

## Review of representation arrangements - recommendations of Joint Governance Working Party

File No.: CP2018/18925

### Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To decide Auckland Council's final proposal for a review of its representation arrangements for the 2019 elections.

### Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. On 26 July 2018 the Governing Body delegated to the Joint Governance Working Party (Working Party) the responsibility to hear and consider submissions on representation arrangements for the 2019 elections.
3. This report contains the recommendations of the Working Party for the Governing Body to consider in finalising the proposal for the review of Auckland Council representation arrangements.
4. The Local Electoral Act 2001 (Act) requires that a council must consider all submissions received and may, by resolution, make such amendments to its initial proposal as it sees fit. Because the consideration of submissions was delegated to the Working Party, this meeting needs to ensure it takes full consideration of all submissions if it wishes to change any of the Working Party's recommendations. An overview of the number of submissions including those in support of or opposed to the council's proposals is contained in Attachment B. The written comments for each proposal are contained in Attachments C to G.
5. The recommended changes increase the number of non-complying ward arrangements. The final proposal will be forwarded to the Local Government Commission which will uphold or amend the council's non-complying decisions.
6. The council's final proposal will be publicly notified. Any appeals and objections will be forwarded to the Local Government Commission for determination. The Commission may, in due course, wish to engage with the council about its final proposal.
7. A report from Richard Northey, the chairperson of the Joint Governance Working Party, is contained in Attachment A.

### Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

- a) receive the report from Richard Northey, Chairperson of the Joint Governance Working Party, contained in Attachment A of the agenda report.
- b) receive the submissions of members of the public as contained in Attachments B to G.
- c) note the feedback from local boards as contained in Attachment H
- d) receive the minutes of the Joint Governance Working Party meeting at which submissions were presented and considered as contained in Attachment I.

- e) adopt the following recommendations of the Joint Governance Working Party, with reference to the maps contained in Attachment J, as the Auckland Council's final proposal arising from its review of representation arrangements for the 2019 elections:

#### **Isthmus wards**

- i) retain all of Grey Lynn and Westmere in the Waitemata and Gulf Ward, by keeping the western boundary of the ward unchanged from its present location (Meola Creek and Motions Road). (*Area A on Attachment J*)
- ii) move parts of Grafton along with the Domain and the Carlaw Park area, to the Ōrākei Ward. The areas of Grafton to be moved, broadly speaking, include:
  - A) that area south of the Southern Motorway, bounded by Symonds Street, Mt Eden Road, Boston Road and the motorway (*Area B*); and
  - B) the area to the north of the Southern Motorway, bounded in the west by Grafton Gully and in the east by Mountain Road and Park Road. (*Area C*)
- iii) move that part of the Eden Terrace/Grafton area which was not subsequently changed to Ōrākei Ward by the recommendations of the Joint Governance Working Party noted above, from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. (*Area D*)
- iv) move the communities of Parnell and Newmarket from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Ōrākei Ward. (*Area E*)
- v) retain the part of Mt Roskill, which under the initial proposal was to be moved to the Whau Ward, within the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. (*Area F*)
- vi) move a small area around Royal Oak from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. (*Area G*)
- vii) move part of Ellerslie and St Johns (between College Road and the Glen Innes Railway Station) from the Ōrākei Ward to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward. (*Areas H + I*)
- viii) with the exception of the recommendations above, retain all other current boundaries of isthmus wards.

#### **Manukau Ward**

- ix) retain the two-member Manukau Ward using the current boundaries, which respects the overwhelming views of submitters and which still reasonably reflects existing communities of interest.

#### **Rodney Local Board Subdivision boundaries**

- x) adjust the subdivision boundaries in the Kaipara Coast area of the Rodney Local Board such that the Kaipara Coast area is changed from the Wellsford Subdivision, as per the initial proposal, to a combination of the Kumeu (south of the Hoteo River) and Wellsford (north of the Hoteo River) Subdivisions. (*area J*)
- xi) move the boundary between the Warkworth and Wellsford Subdivisions north to include a small area north-west of Matakana in the Warkworth Subdivision. (*area K*)

#### **Additional non-complying decisions not changed from the initial proposal**

- xii) retain the existing Rodney Ward boundaries
- xiii) retain the existing Manurewa-Papakura Ward boundaries
- xiv) retain the existing Howick Local Board Subdivisions

### Renaming

- xv) rename the Great Barrier Local Board to Aotea Great Barrier Local Board
- xvi) rename the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward to Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa Ward
- f) delegate to His Worship the Mayor the responsibility of identifying representatives of the Auckland Council to engage with the Local Government Commission on the council's final proposal should this be required.
- g) confirm that it wishes to be able to review the number of members of the Governing Body and will continue to seek the required legislative change.

## Horopaki / Context

### Overview

#### Process

8. The process for conducting this review was agreed by the Governing Body in 2017 and included the Working Party developing the council's initial proposal with feedback from local boards.
9. The Governing Body, on 26 July 2018, considered recommendations by the Working Party and made the council's initial proposal. It was publicly notified on 8 August 2018, with a closing date for submissions of 11 September 2018. The initial proposal is attached in Attachment K.
10. The Governing Body delegated to the Working Party the responsibility and power to hear and consider submissions and to report recommendations to the Governing Body to take into account when making its final proposal. Those recommendations are presented in this report. The Working Party heard submissions on Thursday 20 September 2018 and heard local board feedback on Friday 21 September 2018.
11. The Governing Body will decide the council's final proposal at this meeting. It needs to be careful about making changes to the Working Party recommendations and should only do so on the basis of having considered all submissions.
12. The final proposal will be publicly notified for appeals and objections. Any appeals and objections that are received will be forwarded to the Local Government Commission for determination. The Local Government Commission must also uphold or amend any non-complying decisions (decisions which do not comply with the ten per cent rule). The Working Party's recommendations increase non-compliance with the ten per cent rule and will need to be forwarded to the Local Government Commission.
13. Any person who made a submission on the initial proposal can lodge an appeal. The appeal must address only those matters raised in the submission. Any person may object to any changes made by the council to its initial proposal.

#### Engagement

14. An engagement plan was developed with the council's engagement team. For engagement options in the Manukau area discussions were held with the Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Boards and a specific engagement plan developed on their advice. The engagement plan included:
  - a double-page public notice in the New Zealand Herald (8 August), which is required by law
  - a half-page display advertisement in the Manukau Courier (14 August), East and Bays Courier (15 August), Central Leader (16 August) and Rodney Times (14 August)

- media releases – including to ethnic media channels
  - information booklets and leaflets containing frequently asked questions
  - a single page document outlining issues on the Manukau Ward
  - information including posters, booklets, frequently asked questions sheets and feedback forms, in key libraries, service centres, local board offices and an email to identified stakeholder groups across the region such as residents and ratepayers associations
  - comprehensive information on the council's "Have your say" website
  - survey sent to the People's Panel
  - working with a community partner to directly engage with the public in the Manukau Ward area, targeting Pasifika communities
  - attendance at a Papatoetoe Indian Sikh Temple and at a meeting of Business Grey Lynn
  - presentations to the Youth Advisory Panel and the Pacific Peoples Advisory Panel.
15. The community partner attended Mangere Markets, Ōtara Flea Market and Mangere Bridge Markets and spoke at a number of south Auckland church services and their community gatherings over the consultation period. The impact of this engagement directly resulted in a significant number of submissions from Pasifika people – out of the 900 people who responded with their ethnicity, 636 identified as Pasifika.

### Submissions

16. A total of 1,265 submissions were received. These were received through the online feedback form, hard-copy submission forms and emails to the email account for the review. Comments on Facebook were also taken into account.
17. A summary of all submissions is attached in Attachment B and written comments on each proposal are contained in Attachments C to G.
18. Thirteen members of the public made oral submissions to the Working Party as outlined in the minutes of the Working Party's meeting, in Attachment I.
19. All submitters who provided an email address were notified of the Working Party's recommendations following its consideration of submissions.

### Local boards

20. The legal timeframe for considering submissions did not allow for formal reporting of submissions to local boards for their comment. Local boards were invited to present their feedback to the Working Party following the hearing of public submissions. Feedback additional to that provided in July on the initial proposal was received from the following local boards:
- i) Albert-Eden Local Board – written and oral presentation
  - ii) Great Barrier Local Board – oral comments
  - iii) Howick Local Board – oral comments
  - iv) Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board - written and oral presentation
  - v) Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board – written comments
  - vi) Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board – written and oral presentation
  - vii) Papakura Local Board – written comments
  - viii) Puketāpapa Local Board – written and oral presentation
  - ix) Rodney Local Board – written comments
  - x) Waitematā Local Board – oral comments
21. The written feedback from local boards is contained in Attachment H.

## Local Electoral Act requirements

22. The Act requires the council to consider both:
  - effective representation of communities of interest
  - fair representation (as expressed by the ten per cent rule).
23. The sections of the Act that apply are attached in full in Attachment L.
24. The 'ten per cent rule', as contained in section 19V of the Act, and the population data that should be used, have been the source of some debate during the consultation. Sub-section (1) requires a territorial authority to ensure that the electors of a ward receive fair representation having regard to the population. Subsection (2) states that the territorial authority gives effect to this by ensuring the population of each ward, divided by the number of members in the ward, produces a result that is within ten per cent of the average for the whole of Auckland.
25. Section 19X of the Act requires the Government Statistician to provide the ordinarily resident population for the purposes of sections 19H to 19W. In practice, the Local Government Commission forwards this information to councils conducting reviews.
26. The Local Government Commission's office has confirmed that the statistics that the council must use are those issued from the Government Statistician that are passed on to the council by the Local Government Commission. These statistics are the ordinarily resident population and are a 2017 estimate based on the 2013 census.
27. The council is able to not comply with the requirements of subsection (2) (the ten per cent rule) if compliance would lead to splitting communities of interest or joining disparate communities of interest ((3)(a)(ii) (3)(a)(iii)).
28. If the council makes a non-complying proposal, the proposal needs to be referred to the Local Government Commission, which will uphold or alter the proposal. The Local Government Commission's own decisions must comply with the requirements in the Act, including section 19V.
29. Some of the Working Party's recommendations for changes to the council's initial proposal arise from considering the balance between the requirement for effective representation of communities of interest and the requirement for fair representation. The revised proposal for the Waitemata and Gulf Ward is better recognition of communities of interest but there is now non-compliance with the ten per cent rule.
30. Non-complying proposals require that the council makes a convincing case to the Local Government Commission that non-compliance is necessary to avoid splitting communities of interest or joining disparate communities of interest. The submissions received by the council will support the proposal to not comply.

## Number of councillors

31. A number of submitters to boundary changes in the Waitemata and Gulf Ward stated that the preferred solution was to increase the number of councillors. This reflects the council's own position. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 sets the number of councillors at twenty and the option to increase the number of councillors is not currently open to the council. The council has recently made a submission to the Local Electoral Matters Bill which included a submission to remove the cap and to provide a process for keeping ward and local board boundaries aligned. The select committee is due to report back on the bill in November 2018 and it is unlikely any change will affect the current representation review.
32. Staff note that increasing the number of councillors would enable under-representation in the Waitemata and Gulf ward to be addressed with less disruption to boundaries and would improve the over-representation in the Rodney because the number of people per councillor would decrease.

33. When considering submissions, the Working Party resolved to “*urge the Governing Body again to make representations for an urgent law change that would enable an increase in the number of governing body members.*”

### Future changes to ward boundaries

34. With rates of population growth varying over the whole of the Auckland and a potential future change in the number of councillors, it is likely that ward boundaries will continue to change and become more unaligned with local board boundaries although there is the legal requirement to keep them aligned as far as is practicable.
35. Some submitters felt that this review should take a future-proofing approach so that change is not required into the future. However, the current recommendations should not be seen as long-lasting. Each future review will need to consider the balance between the requirement for the effective representation of communities of interest and the requirement for fair representation in the context of changing population growth.

## Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

### Waitemata and Gulf Ward boundaries

#### Summary of initial proposal

36. To meet the ten per cent rule, the council’s initial proposal included shrinking the boundaries of the Waitematā and Gulf Ward. This led on the eastern side, to the Ōrākei Ward boundaries being extended to include Newmarket and Parnell and on the western side, the boundary being through the shopping areas of Grey Lynn and West Lynn.
37. There were consequential effects arising from this initial proposal. To prevent the Ōrākei Ward becoming non-complying, the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward was extended to include parts of St Johns and Ellerslie. To prevent the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward becoming non-complying, the Whau Ward was extended into the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward as was part of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward.

#### Submissions

38. There were 104 submissions which supported this proposal and 234 which opposed it. The most common areas of concern from those who opposed the initial proposal were the effects on communities in the Grey Lynn, Grafton and Ellerslie areas.

#### Grey Lynn community of interest

39. There were 47 submissions opposing the council’s proposal on the basis it would split the Grey Lynn community of interest. There were no written submissions that specifically expressed support for the proposed new Grey Lynn / Westmere boundary. Submitters are particularly concerned about the proposed boundary through the Grey Lynn and West Lynn shopping areas, such that shops on different sides of the street will be in different wards.
40. The Working Party noted the reference to the postal code 1021 area in the submission from the Grey Lynn Residents Association and considered that as an option for amending the initial proposal to better represent the Grey Lynn community of interest. That option includes the Grey Lynn and West Lynn shopping areas in the Waitematā and Gulf Ward but excludes Westmere. A number of submitters stated that Westmere belongs in the same community of interest.
41. The Working Party recommends, therefore, that the boundary of the Waitematā and Gulf Ward on the western side of the ward stays as it is. As well as retaining the current communities of interest, this recommendation assists the alignment of the ward boundary with the local board boundary.

### Grafton

42. There were ten submissions which objected to splitting Grafton from Newmarket and Parnell, including from the Grafton Residents Association.
43. Moving Grafton to Ōrākei assists the quota issue with the Waitemātā and Gulf Ward but increases the variance in the Ōrākei Ward. There are no obvious options for passing more of Ōrākei's population to Maungakiekie-Tāmaki without affecting communities of interest and therefore Ōrākei becomes non-complying. The growth in Ōrākei is slower than the rest of Auckland and the extent of non-compliance will decrease in time.
44. The Working Party therefore recommends moving parts of Grafton, and the Domain and Carlaw Park, along with Newmarket and Parnell into the Ōrākei Ward.

### Ellerslie

45. Out of a total of 12 submissions which referred to Ellerslie, eight submissions supported the initial proposal. Four submissions stated that the Ellerslie Racecourse should not be split from the part of Ellerslie that will become part of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward.
46. Although the name of the racecourse, which is operated by the Auckland Racing Club, refers to Ellerslie in its title, the Working Party noted that it is not necessary to consider the racecourse in terms of the community of interest requirements of the Local Electoral Act. It was not historically in the Ellerslie Borough and it is a regional facility. For example, it is not used more by Ellerslie residents than Ōrākei residents. Furthermore, the area in which it is located does not contain a residential population of any significance.
47. The Working Party is not recommending any changes to council's proposal as a result of these submissions.

### Local board feedback

48. The Ōrākei Local Board stated that its preference was for legislative change to allow the number of councillors for the Waitemātā and Gulf Ward to be increased without an overall increase. The board supports Parnell moving to the Ōrākei Ward but not Newmarket. It also considers that the St Johns area that is proposed to move to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward should remain in the Ōrākei Ward and that west of the racecourse should remain in Ōrākei.
49. The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board expressed concern that ward and local board boundaries being unaligned would create confusion.
50. The Puketāpapa Local Board supports single member wards, decoupling ward and local board boundaries and being able to increase the number of councillors.
51. The Albert-Eden Local Board supports legislative change to allow the number of councillors to be increased.
52. The Waitemātā Local Board acknowledged the strength of concern in the Grey Lynn area and expressed concern about confusion arising due to mis-alignment of ward and local board boundaries. The board also expressed concern about many people in the area not knowing about the proposed changes.

### Working Party recommendations regarding Waitemātā and Gulf Ward

53. The Working Party recommends the following changes to the initial proposal:
  - i) retain all of Grey Lynn and Westmere in the Waitemātā and Gulf Ward, by keeping the western boundary of the ward unchanged from its present location (Meola Creek and Motions Road). (*Area A on Attachment J*)

- ii) move parts of Grafton along with the Domain and the Carlaw Park area, to the Ōrākei Ward. The areas of Grafton to be moved, broadly speaking, include:
    - a) that area south of the Southern Motorway, bounded by Symonds Street, Mt Eden Road, Boston Road and the motorway (B); and
    - b) the area to the north of the Southern Motorway, bounded in the west by Grafton Gully and in the east by Mountain Road and Park Road. (C)
  - iii) move that part of the Eden Terrace / Grafton area which was not subsequently changed to Ōrākei Ward by the recommendations of the Joint Governance Working Party noted above, from Waitematā and Gulf Ward to Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. (D)
  - iv) move the communities of Parnell and Newmarket from the Waitematā and Gulf Ward to the Ōrākei Ward. (E)
  - v) retain the part of Mt Roskill, which under the initial proposal was to be moved to the Whau Ward, within the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. (F)
  - vi) move a small area around Royal Oak from the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. (G)
  - vii) move part of Ellerslie and St Johns (between College Road and the Glen Innes Railway Station) from the Ōrākei Ward to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward. (H + I)
  - viii) with the exception of the recommendations above, retain all other current boundaries of isthmus wards.
54. These changes are shown in the map in Attachment J.
55. The following table shows the change in the per cent difference from quota of the recommended boundaries as compared to the current boundaries and those in the council's initial proposal.

Ward	Per cent difference from quota		
	Current	Initial proposal	Recommended final proposal
Waitematā and Gulf Ward	43.74	9.22	17.19
Whau Ward	2.22	9.58	2.22
Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward	3.91	10.07	7.29
Ōrākei Ward	10.43	10.91	15.86
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward	-3.81	10.43	10.43

## Manukau Ward

### Summary of initial proposal

56. As part of reviewing current representation arrangements, the Working Party considered whether any current two-member wards should be split into single-member wards. Existing local board boundaries were used as representing communities of interest. The only two-member ward that can be split along local board boundary lines and still comply with the ten per cent rule is the Manukau Ward.
57. Opinion was divided on whether this should be pursued. The two local boards in the Manukau Ward area were opposed. The Governing Body included the proposed split of Manukau Ward so that the community could comment.

## Submissions

58. There were 953 responses from across all of Auckland to this proposal:
- 78 per cent opposed the proposal
  - 22 per cent supported the proposal.
59. When only submitters from the affected areas are considered:
- from Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, there were 256 submitters with 20 per cent supporting and 80 per cent opposing the proposal
  - from Ōtara-Papatoetoe, there were 297 submitters with 23 per cent supporting and 77 per cent opposing the proposal.

## Comments made in submissions

60. Those submissions supporting the proposal made comments summarised as follows:
- Enhanced engagement by the two councillors
  - Councillors will be more focussed and able to give more attention to local matters
  - All wards should be single-member
  - All wards should have same boundaries as local boards
  - Parliamentary electorates are single-member
  - Simplify choosing a representative (only have to choose one instead of two)
  - Current ward is too big
  - Election campaigning less expensive
  - Increase councillor accountability
  - Workload is high and pace is slow
61. Those submissions opposing the proposal made comments summarised as follows:
- Papatoetoe would dominate Ōtara
  - Current arrangement is working well and no need to fix it
  - All double-member wards should be split, not just Manukau
  - Splitting the ward to make it easier for the councillors is not a good reason
  - Manukau is currently a community of interest which shares common issues
  - Splitting up the ward is not going to help with councillors getting involved in local issues
  - The entire ward is similar demographically, culturally and politically
  - Ōtara will get marginalised
  - Splitting the ward is reinforcing first past the post, multi-member wards are required for proportional representation
  - Would split the Pasifika population
  - Families are spread over the whole Manukau Ward
  - The community benefits by having two councillors – one may have qualities the other lacks.
62. Some submissions misunderstood the legislative requirement to conduct the review and took the view that the council was conducting the review unnecessarily or that there was an agenda to undermine south Auckland. The submissions advocated no need for change.

## Communities of interest

63. Although the number of submissions speaks for itself, the council is required to consider the effective representation of communities of interest.
64. The matter of fair representation is not an issue – both the status quo and the proposed split of the ward comply.
65. The Māngere and Ōtāhuhu communities currently exist in one local board area without subdivisions. The Ōtara and Papatoetoe communities currently exist in one local board area but the Local Government Commission recognised they were separate communities by creating separate subdivisions:
- “We looked for the existence of distinct communities in other local board areas and considered the relative size of these and whether they were physically separated from each other as factors in determining the need for subdivisions. As a result, we have also established electoral subdivisions in the Hibiscus and Bays, Albert-Eden, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Boards. In two of these board areas, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Ōtara-Papatoetoe, it was not possible to create equal-sized subdivisions without drawing what we saw as arbitrary boundaries splitting communities of interest as a result of the ‘+/-10% fair representation rule’.”*
66. Given that the Local Government Commission considered Ōtara and Papatoetoe to be distinct communities rather than similar communities, information is contained in Attachment M comparing ethnicity, socio-economic status and voter turnout, which provides data supporting the differences between the two communities.
67. As well as the two communities being dissimilar, submissions noted that Ōtara shares community activities and family ties with Māngere.

## Effective representation

68. The reason for splitting the ward is based on the size of wards in Auckland Council. A smaller ward might promote more effective representation. A single member represents, on average, 82,860 people and two members represent, on average, 165,720 people. In a double-member ward, the ward is not split and both councillors are expected to support the total electorate.
69. The Local Electoral Act 2001 requires the Local Government Commission to publish guidelines identifying factors and considerations for councils to take into account in making decisions. Included in those guidelines are the following comments, which help to define what may be considered when in terms of effective representation:
- 5.17 *When practicable, the following factors need to be considered when determining effective representation for the local authority:*
- *avoiding arrangements that may create barriers to participation, for example, not recognising residents’ familiarity and identity with an area during elections*
  - *not splitting recognised communities of interest between electoral subdivisions*
  - *not grouping together two or more communities of interest that have few common interests*
  - *accessibility, size, and configuration of an area, including:*
    - *the population’s reasonable access to its elected members and vice versa*
    - *the elected members’ ability to:*
      - *effectively represent the views of their electoral area*
      - *attend public meetings throughout the area, and provide reasonable opportunities for face-to-face meetings.*

5.21 Consider the relative merits of one and multi-member wards/constituencies:

- single-member wards/constituencies provide a close direct link between local electors and their representative
- multi-member wards/constituencies can provide:
  - greater choice for voters
  - following the election, provide greater choice for residents on who to approach on local issues
  - allow sharing and specialising in responsibilities between the ward/constituency representatives.

70. Some submitters stated that having two members provides more effective representation. Each elector in the ward can elect two representatives and there are two representatives across the whole ward who can be called on.

### Balancing the issues

71. In balancing more effective representation through smaller wards against the dissimilar nature of communities that would result from splitting the wards, the clear majority of submissions from members of the public is that the ward should not be split. From the community's perspective, the current arrangements work well. The whole area within the current ward can elect two representatives and call on two if needed.

### Local board feedback

72. The formal resolutions of both the Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local boards acknowledged the large number of responses to the consultation from their communities being overwhelmingly opposed to splitting the ward. Members of both wards attended the hearing and their chairpersons made oral presentations.

### Working Party recommendations regarding the Manukau Ward

73. The Working Party recommends that the council's initial proposal is amended by removing the proposal to split the Manukau Ward.

## Rodney Local Board Subdivisions

### Summary of initial proposal

74. The council proposed changing the local board subdivisions to recognise:
- communities along the Kaipara Harbour, and which are currently in the Warkworth Subdivision, do not share a community of interest with Warkworth
  - communities in the Matakana area, currently in the Wellsford Subdivision, have a greater community of interest with the Warkworth Subdivision.
75. The southern boundary of Wellsford was moved southwards along the Kaipara Harbour and the boundary of Warkworth was moved inwards on the western side and northwards to encompass the area north-west of Matakana.

## Submissions

76. There were 78 submissions received on this proposal. The written comments were generally supportive of including the Matakana area in the Warkworth Subdivision. Four submissions opposed moving the Wellsford boundary south along the Kaipara Harbour on the basis it was already geographically large and only had one board member. Submissions from Federated Farmers and Grant Kirby stated that it is more appropriate to bring the Kumeu boundary northwards rather than bring the Wellsford boundary south. Submissions noted that schooling lies to the south and east, rather than to the north, as does shopping. Those who commute to work, travel south.
77. A submission was received from the Kumeu-Huapai Residents and Ratepayers Associations advocating there should be two local boards.

## Local board feedback

78. Feedback from the Rodney Local Board was to confirm its support for the initial proposal.

## Working Party recommendations regarding the Rodney Local Board Subdivisions

79. The Working Party recommends the council's initial proposal is amended, as illustrated in the map in Attachment J, by moving the northern boundary of the Kumeu Subdivision boundary northwards and changing the Wellsford / Warkworth boundary
- i) west of Hoteo such that it follows the Hoteo River south-west to the Kaipara Harbour, and
  - ii) in the vicinity of Matakana, northwards to encompass the area north-west of Matakana in the Warkworth Subdivision.
80. The effect of these recommendations is as follows:

Subdivision	Population (2017 Est.)	Members	Population per member	Difference from quota	Per cent difference from quota
Dairy Flat Subdivision	7,510	1	7,510	367	5.13
Kumeu Subdivision	30,400	4	7,600	457	6.39
Warkworth Subdivision	20,200	3	6,733	-410	-5.74
Wellsford Subdivision	6,210	1	6,210	-933	-13.07
<b>Rodney Local Board Total</b>	<b>64,290</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7,143</b>		

## Other recommendations of the Working Party

### Name of the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward

81. Feedback from the Puketāpapa Local Board included a request to change the name of the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward to Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa.
82. The Working Party noted that this change of name has not been consulted on but also noted that any changes in the council's final proposal that were not part of the initial proposal are open to the public to object to the Local Government Commission.
83. The proposed change reflects the names of both local boards contained in the ward.
84. The Working Party recommends that the change of name is included in the final proposal.

### Other changes to current arrangements that were included in the initial proposal

85. The council's initial proposal included the following arrangements that have not been separately addressed elsewhere in this report.
86. The Rodney Ward boundaries will not change and this will be a non-complying decision because over-representation is currently 22 per cent. There were 29 submissions which supported and 12 which opposed this proposal. The comments opposing the proposal tended to favour a strict approach to the fair representation rule across all wards. The Working Party does not recommend changes to the initial proposal.
87. The Great Barrier Local Board will be renamed Aotea Great Barrier Local Board. There were 70 submissions which supported this proposal and 42 which opposed it. The Working Party does not recommend changes to the initial proposal.
88. There were no submissions regarding the Botany Subdivision of the Howick Local Board being over the quota. There were no submissions regarding the Manurewa-Papakura Ward as being under the quota (other than submissions of a general nature advocating strict compliance with the ten per cent rule throughout).

### Summary of all Working Party recommendations

89. The wards for electing members of the Auckland Council Governing Body will be as follows:

Ward	Population (2017 Est.)	Members	Population per member	Difference from quota	Per cent difference from quota
Rodney Ward	64,300	1	64,300	-18,560	<b>-22.40</b>
Albany Ward	169,800	2	84,900	2,040	2.46
North Shore Ward	156,800	2	78,400	-4,460	-5.38
Waitākere Ward	176,500	2	88,250	5,390	6.50
Waitematā and Gulf Ward	97,100	1	97,100	14,240	<b>17.19</b>
Whau Ward	84,700	1	84,700	1,840	2.22
Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa Ward	177,800	2	88,900	6,040	7.29
Ōrākei Ward	96,000	1	96,000	13,140	<b>15.86</b>
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward	91,500	1	91,500	8,640	<b>10.43</b>
Howick Ward	150,200	2	75,100	-7,760	-9.37
Manukau Ward	168,900	2	84,450	1,590	1.92
Manurewa-Papakura Ward	148,900	2	74,450	-8,410	<b>-10.15</b>
Franklin Ward	74,600	1	74,600	-8,260	-9.97
<b>Total Auckland</b>	<b>1,657,200</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>82,860</b>		

90. The subdivisions for those local boards having subdivisions will be as follows:

Local board	Population	Members	Pop per member	Difference from quota	% Diff from quota
<b>Rodney Local Board</b>					
Wellsford Subdivision	6,210	1	6,210	-933	<b>-13.07</b>
Warkworth Subdivision	20,200	3	6,733	-410	-5.74
Kumeu Subdivision	30,400	4	7,600	457	6.39
Dairy Flat Subdivision	7,510	1	7,510	367	5.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>64,290</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7,143</b>		

Local board	Population	Members	Pop per member	Difference from quota	% Diff from quota
<b>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</b>					
Hibiscus Coast Subdivision	53,300	4	13,325	263	2.01
East Coast Bays Subdivision	51,200	4	12,800	-263	-2.01
Total	<b>104,500</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13,063</b>		
<b>Albert-Eden Local Board</b>					
Owairaka Subdivision	53,800	4	13,450	-200	-1.47
Maungawhau Subdivision	55,400	4	13,850	200	1.47
Total	<b>109,200</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13,650</b>		
<b>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board</b>					
Maungakiekie Subdivision	31,200	3	10,400	-971	-8.54
Tāmaki Subdivision	48,400	4	12,100	729	6.41
Total	<b>79,600</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11,371</b>		
<b>Howick Local Board</b>					
Pakuranga Subdivision	45,800	3	15,267	-1,422	-8.52
Howick Subdivision	45,900	3	15,300	-1,389	-8.32
Botany Subdivision	58,500	3	19,500	2,811	<b>16.84</b>
Total	<b>150,200</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16,689</b>		
<b>Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board</b>					
Papatoetoe Subdivision	51,600	4	12,900	343	2.73
Ōtara Subdivision	36,300	3	12,100	-457	-3.64
Total	<b>87,900</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12,557</b>		
<b>Franklin Local Board</b>					
Waiuku Subdivision	15,350	2	7,675	-619	-7.47
Pukekohe Subdivision	35,900	4	8,975	681	8.20
Wairoa Subdivision	23,400	3	7,800	-494	-5.96
Total	<b>74,650</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8,294</b>		

## Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

91. The Auckland Council has the most complex governance arrangements in the country, having 21 local boards in addition to the Governing Body. The process for conducting this review included the development of an initial proposal by the Working Party with feedback from local boards.
92. Staff expected the Working Party would communicate with the Governing Body about the representation arrangements for the Governing Body and with local boards about each local board's representation arrangements. The extent of interest by local boards in Governing Body arrangements was more than anticipated. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Mangere-Otahuhu local boards objected to the Working Party changing its recommendations to the Governing Body on the Governing Body arrangements for the Manukau Ward after the feedback from the local boards was received.

93. Apart from this issue, local boards have had opportunities to provide feedback on both the development of the council's initial proposal and on the submissions received. The local board submissions are described throughout the report.

### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

94. The change of name of the Great Barrier Local Board to Aotea Great Barrier Local Board acknowledges the Treaty settlement in that area. The Working Party's recommendation to change the name of the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward to Albert-Eden-Puketāpapa Ward recognises the Māori name for Mt Roskill. Puketāpapa means "flat-topped mountain".

### Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

95. The total cost of the review is \$83,000 and will be covered from existing budgets.

### Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

96. In deciding its final proposal, the council has had to balance the requirements for effective representation of communities of interest and fair representation. Non-complying decisions will need to be either upheld or altered by the Local Government Commission. There is the risk that the Commission will not uphold the council's decisions.

### Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

97. Once the Governing Body has decided the council's final proposal it will be publicly notified for objections and appeals, closing on 30 November 2018. The council is required to forward these to the Local Government Commission, along with its non-complying decisions. The Commission has until 11 April 2019 to make its determinations.

### Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

No.	Title	Page
<a href="#">A</a> 	Report of the chairperson of the Joint Governance Working Party	25
<a href="#">B</a> 	Overview of all submissions	29
<a href="#">C</a> 	Comments on isthmus wards	41
<a href="#">D</a> 	Comments on Manukau ward	89
<a href="#">E</a> 	Comments on Rodney ward	111
<a href="#">F</a> 	Comments on Rodney subdivisions	119
<a href="#">G</a> 	Comments on Great Barrier name	125
<a href="#">H</a> 	Summary of local board feedback	129
<a href="#">I</a> 	Minutes of the Joint Governance Working Party hearing	133
<a href="#">J</a> 	Maps showing changes to initial proposal	143
<a href="#">K</a> 	Council's initial proposal	145
<a href="#">L</a> 	Local Electoral Act 2001 requirements	149
<a href="#">M</a> 	Data on Ōtara and Papatoetoe communities	151

### Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

Author	Warwick McNaughton - Principal Advisor - Democracy Services
Authorisers	Marguerite Delbet - General Manager Democracy Services Phil Wilson - Governance Director Stephen Town - Chief Executive