Representation Review workshop

12 March 2024

Mark Abbot, Brendan Madley & Tash Port



Contents

- Recap
- Communities of interest exercise
- Four boundary options
- Number of Elected Members exercise
- Guidance and next steps



Part One: Recap

- s19H of the Local Electoral Act 2001 requires a Representation Review to be undertaken at least once every six years – critical legislative requirement
- Last review undertaken in 2018
- To facilitate fair and effective representation for individuals and communities



Focusing questions (from LGC)

- Is the current electoral system appropriate for the local authority?
- Does the present number of councillors provide effective representation for communities of interest?
- Have there been significant changes in population in some areas which impact on fair representation, that is, approximate equality between councillors in the numbers represented?
- Is the current basis of election (that is, a ward system, an at-large system or a mixed system) appropriate for the local authority?
- Are current community boards appropriate? If not, is there a need for the establishment of new boards, or the de-establishment or merger of current boards?



Parameters

- Required to adhere to mesh block boundaries
- Population data provided by StatsNZ (2023 estimated rounded population, and meshblocks)
- Required to adhere to legislative timeframes (e.g. initial proposal resolution and public notice by 8 September 2024)
- Council is the decision maker (will update Community Boards at their April meetings)



Key decisions

- (not for today)
- For Council and each of the Community Boards (if retained):
 - Basis of election: wards, at large, or a combination
 - Total number of elected members, and number elected by each ward if applicable
 - Names and boundaries of each ward



Timeline

To date

- August 2023 First Council workshop
- September 2023 Council decision on electoral system
- November 2023 Second Council workshop, and Community Board workshop
- March 2024 Third Council workshop

Tentative future dates (no earlier than)

- 7 May 2024 Council decision on Initial Proposal
- May to June 2024 Public consultation on Initial Proposal (at least one month)
- July 2024 Hearing (if applicable)
- 13 August 2024 Council decision on Final Proposal
- August to September 2024 Public notice and Appeal/ Objection period (if applicable)
- TBC LGC determination process (if applicable)



The workshops to date

What we've heard

- Rangitata Huts community more closely aligned to Temuka than Geraldine
- Orari community more closely aligned to Geraldine than Temuka
- Retaining the wards and community boards ensures that Timaru township does not disproportionately dominate
- Appetite to review # of EMs (in total, and membership of community boards); potential Pareora Community Board
- Correspondence from Geraldine Community Board

What we were asked to do

- Model a number of scenarios
 - Urban v rural
 - Consider a fourth ward
- Model amending the number of EMs
- Consider addition of Community Board
- Check access to Census data



Part Two: Communities of interest exercise

LGC guidance provides three characteristics:

perceptual: a sense of identity and belonging to a defined area or locality as a result of factors such as distinctive geographical features, local history, demographics, economic and social activities

functional: ability of the area to meet the needs of communities for services such as local schools, shopping areas, community and recreational facilities, employment, transport and communication links

political: ability to represent the interests of local communities which includes non-council structures such as for local iwi and hapū, residents and ratepayer associations and the range of special interest groups.

 Communities of interest may change over time so identifying current communities of interest during a representation review is necessary



LGC guidance

We note that in many cases councils, communities and individuals tend to focus on the 'perceptual' dimension of communities of interest. That is, they focus on what intuitively they 'feel' are existing communities of interest. While this is a legitimate view, more evidence may be required to back this up. It needs to be appreciated that the other dimensions, particularly the 'functional' one, are important and that they can also reinforce the 'sense' of identity with an area. In other words, all three dimensions are important but should not be seen as independent of each other.

In addition to demonstrating existing communities of interest, evidence also needs to be provided of *differences* between neighbouring communities, i.e. that they may have "few commonalities". This could include the demographic characteristics of an area (e.g. age, ethnicity, deprivation profiles) and how these differ between areas, and evidence of how different communities rely on different services and facilities.



Take Ten – are the existing communities of interest fit-for-purpose?

- Where is population growth and decline occurring?
- How do people move around the district?
- Where do people work, shop, go to school, and use facilities?
- Who visits which library branches and service centres?
- How do communities react in an emergency?
- What geographic features impact community identity?
- Are there any relevant socio-economic and ethnic considerations?
- Are there any relevant historical or traditional factors?
- How has any of this changed since 2018?



Part Three: Four boundary options

• The 2018 situation (#s do not include Mayor)

Timaru DC Wards
<u>TDC 2018</u> Fair Representation Calculation

Ward	Рор	EMs	Pop/EM Ratio	Difference from Quota	% Difference from Quota
Geraldine	5730	1	5730	498	<mark>9.52</mark>
Pleasant Point-Temuka	9,560	2	4,780	- 452	<mark>-8.64</mark>
Timaru	31,800	6	5,300	68	1.3
Total	47,090	9	5,232		

YULE



• The 2023 situation

2023 estimates (2018 Census b	ase)				
Ward	Population	EMs	Pop/EMs ratio	Difference from quota	% difference from quota
Geraldine Ward	6,240	1	6,240	799	14.68
Pleasant Point-Temuka Ward	9,930	2	4,965	-476	-8.75
Timaru Ward	32,800	6	5,467	26	0.47
Total	48,970	9	5,441		



Option 1: Status quo boundaries

- Options: amend number of elected members to comply with +/- 10%, or appeal to LGC for a determination; the first objective must be to attempt to comply
- The below is illustrative only how # of EMs could meet +/-10%

2023 estimates (2018 Census ba	ise)					
Ward	Population	Current	EMs	Pop/EMs ratio	Difference from quota	% difference from quota
Geraldine Ward	6,240	1	2	3,120	-145	-4.43
Pleasant Point-Temuka Ward	9,930	2	3	3,310	45	1.39
Timaru Ward	32,800	6	10	3,280	15	0.47
Total	48,970	9	15	3,265		
numbers do not include the Mayor or a	iny at-large men	nbers				







Grounds for +/-10% to potentially not apply (s19V LEA 2001)

- (2) For the purposes of giving effect to subsection (1), the territorial authority or regional council and, where appropriate, the Commission must ensure that the population of each ward or constituency or subdivision, divided by the number of members to be elected by that ward or constituency or subdivision, produces a figure no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district or region or local board area or community divided by the total number of elected members (other than members elected by the electors of a territorial authority as a whole, if any, and the mayor, if any).
- (3) Despite subsection (2),—
 - (a) if the territorial authority or the Commission considers that 1 or more of the following apply, wards and subdivisions of a local board area or a community may be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply with subsection (2):
 - non-compliance with subsection (2) is required for effective representation of communities of interest within island communities or isolated communities situated within the district of the territorial authority; or
 - (ii) compliance with subsection (2) would limit effective representation of communities of interest by dividing a community of interest between wards or subdivisions; or
 - (iii) compliance with subsection (2) would limit effective representation of communities of interest by uniting within a ward or subdivision 2 or more communities of interest with few commonalities of interest:
 - (b) if the regional council or the Commission considers that effective representation of communities of interest so requires, constituencies may be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply with subsection (2).



The following councils required determinations relating to the +/-10% rule in their last Representation Review = 17/78 = 22% (Source: LGC)

- Far North District
- South Taranaki District
- Ōtorohanga District
- Mackenzie District
- Whakatane District
- Wellington City
- Waikato District
- Manawatū-Whanganui Regional (Horizons)

- Horowhenua District
- Rangitikei District
- Kapiti Coast District
- Marlborough District
- Taranaki Regional
- Taupo District
- Christchurch City
- Hawkes Bay Regional
- Hastings District



Option 2a and 2b: Moving the boundary around Ōrarī

- The old option 1 (move the entire community) and option 3 (follow SH1 as closely as possible within the constraints of mesh blocks)
- Did not include the old option 2 appeared to be a lack of appetite to split the community arbitrarily



Ward	Population	EMs	Pop/EMs ratio	Difference from quota	% difference from quota	#2a
Geraldine Ward	5,590	1	5,590	158	2.90	
Pleasant Point-Temuka Ward	10,570	2	5,285	-147	-2.71	
Timaru Ward	32,730	6	5,455	23	0.42	
Total	48,890	9	5,432			
numbers do not include the Mayor or a	ny at-large memb	ers				
2023 estimates <mark>(</mark> 2018 Census ba	se) (meshblock	cs)				
Ward	Population	EMs	Pop/EMs ratio	Difference from quota	% difference from quota	#2b
Geraldine Ward	5,770	1	5,770	338	6.22	
Pleasant Point-Temuka Ward	10,390	2	5,195	-237	-4.37	
Timaru Ward	32,730	6	5,455	23	0.42	
Total	48,890	9	5,432			

















Option 3: Adding a fourth ward

- Informed by the Communities of Interest exercise earlier in the workshop
- To start this discussion, the simplest option was to split Pleasant Point-Temuka into two wards based on their Community Board boundaries

2023 estimates (2018 Census base) (meshbloc				
Population	EMs	Pop/EMs ratio	Difference from quota	% difference from quota
6,230	1	6,230	798	14.69
3,190	1	3,190	-2,242	-41.28
6,740	1	6,740	1,308	24.07
32,730	6	5,455	23	0.42
48,890	9	5,432		
	Population 6,230 3,190 6,740 32,730	Population EMs 6,230 1 3,190 1 6,740 1 32,730 6	Population EMs Pop/EMs ratio 6,230 1 6,230 3,190 1 3,190 6,740 1 6,740 32,730 6 5,455	Population EMs Pop/EMs ratio Difference from quota 6,230 1 6,230 798 3,190 1 3,190 -2,242 6,740 1 6,740 1,308 32,730 6 5,455 23



numbers do not include the Mayor or any at-large members





Option 4: Urban-rural wards

- This example is illustrative only we require additional guidance if Council is interested in exploring this option further
- Define "urban" and "rural" (refer to the communities of interest exercise)
- Based on legal town zones (urban sprawl extends beyond and doesn't match mesh blocks), rating zones, or Operative/ Proposed District Plan zones (including/ excluding which zones?)



Ward	Population	EMs	Pop/EMs ratio	Difference from quota	% difference from quota
Jrban Ward	39,010	8	4,876	-13	-0.26
Timaru	28,770				
Temuka	4,660				
Geraldine	2,990				
Pleasant Point	1,530				
Pareora	500				
Winchester	270				
Orari	200				
Cave	90				
Rural Ward	9,880	2	4,940	51	1.04
Total	48,890	10	4,889		







Other matters

- Pareora Community Board
- Consideration of "at-large" members
- Anything else?



Part Four: Number of Elected Members

- Opportunity for you to consider number of total Elected Members and their ward split (if applicable) within the options proposed
- Refer to the link that you have been emailed



Part Five: Guidance and Next Steps



