areas. Its northern boundary is the Waimakariri River from Chaneys to Chattertons Road. Its western boundary contains the whole of the McLeans Island lands north of the airport and thence passes down Russley Road, Memorial Avenue and Fendalton Road to the railway and Wairarapa Terrace.

Community Area 4

Proposed Name: Sockburn
This area embraces the shopping centres of Riccarton, Church Corner and Hornby and includes the extensive rural land surrounding the Christchurch International Airport and the river gravel plains beyond.

Description: Its southern boundary lies along the proposed southern arterial road from Springs Road along the southern boundary of the former Wigram airfield to Curletts Road and thence along the railway line to the Addington railway station. Its eastern boundary includes the railway through Riccarton and thence along Fendalton Road, Memorial Avenue and Russley Road. Its northern boundary passes along the north of the Christchurch Airport and thence along the southern edge of the McLeans Island land. The western boundary is the western boundary of the district along Chattertons Road, Dawsons Road and Marshs Road to Springs Road.

Community Area 5

Proposed Name: Heathcote
This area embraces the Cashmere, Beckenham, Spreydon and Halswell areas and includes the Sydenham shopping centre.

Description: Its southern boundary is the crest of the Port Hills. Its eastern boundary is the Rapaki Track and the Heathcote River to the railway. Its northern boundary passes along the railway to Curletts Road and thence follows the proposed southern arterial route to Springs Road. Its western boundary is the district boundary following Marshs Road, Hodgens Road, the Halswell River and thence rising to the Summit Road.

Community Area 6

Proposed Name: Ferrymead
This area includes the Linwood shopping centre and the suburbs of Linwood, Wainoni, Aranui and through to Sumner.

Description: The southern boundary is the crest of the Port Hills from the Rapaki Road through to Godley Head. The eastern boundary is the sea coast from Sumner including the Estuary and thence along the Avon River. The northern boundary is the Avon River over its full length up to Linwood Avenue. Its western boundary is the boundary with Area 1 at Olliviers Road, Ferry Road and Ensors Road thence along the railway line to the Heathcote River at Opawa and up the Rapaki Track.

As already mentioned these boundaries are deemed to be appropriate either as boundaries of 'separation' between the wards or, especially in the case of the Central City Area boundaries of 'collaboration' between Area 1 and the adjacent five suburban community areas.

8. IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 Consultation

The City Council has adopted a policy on consultation ('Seeking Community Views' 17 December 1997) which is forward looking and ensures the principles of consultation are pursued on policy issues as well as major projects. The community boards are integral to such consultation.

The Local Government Commission is also bound by statue to be involved in measures of consultation although in terms of the definition of community board areas and Community Board member election the initiative for the development of proposals and the associated consultation rests with the territorial authority.

While there were extensive consultations and submission and considerations by both the Council's transition committees and the Local Government Commission in 1988 there has been no significant opportunity for public involvement and consultation on the issues considered in this investigation, since that time.

The Local Government Act does require a formal review of wards and Councillor numbers every three years. It was that process that gave rise, in 1997, to an appeal against the Christchurch City Council continuing with a 24 member 12 ward arrangement. The Local Government Commission indicated that while it accepted that structure for the 1998 election it stated:

'The Commission considers that prior to the next election, the Council should carry out a much more thorough investigation of its existing wards in order to ascertain what changes should be made. The next review will be particularly important because it will be carried out more than 10 years after the reconstitution of Christchurch City in 1989.'

The Commission continued:

'At the same time, if not earlier, it should thoroughly review its governing structure with a view to identifying a possible reduction in the number of elected and appointed members of the Council, Community Boards and other Council operations.'

In view of the Council's policy on 'Seeking Community Views' and the Local Government Commission's expressed desire that there should be thorough community consultation it is now timely that the recommendations arising from this investigation should be placed before the community boards and the public to provide an opportunity for community input and ownership of the proposals that might be recommended by the Council in due course.

In the time available we have only been able to bring the background and detailed information, for this report, to a standard suitable to support our recommendations.

It is now necessary for a group of pamphlets and reports to be prepared suited to encouraging public understanding, comment and acceptance of the proposals which might ultimately be adopted by the Council.

8.2 **Statutory Issues**

During these investigations we have been informed of a range of local government decisions, the statutory framework under the Local Government Act 1974 and the provisions for election of Councillors by wards and Community Board members by community areas.

It is appreciated that the Local Government Commission plays an important role both in determining the ward and Councillor arrangements for the city and also approving the community areas and community board provisions for inclusion in the ultimate 'Order in Council'.

The City Solicitor has identified that our proposal for having 'sub-communities' of community areas for the purposes of electing Community Board members is not at this time provided for in statue.

The word 'wards' is used in relation to the election of Councillors. The word 'community' is used in relation to the election of Community Board members.

In the arrangements we originally recommended we suggested that three or four electoral units within each community area should be used as the basis of electing Community Board members.

It is understood that the Local Government Association of New Zealand has already approached the Local Government Commission and Internal Affairs seeking the flexibility to have such an arrangement. We recommend that the Christchurch City Council pursue this matter directly with the Local Government Commission and Internal Affairs with a view to enabling this arrangement of elections of Community Board members for elections in the year 2004.

8.3 **Naming of Community Areas and Wards**

We have found it helpful during this exercise to make suggestions about possible names that could be attached to the community areas and future wards. We emphasise these are tentative at this time, but they do focus attention on the locations of these communities of interest and boundaries at both the ward level and also the community area level.

In considering the ward/community area names we are conscious of a desire to establish names which avoid confusion with parliamentary electorates and are 'neutral' in the context of historic and the existing circumstances and also a name that reflects a broad geographic concept for the area concerned. As a result the following is proposed:

Area No 1	Central Area	Hagley	Based on Hagley Park and the City Centre 1 ward - Hagley
Area No 2	The North-East	Pegasus	Based on the Coastal area and the former ward/community board description. 2 wards - Shirley and Brighton
Area No 3	North-West	Papanui	This is a name that best covers the general locality which includes McLeans Island, Belfast, Northcote, Bishopdale and Fendalton. 2 wards - Fendalton and Northcote
Area No 4	West	Sockburn	Sockburn is a name well known in the locality and embracing the previous Wigram, Riccarton and minor parts of Waimairi/Fendalton community areas. The latter names can continue to be used for wards in the area. 2 wards - Riccarton and Hornby
Area No 5	South	Heathcote	This name has traditionally been associated with the area and which embraces the greater length of the Heathcote River and its catchment. 2 wards - Spreydon and Cashmere
Area No 6	South-East	Ferrymead	Ferrymead seems an appropriate name for the areas surrounding the Avon/Heathcote Estuary (and linking, if so decided, with Lyttelton). 2 wards - Avon and Mt Pleasant

These names are those contained on Figure 2 of this report and Figure 44.

With respect to the ward names within the community areas, a group of names have been suggested which use existing ward names or generally reflect the suburban locations proposed to be covered by the new ward arrangements.

The names tentatively suggested are noted on Figure 2 and Figure 44.

As already mentioned these names are suggestions yet to be confirmed. We have found them helpful and they provide a start point for consultation on the next round of development of the proposals.

8.4 **Regional Constituencies**

The Canterbury Regional Council made submissions seeking that, if possible, Christchurch City adopt a four-way split for community area purposes which would then coincide with the Regional Council's electoral constituencies. We have not found it possible to create such a simple arrangement. As with the Canterbury Regional Council at present the identification of constituencies will have to rely on a grouping of wards or sub-community electoral units to match their population and election arrangements.

There are several ways in which the wards and electoral units could be combined to give the Regional Council an exact allocation of a quarter of the population of the Christchurch metropolitan area into four separate constituencies.

During the submissions both by the Regional Council and Community Board members the plea was made that the Regional Council boundaries should as far as possible coincide with community board areas so that people have a simpler understanding of the regional constituencies. While this cannot be achieved with a simple four-way split of two members per constituency our investigations have provided a very satisfactory representation should the Regional Council agree to having two 3 Regional Council constituencies and one 2 Regional Council constituency.

This arrangement is set out in the following tables 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3:

Table 8.1 Regional Constituencies NE, SW, SE

Arrangement 1				
2 Pegasus	56133	114353	3	-1.3
3 Papanui	58220		38118	
4 Sockburn	56685	116669	3	+0.7
5 Heathcote	59984		38890	
1 Hagley	26169	78006	2	+1.0
6 Ferrymead	51837		39003	
	309028		8	
			38629	
(Preferred Option)				

Table 8.2 Regional Constituencies N, W, S

Arrangement 2				
2 Pegasus	56133	114353	3	-1.3
3 Papanui	58220		38118	
4 Sockburn	56685	82854	2	+7.2
1 Hagley	26169		41427	
5 Heathcote	59984	111821	3	-3.5
6 Ferrymead	51837		37274	
	309028		8	
			38629	

(Second Preference)

Table 8.3 Regional Constituencies E, NW, S

Arrangement 3				
2 Pegasus	56133	107970	3	-6.8
6 Ferrymead	51837		35990	
4 Sockburn	56685	114905	3	-0.8
3 Papanui	58220		38302	
1 Hagley	26169	86133	2	+11.5
5 Heathcote	59964		43067	
	309028		8	
			38629	
(This is not recommended)				

By combining two suburban community areas populations in the range of 107,000 to 116,000 emerge and for three Regional Councillors the ratio of Councillor to population is typically 1:38,000. Then by including Hagley with Ferrymead or one of the other community areas a lower population of about 80,000 emerges enabling a two Councillor constituency arrangement.

We would suggest that arrangement 1 covered in Table 8.1 is the preferred solution and it will be noticed that the variations are very small at -1.3, +0.7 and +1.0 respectively.

The figures shown are for the existing Christchurch City and do not include the Lyttelton Basin at this time. A decision as to the relationship of the Banks Peninsula District either completely or in parts linked with the Selwyn constituency has not been traversed in this investigation. It would not alter, however, the principle of the arrangement proposed.

Thus in achieving equal populations between the five suburban community areas with a half size community area for the city centre a satisfactory solution has emerged for the regional constituencies, provided the Regional Council agrees to have three members in two constituencies and two members in the third.

We suggest to the Regional Council that arrangement 1 appears to be the best both from a representation viewpoint and also best reflects the regional communities of interest for those functions which the Regional Council has particular responsibility eg the river and the coastal areas in the north-east, the protection of agricultural land and rural resource management issues in the south-west, and the consideration of the Heathcote and Avon Rivers and their estuary together with the Port Hills protection in the south-east sectors of the Christchurch City area. The latter would also link more logically with the Banks Peninsula territory for functions affecting the Lyttelton/Akaroa areas.

8.5 **Administrative and Technical Details**

From our enquiries we are satisfied that, with the exception of amending the statutes to provide for a 'sub-community electoral unit' in the future there are no other legal, administrative or technical impediments to the proposal here recommended.

Arising from the adoption of the proposal, however, there will be some administrative and technical matters such as confirming definitions of the ward boundaries and establishing the new electoral rolls which will all need to be undertaken prior to the 2001 election.

It would also be appropriate for the Council to approach the Statistics Department with a view to recognising the growth patterns which are occurring in the Christchurch urban area and its surrounds which in turn will give rise to the need to either subdivide or slightly adjust a small number of meshblock boundaries to better match future needs.

These are all issues which can be put in place following the decisions in principle by the Council adopting new arrangements and subject to the Local Government Commission determination and the Order in Council in due course.

The recommendations are included as Section 15 in the Part 1 report.

Malcolm Douglass, Commissioner (Chairman)

Jan McLauchlan, Commissioner

Alan McRobie, Commissioner

21 June 1999