

**MINUTES OF AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE
REPRESENTATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS,
SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL, ROLLESTON
ON WEDNESDAY 11 AUGUST 2021 COMMENCING AT 10.00AM**

PRESENT

Councillors M A Alexander (Chair), S N O H Epiha J A Gallagher, G S F Miller, Mayor S T Broughton, and Mr J B Morten (Malvern Community Board Chair, from 10:15am)

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors Lemon, Reid, Mugford, and McInnes, Messrs D Ward (Chief Executive), S Hill (Group Manager Communication and Customers / Deputy Electoral Officer), M Staite (Miro Business Services Ltd); Mrs N Smith (Executive Assistant); and Ms T Davel (Governance Coordinator)

KARAKIA

The Chair declared the meeting open and welcomed everyone present and on-line.

The Chair opened with karakia.

APOLOGIES

An apology for lateness was received in respect of Mr J B Morten.

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

‘That the Representation Review Committee receive the apology for lateness from Mr Morten.’

CARRIED

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of an Ordinary Meeting of the Representation Review Subcommittee held in the Council Chambers on Wednesday 23 June 2021

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

'That the Representation Review Committee confirm the minutes of its Meeting held on 23 June 2021, as circulated.'

CARRIED

CORRESPONDENCE

None.

REPORTS

1. Chair's Verbal Report

Verbal Report

The Chair reported on the recently held drop-in sessions and said they were poorly attended. However a wide range of views were expressed with a reasonable number of on-line submissions. He added that the Subcommittee tried to engage with the community and thanked staff for their work in this regard.

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

'That the Representation Review Subcommittee receive the verbal report from the Chair.'

CARRIED

2. Deputy Electoral Officer

Draft Submission on Proposed Changes to Māori Wards and Constituency Processes for Local Elections

The Deputy Electoral Officer, Mr Stephen Hill told the Subcommittee that this was the second stage of changes for Māori ward and constituency processes, following the repeal of the poll provisions earlier in 2021. The Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) is asking Councils to submit their views on the consultation.

There are six issues the DIA are inviting comments on, including requirements for Councils to consider ward systems, timing of decisions, opportunities for public input, decision-making rights, how and when wards can be discontinued and types of polls that Councils can hold.

Any changes will come into effect after the 2022 elections and in time for the 2025 elections. Consultation closed on 27 August 2021. Mr Hill said due to the relatively short timeframe for consultation a working group got together, comprising himself, the Chair, Councillor Epiha and the Chief Executive. They prepared a draft initial view as a response and asked the Subcommittee for any comments or amendments to the response.

Councillor Gallagher expressed her disappointment with the fact that the Subcommittee as a whole was not given an opportunity to look at the information together. Councillor Gallagher said the Subcommittee should have considered it as a whole, not only presenting a view of a few members.

Councillor Miller said he did not see any issue with what has been done. Philosophically he was fundamentally against establishing separate Māori wards and added New Zealand was heading in the wrong direction when selection is based on race.

Councillor Epiha said the key point here was the short time for consultation and that if there was any engagement to be done it should have been with the entire population. Given the question he thought the working group responded in a manner which aligned with moving to a more democratic system allowing for greater engagement.

Moved – Mr J Morten / **Seconded** – Councillor Epiha

‘That the Representation Review Subcommittee;

a) receive the report; and

b) recommend to the Council that it endorses the draft submission on the proposed changes to Māori wards and constituency processes.’

CARRIED

3. Deputy Electoral Officer

Representation Review: Report on Preliminary Consultation

The Deputy Electoral Officer, Mr Stephen Hill noted that the report summarises the findings of the preliminary consultation. Mr Hill said the Chair already noted that the public drop-in sessions were not well attended and although numbers were limited there were some good quality discussions from those. A number of written feedback forms had also been received.

Mr Morten entered the meeting at 10.15am

Mr Hill said a total of 106 submissions were received, of which 79 were online and 26 printed. All of the information was entered. Although preliminary consultation and results were non-statutory the information is being provided to the Subcommittee for its consideration.

Mr Hill said guidance from the Local Government Commission on preliminary consultation stipulates that while public feedback could assist Council to make a decision, Council is not bound by or held to the findings of community feedback.

Mr Hill then went through some of the graphs and charts showing the findings.

In terms of the four options, Option 1 had 26% support with Option 2 receiving 30% support and Option 4 24%. Option 3 was somewhat lower in terms of preference than any of the other options.

The consultation did not propose any specific options for community boards, but asked an open question about respondents' preferences for their own ward. Over all 62% of respondents were in favour of a community board with 32% not in favour.

Mr Hill said the subcommittee have to consider Community Boards at this meeting, and then also recommend the name of the Community Board, subdivisions, if any, as well as number of elected community board representatives.

The next steps are to consider public feedback and take into account key findings. A recommendation will be made to Council on 25 August after which the proposal will be publicly notified on 3 September. Public consultation will run through September, closing on 4 October.

The Chair thanked staff for the presentation and asked the Subcommittee which of the four options they wish to take forward as the selected option.

The Subcommittee expressed their preferences (first and second), and reasons for these, as follows:

Councillor Gallagher – Option 2 / 1

Councillor Miller – Option 1 / 3. Councillor Miller said that looking at the future it was blatantly obvious that Rolleston will continue to grow and warrant more Councillors. It may be a separate ward in the next representation review.

Mr Morten – Option 2 / 1. Mr Morten could see both options 1 and 2 being workable. He said he leaned towards option 2 where West Melton was not part of Malvern, although if West Melton was to form part of Malvern the representatives might get a more balanced view of a mixed rural / urban ward.

Councillor Epiha – Option 1 / 2. Councillor Epiha said there was also a significant amount of growth in Ellesmere.

Mayor Broughton – Option 1 / 3. The Mayor said he had no strong view either way but did feel Option 4 should be taken out as there didn't seem to be much support for it.

Councillor Alexander – Option 2 / 3. Councillor Alexander said Option 1 failed in the communities of interest test. He spoke at length about the pros and cons of the different options and agreed there was no support for Option 4 with little support for Option 3. This left Options 1 and 2 but with Option 1 failing the test of communities of interest, he would have to choose Option 2 as his first preference. He said Option 1 would be putting people into wards with which they had no affinity.

The Chief Executive said based on the members' preferences, the Subcommittee now finds itself considering only options 1 and 2. There needed to be a clear outcome to recommend to Council on 25 August. Taking account of the first and second preferences the favoured option was Option 1. He asked the Subcommittee what the reasons would be for not putting it forward as the selected option.

Councillor Alexander reiterated Option 1 fails to address the issue of communities of interest and it needed to be considered.

The Chief Executive asked what it was about the current model that was not working well. Mr Morten said no-one was unhappy with the current model and that council was

only going through this process because it was required to do so under legislation. If this was not the case, there would be no need to debate this issue.

The Mayor added that whatever decision was made, it would be a compromise. There was no real driver for change other than legislation. Council is tasked with gathering data, using its experience and getting to an outcome. He said it was hard to make a decision where there was no obvious answer.

Councillor Miller noted the entire debate seems to have centred around West Melton. He asked why was it acceptable to join Leeston, Doyleston etc up with Springs Ward, and said that to him it appeared those communities were being lost.

The Chief Executive advise the Subcommittee that they would need to inform Council what they have chosen and why.

Moved (as amended) – Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Gallagher

- a) *‘That the Representation Review Subcommittee receive the report; and*
- b) *That the Subcommittee recommends **Option 1** to Council for representation arrangements, to be adopted by the Council as the Initial Proposal for formal consultation.’*

CARRIED (5:1)

Councillor Alexander proposed that the name of the Selwyn Central Ward be changed to Rolleston Ward and said it would more truly reflect its size.

Moved– Councillor Alexander / Seconded – Councillor Gallagher

- c) *‘That the Representation Review Subcommittee recommends to Council that the names of the Wards be Springs; Ellesmere; Malvern; and Rolleston.’*

CARRIED

4. Deputy Electoral Officer

Representation Review: Supplementary Discussion Document – Community Boards

Mr Murray Staite went through the report, explaining that Council undertaking a representation review must give consideration to whether community boards are appropriate. During the preliminary consultation community feedback was sought on community boards, although it was an open question as to whether the public would want a community board in their preferred ward. There were no specific options presented for or against community boards.

62% of respondents were in favour of having community boards compared to 38% not.

The Chair said that there would only be a need for subdivisions in the Malvern Ward. He added that the Subcommittee could simplify the decision if they decided against having Community Boards but if it decided to have Community Boards, whether in Malvern only or any others, there was a need for debate. The Mayor said it was a

decision for the community as to whether or not they wanted a Community Board. His preference would be to not have any community boards as option and let the public decide.

Mr Morten said he would support a Community Board for Malvern and one for Springs. Councillor Miller said the question was tied up with the community committee restructure and asked why there would be a need for a Community Board if there was a committee. He agreed to not having an option of any Community Boards and let the public decide.

Councillor Gallagher said the community should be asked but agreed to having a Community Board for Malvern.

The Chair said his preference was for 3 Community Boards, given the removal of ward committees but would agree to at least one Community Board in Malvern.

Councillor Miller noted that to date there had been no report documenting the effectiveness of the Malvern Community Board as to whether it achieved its goals and delivered what the community wants. The Chair noted if a Community Board was operating correctly it would have the support of its community. The Mayor added there was no strong view from the community yet as to whether the Community Board should or should not exist. If the Board continued, its subdivisions should continue as well.

The Chief Executive said the first question from the community would be what the Community Board would do and what they would be paid. Remuneration was something the Remuneration Authority decided and as for delegations and responsibilities, Council would decide that after the next election.

Staff reiterated that the consultation proposal need to include a definite option. Additional information relating to role, costs and background could be included to help inform the public's thinking.

Mr Morten supported a Community Board in Malvern but not in any other ward. He said the Subcommittee needed to decide for it to remain or to be disestablished, in which case the community could make a submission to the Local Government Commission for the Board to be retained.

Councillor Miller asked for feedback from Councillor Gallagher and Mr Morten on the effectiveness of the Malvern Community Board. His personal observation was that the delegations and ability for the Board to achieve much, were few. He questioned why it should continue if the outcomes seem to be poor. He suggested that the local Councillors would be better served by having a different model.

Mr Morten told Councillor Miller that the reasons for having a Community Board in Malvern haven't changed and was built on history. Twice before the community in Malvern went to the Commission to retain the Board. It is a large area with many isolated small townships. Increasing the size of the Ward with a larger population and now there was an even better argument. He added that Council has always seen the Malvern Community Board as not being effective. Councillor Gallagher added that the Community Board needed to get out in the community to work with them. As there was also now a process around community committees, it would be good to consider keeping the Board in Malvern.

Debating the names of the subdivision it was agreed that Mr Morten could ask the Malvern Community Board for (new) names rather than Hawkins and Tawera. This would be especially so because the Subcommittee agreed to have West Melton as one of the subdivisions. The other two should probably also reflect township names.

Moved – Mr Morten / **Seconded** – Councillor Gallagher

a. *'That the Representation Review Subcommittee receive the report; and*

CARRIED

Moved – Mr Morten / **Seconded** – Councillor Gallagher

b. *That the Subcommittee recommends to Council that the Malvern Community Board is retained, but does not recommend any other Community Boards be established; and*

CARRIED

Moved – Councillor Alexander / **Seconded** – Councillor Miller


c. *Recommends to Council subdivisions of the Malvern Ward be called: West Melton (2 members); Hawkins (2 members); and Tawera (1 member).'*

CARRIED (5:1)

GENERAL BUSINESS

The meeting closed at 11.51am

DATED this 27 day of October 2021



CHAIRPERSON