MINUTES OF THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL REPRESENTATION REVIEW DELIBERATIONS HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, ROLLESTON ON THURSDAY 10 OCTOBER 2024 COMMENCING AT 9AM

PRESENT

Mayor Sam Broughton, Councillors, P M Dean, S N O H Epiha, L L Gliddon, D Hasson, M B Lyall, R H Mugford, E S Mundt, & N C Reid

IN ATTENDANCE

Messrs. T Harris (Executive Director Enabling Services; and Acting Chief Executive), T Mason (Executive Director Infrastructure & Property), Mesdames S Carnoutsos (Head of Marketing and Communications), P Stephens (Representation Review Coordinator), C Bennet (Governance Coordinator), T Van Der Velde (Executive Assistant) and Ms T Davel (Senior Governance Advisor).

The meeting was livestreamed.

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor McInnes and Miller, with apologies for lateness from Councillor Epiha and Lyall.

Moved – Councillor Mugford / **Seconded** – Councillor Mundt

'That the Council receives the apologies as notified.'

CARRIED

OPENING COMMENTS

Introduction and Welcome from the Mayor

The Mayor welcomed everyone to the deliberations and thanked everyone for their hard work in getting to this point.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1. **Minutes of the Representation Review Hearings held on 26 & 27 September 2024 at the Selwyn District Council Chambers**

   Councillor Reid noted she was not present on the second day of hearings.

   Moved – Councillor Dean / **Seconded** – Councillor Mugford

   'That Council confirms the minutes of the 2024 Representation Review Hearings, held on 26 & 27 September 2024, as circulated.'

   CARRIED

REPORTS

1. Executive Director Enabling Services

2024 Representation Review Deliberations 10 October 2024

Mr Harris noted the recommendations in this report were to receive the report and also receive and accept any late submissions as listed.

He said the presentation today will be a team effort. He provided a brief overview of the representation review requirements.

Councillor Lyall arrived at 9.11am

Mr Harris said one of the key drivers of a representation review is the +-10% rule and the key reason Council undertook a review within three years of the last one, was the growth in the District. Also, the growth isn't spread evenly across the District.

Mr Harris also referred to the establishment of a representation review subcommittee in April 2023 and said the subcommittee looked at various options and scenarios, through workshops and research as well as discussion with other councils.

Important decisions by the subcommittee included not having Māori wards and using first past the post voting system in the upcoming local government elections in 2025.

Ms Carnoutsos then explained the two sets of consultation, and the analysis of submissions. She noted the preferred option recommended to council after preliminary consultation was having 4 wards, 8 councillors and no community boards.

She provided brief background on the public consultation on the initial proposal which used a combination of digital and face to face media. There was the option of submitting online or using printed forms at any one of council's facilities. Drop-in sessions were also held.

Consultation Analysis

In total there were 616 submissions received, which showed feedback from .7% of the total population, 68% of submitters were from the Malvern Ward.

The analysis was broken into themes with the information noted by ward and by township, a summary follows below with more detailed to be found in the staff report circulated as part of the agenda.

Question 1 Do you support the initial proposal to change ward boundaries and the number of councillors (four wards, eight councillor) for local elections?

- 598 submissions were received – 17% in support and 83% not.
- Those in support noted it ensured a fair and equitable presentation with a modern approach.
- Those opposed noted it would lead to more work and larger distances to travel.
- West Melton had a connection to Springs; Burnham showed a strong connection as being its own township with natural linkages to Rolleston.
- Main disadvantage described one councillor in wards 1 and 3.
- Most submissions came from the current Malvern Ward and expressed concern with fewer councillors especially if there was no community board.

- In terms of geography, it was noted Ward 1 is diverse but much of it is being managed by the Department of Conservation (DOC).

Question 2 Do you support the initial proposal to have no community boards? This would mean that the Malvern Community Board would be disestablished.

- 607 submissions received with 16% in support of disestablishing the community board and 82% opposed.
- Those in support did not think it's fair to have one community board and accordingly over representation in a particular ward.
- Those opposed were concerned about losing the community voice, with less community engagement.
- Only 9% of Malvern respondents considered a community board as their primary representation with most leaning towards a councillor to represent their views.
- Larger community saw no need for a community board.
- Other wards do not have a desire for a community board.
- During the initial proposal most of the views came out of Darfield, which is a large town and not representative of those in their argument. The need for representation in the rural part of the ward is broader than a community board.
- Removing the community board is seen as increasing the workload of elected members. It is not expected that this would happen as there are multiple access options available to residents. Also, an elected member represents the whole district and many people contact the councillor they know, not necessarily the councillor in their ward.

Question 3 Do you support the name suggestions for the four local electoral wards?

- 591 submissions were received with 31% in support and 67% opposed.
- Those in support noted biculturalism, and support to the district history as reasons.
- Those opposed noted the associated costs and general preference for English.
- Council considers recognising the Māori language as necessary and will remain committed to work with Papatipu Rūnaka to understand how to advance this commitment.

Question 4 Do you have any other comments about our initial proposal for our representation arrangements?

283 additional submission points were received ranging from general advocating for rural representation; a desire to maintain or increase representation; and the concern of having only one councillor in one of the larger rural wards.

Staff made some general comments on the analysis presented. They said that costs were considered and there is currently a targeted rate of $25 per property in Malvern, to pay for the community board. They also said the cost of maintaining the community board will likely need to rise. Staff said amongst the submissions captured there was not a lot of support for reducing the number of councillors but added the current situation doesn't meet the +-10% rule.

The analysis showed that the community of interests were identified as being correct. There was a concern about rural representation though. With the retention of the community board, Council would need to consider the number of appointments to the board. Currently there are 2 councillors on a rotating basis. Staff also said council could look at having a rural community board, representing both Malvern and Ellesmere.

Although adding an additional councillor to the Rolleston Ward presents a simple fix, it did not appear to be consistent with communities of interest. There was also an option using existing resident's and other community groups to be part of the community voice.

Councillor Hasson noted she would like to move an amendment that: -

'The current ward boundaries are retained with one extra councillor for the Rolleston ward; that the Malvern Community Board be retained and the ward names in te reo be retained.'
(Seconded by Councillor Gliddon)

Councillor Epiha arrived at 9.45am

Councillor Hasson spoke to her amendment noting that this was not a council decision, but rather a decision by the communities. She spoke about different communities of interest which she did not necessarily agree with, for example Tai Tapu being part of Ellesmere, yet she questioned whether the community of interest would rather be the Springs Ward.

The Mayor noted that the feedback received should bear in mind communities of interest but added that West Melton clearly noted during pre-consultation and research that it did not feel part of Malvern and rather connected to Rolleston. This is the same for Lincoln and Tai Tapu with each of these seeing themselves as individual towns and not as a community of interest.

Councillor Gliddon spoke about being a Malvern councillor in a large area. She also added she thought the process is backwards e.g. choosing the voting system before looking at wards. She said about the workload, that no one ever asked her about what her workload is, and to make an assumption around that was interesting. She said it was a struggle to balance her workload and family life now, especially being a mother and her workload will increase. She challenged other councillors as to whether they would want to be the sole councillor in such a large ward.

She said the rural community have a different set of values and want to have meaningful conversations which they find better face to face, not by using technology which often doesn't work.

She said that council wanted fewer representatives, but its communities clearly want something different, and council needed to listen to them.

Councillor Mundt agreed saying other councils have made different decisions and that Selwyn need not rely on the Local Government Commission. She added that keeping to the status quo should be an option.

Councillor Dean said it was good to see a community so motivated but the problem with that was that it seemed to be biased towards one area in the District. There is another set of data which shows something different. He said it was council's responsibility to create a representation that is proportionate, not to put a system in place which deliberately puts an error into the proportionality of the representation. Legislation assists council to do so. He said 60% of Malvern is covered by DOC and most of the submissions around the distance etc, is from Darfield, which is a built-up town and not a rural area.

Councillor Mugford noted he would not put his name forward in the next election and said as it currently stands, he will have lost at least 50% of his representation as a Malvern resident. He asked whether it would be difficult to talk to the Local Government Commission (LGC) and find out exactly where council stands on this matter.

He said looking at health and safety, it was not safe for a female to travel to Arthur's Pass in the middle of the winter. He said having two councillors made it easier to discuss your community issues and there were several committees to attend as well as a community board. It is a system that works well. People were asked about the community board and since the Malvern residents pay for it why should the rest of the District have a say in whether or not it is retained.

Staff said they could go back to LGC but there was a high threshold for non-compliance. By going to them with this will be removing the decision-making process from Council to another body.

Councillor Lyall said it was inevitable to move blocks of people from time to time and the bar for not complying to the legislation was very high. He added that with the growth, it's possible that boundaries will need to be changed again in the next triennium. He said people in Malvern seem to demand having a councillor to talk to rather than using other options to reach council. He would not support the motion on the table as he found it simplistic and illegal.

Councillor Reid did not wish to speak at length due to being one of the Rolleston Ward councillors. Councillor Epiha said it was Council's job to make decisions in the best interest of everyone in the District. Sentiment, whilst important, would not sway his decision today. He said council had experts and staff who advised all the way through, and he is comfortable with their recommendations. He added there could be better performance from the community board, but he also said it should be their decision as they pay for it.

The Mayor said during hearings it is not uncommon to hear things that council did not necessarily want to hear but it was a good process. He said council represent people, not a parcel of land or the amount of money someone might have. That might have been how it was in the past, but we are beyond those systems now and people expect councillors to represent them.

Moved – Councillor Dean / **Seconded** – Councillor Lyall

'That the Council

a) Receives this report and considers the information contained within and attached;

b) Accepts the late submissions from Elaine Smart, Gordon Gilmour, Federated Farmers of New Zealand, Evan Frew, Gavin Lea, Julie Sorrell, Lois Lea, Peter Hobbs and Gillian Sweeney.'

CARRIED

Ms Carnoutsos commented that the scenario on Appendix 4, page 54 of the agenda was looked at, during a workshop in December 2023. This scenario maintains the existing 4 wards and same boundaries as we have currently, and increases the number of Councillors to 11, with 4 in the Rolleston Ward. While this does meet the +/-10% rule, it comes with a caution for the Ellesmere ward with -9.1% difference from quota. This scenario was formed with the 2023 Census Statistics NZ data.

Mr Harris commented that going back to December 2023 the reason this scenario was discounted was mainly because of the communities of interest.

Moved (as amended) – Councillor Hasson / **Seconded** – Councillor Gliddon

'That the Council

1) *recommend that the current ward boundaries are retained with one extra councillor for the Rolleston Ward;*

CARRIED

Councillors Dean, Epiha and Lyall voted against

Moved (as amended) – Councillor Hasson / **Seconded** – Councillor Mugford

2) *resolves to retain the Malvern Community Board; and*

CARRIED

Councillors Dean, Epiha and Lyall voted against

Councillor Dean commented that having a community board in only one of our wards means that ward has more representation than other wards and suggested that maybe Selwyn should have community boards in all of the wards.

Councillor Epiha questioned the effectiveness of the Malvern Community Board in the community, noting he has not seen any evidence.

Councillor Mugford commented that throughout New Zealand it has been proven that community boards work well, and he would also like to see community boards in all the wards in Selwyn.

Councillor Lyall commented that community boards are seen as a buffer in delaying decision-making. He added he does not see the Malvern Community Board as being effective and therefore, does not support retaining the Malvern Community Board.

Mayor Broughton commented that through the consultation Council heard from the Malvern Community of how much they value their Community Boards.

Staff needed time to check if existing subdivisions and current boundaries in Malvern complied with the +/-10% rule, meeting was adjourned.

'Meeting adjourned between 11.15am and 11.52am'

Staff proposed a split of subdivisions and provided a map of the subdivisions. Staff spoke to the proposed split, which will continue to comprise of three subdivisions, Hawkins, Tawera and West Melton. With a total of five Community Board members, 2 in Hawkins, 1 in Tawera and 2 in West Melton, the split that is being proposed complies with the +/-10%.

Mr Harris advised that the number of appointed members is to be less than half the total number of Community Board members, i.e. 1 or 2.

Councillor Mugford moved a further motion:

Moved – Councillor Mugford/ **Seconded** – Councillor Gliddon

'That two Malvern Councillors are appointed to the Malvern Community Board'

CARRIED

Councillor Dean commented that given the performance of the Malvern Community Board over the last period, he suggested that one out of two of the appointed members is a non-Malvern Councillor.

Mr Harris advised that legislation sets out that appointed members need to be a member of the ward that the Community Board sits in.

Council discussed working with Residents and/ or Community associations in the Te Waihora Ellesmere Ward and Tawera Malvern Ward to create a memorandum of understanding for how the groups will engage for this election cycle.

Staff commented that this resolution was included as an alternative to the Community Board. There was discussion around that table that it was pleasing that Council would be looking to have closer relationships with residents and community associations. It was noted that this resolution does not need to be passed today as further work, and discussion is required on this matter and this was a matter for the new Council to implement in the new term.

Moved – Mayor Broughton / **Seconded** – Councillor Epiha

3) *'Ward Names –That council resolves to change the Four Electoral Ward names to Kā Māni a Rolleston Ward; Te Waihora Ellesmere Ward; Kā Puna Springs Ward; Tawera Malvern Ward'*

CARRIED

There was discussion in regard to the three subdivisions for the Community Board of which two do not have a Te Reo Māori name. Staff advised because of tight timeframes Council was unlikely to receive names for these wards before the required time, therefore Te Reo Māori names for the subdivisions will need to wait for a future Representation Review. Existing names for the three subdivisions to the Malvern Community Board will remain.

Councillor Mundt moved an amendment as follows, noting she didn't have a personal preference but wanted to put this forward after feedback from the community.

Moved – *Councillor Mundt* / **Seconded** - *Councillor Mugford*

'That Council change the order and have the English name before Te Reo Māori name.'

LOST

Staff advised that dual names can be interchangeable. Ms Carnoutsos commented that local Rūnaka Taumutu gifted the names, and the names have geographical significance behind their meanings. They were gifted as per the Te Reo Māori name first; therefore, it would be appropriate to use the Te Reo Māori name first. It would be considered impolite to change and especially without consultation.

There was discussion around the name of Tawera with one of the subdivisions in West Melton also named Tawera and there may be some confusion. It was noted by staff that communication will need to be clear.

Councillor Epiha commented that the resolution to include Te Reo Māori name is another way of expressing our partnership, that we are responsible through the Local Government Act and what we have collectively agreed to as a Council.

CLOSING COMMENTS

The Mayor thanked Councillors and staff for the deliberations. He also thanked Councillor Dean as the Chairperson of the Subcommittee, as well as the Malvern Community Board and Youth Council for their involvement.

The Acting Chief Executive noted the process going forward including an appeals process. The final proposal will be adopted by Council on 23 October 2024, with a public notice expected to be published by no later than close of business on 24 October 2024.

Mayor Broughton declared the 2024 Representation Review Deliberations closed.

The deliberations closed at 12.23pm on Thursday 10 October 2024.

DATED this 23 day of October 2024

MAYOR