
REPRESENTATION REVIEW 2021 – INITIAL PROPOSAL

MATTER

1. The matter for consideration by the Council is determination of an initial proposal on the representation arrangements for the 2022 and 2025 local authority triennial elections.

RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSIDERATION

That having considered all matters raised in the report the Council determine an initial proposal for consultation on the representation arrangements for New Plymouth District Council including:

- a) **The number of Councillors;**
- b) **Whether Councillors are elected at large, through a ward structure or a mixture of both; and**
- c) **Community Boards and their structure.**

COMPLIANCE	
Significance	This matter is assessed as being significant.
Options (Council)	<p>This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Election at large2.1 Based on existing ward boundaries (Ward option)2.2 Based on existing ward boundaries (Mixed option)3.1 Four ward option (Ward option)3.2 Four ward option (Mixed option)4.1 Four ward option (Ward option)4.2 Four ward option (Ward option)4.3 Four ward option (Mixed option)

COMPLIANCE	
Options (Community Boards)	<p>This report identifies and assesses the following reasonably practicable options for addressing the matter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain the Waitara, Inglewood, Clifton and Kaitake Community Boards with the current boundaries. 2. Establish four urban communities based around the Waitara, Ōākura, Inglewood and Bell Block urban communities. Establish a rural Community Board with three subdivisions covering the remaining area (except the New Plymouth City urban area). 3. Establish Community Boards over the top of the wards established [assumes Council adopt an option other than "at large"] 4. Disestablish the Waitara, Inglewood, Clifton and Kaitake Community Boards
Affected persons	The persons who are affected by or interested in this matter are the residents and ratepayers of the New Plymouth District Council.
Recommendation	This report makes no recommendation for addressing the matter.
Long-Term Plan / Annual Plan Implications	Some structures may have Long-Term Plan / Annual Plan implications.
Significant Policy and Plan Inconsistencies	No

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. This report presents options for how Councillors and Community Boards are elected this process is known as a Representation Review. Councils are required to undertake Representation Reviews a minimum of every six years. NPDC's next review is due before the 2022 triennial elections.
3. The outcome of the review determines the number of Councillors to be elected and whether they're elected at large, in a ward system or a mixture of both. The review also considers whether there should be Community Boards.

-
4. In 2020 the Council established a Māori Ward. Given the population size and demographics of New Plymouth District only one Councillor will be elected from the Māori Ward by electors on the Māori Electoral roll. To increase the number of Councillors in the Māori Ward would require the total number of Councillors to increase to 18 (currently 14). That option has not been assessed as being reasonably practical. The General Ward Councillors will be elected by electors on the General Electoral roll.
 5. To ensure the governance structure is fair and representative for the whole District, the Local Electoral Act 2001 places a number of statutory limitations on the structures that can be implemented. These structures must be determined on population data from the latest census.
 6. As only one Councillor is likely to be elected from the Māori Ward, the election will use an at large system for that election. This report therefore focuses primarily on options for the General Ward(s) and Community Boards.
 7. The Council must determine an initial proposal which will then be released for consultation. Following consultation, the Council will determine a final proposal which is subject to appeal and/or objections. Any objections or appeals, or any governance structure that does not comply with the Local Electoral Act 2001 requirements must be forwarded to the Local Government Commission for final determination.
 8. Public consultation on the Council's initial proposal is expected to commence on 28 August 2021 with Council's final determination being made on 9 November 2021.

BACKGROUND

9. The Local Electoral Act 2001 requires every Council to review representation arrangements at least once every six years. Council undertook its last review in 2015 taking effect for the 2016 triennial election.
 10. The Representation Review relates to the number of Councillors on the Council, whether they're elected at large, in a ward system or a mixed system (of both at large and ward elections). The review also considers whether there should be Community Boards.
 11. The Local Electoral Act places limitations on what structures can be implemented. These limitations are in place to ensure, as far as practicable, the system implemented is fair and representative for the whole District.
-

-
12. With the establishment of a Māori ward the status quo (ward boundaries and the number of elected members from those wards) is not an option. This is because the 2021 representation review is carried out using General Electoral¹ population data and excludes population data relating to the Māori Electoral population.²
 13. During the consultation period, Council Officers and elected members are willing to meet with any individuals or organisations wishing to better understand the representation review system to inform the preparations of their submissions.
 14. While the Local Electoral Act 2001 prescribes the statutory requirements to be met, it does not prescribe the decision-making process. The Local Government Commission (LGC) has produced [Guidelines for local authorities undertaking representation reviews](#). The LGC recommend the following process steps³ to assist Council to achieve a robust outcome that accords with the statutory requirements and other relevant considerations.

- Step 1 Identify communities of interest.
- Step 2 Determine effective representation for communities of interest.
- Step 3 Consider the fairness of representation for electors of wards.
- Step 4 Consider communities and Community Boards.

Communities of Interest (Step 1)

15. The Local Electoral Act 2001 does not define the term 'community of interest' and the term is likely to mean different things to different people. Council needs to consider whether there are communities of interest before determining how those communities receive effective representation.
16. The Local Government Commission [Guidelines](#) identify three dimensions for recognising communities of interest:
 - Perceptual: a sense of belonging to an area or locality
 - Functional: the ability to meet the community's requirements for services
 - Political: the ability to represent the interests and reconcile conflicts of the community.

¹ Definition in [s5](#) LEA

² Definition in [s5](#) LEA

³ Steps abridged

-
17. The Council has previously identified (through previous representation reviews) that communities of interest exist in New Plymouth district.
 18. When asked to identify communities spatially, most people circle communities of interest by urban populations (eg Urenui, Ōkato Inglewood) or suburbs within the New Plymouth City area (eg Fitzroy, Moturoa).
 19. Some people may consider they belong to multiple communities of interest – for example someone may reside in one community, but commute to work in another and commute for recreational activities to another.
 20. Communities of interest are most commonly thought of as where people feel they belong (where they live, shop, play, work). However, it's important to recognise that the functional and political dimensions are also important.
 21. When considering communities of interest in the function dimension, facilities such as libraries, Council service centres, retail centres, schools, religious gathering places and playing fields should be considered.
 22. When considering the political dimension, thought should be given to the influence a particular structure may have on residents' ability to interact with their elected members (and vice versa). Some structures may also influence the likelihood of candidates standing for election.
 23. NPDC has seen a high level of elected member turnover in recent triennia. In some instances (and particularly the Community Boards) there have been low levels of candidates standing resulting in elections not being required and/or by-elections being required.

	Number of members elected in 2019 triennial election (and still serving)	Number of members elected in 2016 triennial election (and still serving)	Number of elected members in 2013 triennial election (and still service)
Mayor & Council (15)	15	9	6
Community Boards (16)	11	8	5

By elections	2019- current	2016-2019	2013-2016
Council	0	1	2
Community Boards	4	1	0

Pre-consultation feedback from 2015 is still relevant

24. Council undertook pre-consultation prior to the 2015 Representation Review. Council officers have reviewed that feedback and believe that feedback is still relevant. The pre-consultation identified communities of interest based on rural/urban/coastal splits, services, shared family histories, location of schools, geographical splits (by the mountain) and demographics.

The complexity of the urban centre population

25. The urban New Plymouth "city" population is comprised of a number of suburbs, many with overlapping boundaries. It is difficult to identify distinct communities of interest within that urban area. Any boundaries would arbitrarily split communities of interest.
26. Council officers also have no firm understanding on whether the residents of Bell Block would like a separate ward or Community Board. There has been some ad hoc feedback regarding representation of Bell Block. For example, two submissions in the Long-Term Plan consultation requested a Community Board. The single appeal on the Council's last representation review commented on representation in Bell Block and particularly the absence of a Community Board.

Effective Representation for Communities of Interest (Step 2)

27. In determining how communities of interest are most effectively represented, Council needs to consider the number of elected members and then determine which basis of election will provide the most effective representation of the identified communities of interest. The term 'basis of election' relates to whether Councillors are elected:
- a) at large (where all electors can vote for all electoral candidates);
 - b) by ward (where electors in a ward can only vote for electoral candidates in that ward); or
 - c) a combination of both (where an elector in a ward can vote for electoral candidates standing in their ward, and can also vote for electoral candidates who have chosen to stand at large).

The number of elected members

28. The Local Electoral Act 2001 sets a minimum of five and a maximum of 29 Councillors for territorial authorities.
-

-
29. The Mayor and Councillors form the Governing Body of the Council. When considering Governance roles, the Institute of Directors⁴ recommend that medium to large sized companies should have 6-8 directors. That approach contemplates there is control over the skill mix and the ability to include the correct skills. In addition, the Board of Directors approach doesn't factor in the representation roles the Mayor and Councillors have. Councils therefore tend to be slightly larger than Corporate Boards and maximising the opportunity to provide a suitable mix of skills and experiences.
30. The table below provides a comparison between NPDC and other similar-sized Councils current arrangements⁵ (based on 2019 electoral data). It is important to remember that each Council's arrangements reflect their own history, geography and politics.

Council	Population⁶	Land area (km²)	System	Number of Councillors
Palmerston North City	84,639	394.7	At large	15
Waikato District	75,618	25,000	10 Wards	13
Hastings District	81,537	5,227	5 Wards	14
Selwyn District	60,561	6,420	4 Wards	10
Napier City	62,241	105	4 Wards	12
New Plymouth District	80,679	2,324	3 Wards	14
Rotorua	54,204	2,409	At large	10

31. The Remuneration Authority determines a governance pool (total Councillor salaries) for every Council based on the relevant size index for each Council. New Plymouth District Council's pool (for 2020/2021 is \$778,568). The governance pool has no relationship to the number of Councillors. Should the number of Councillors on New Plymouth District Council change as a result of the representation review, there will be no change in the annual governance pool. The pool will instead be shared amongst more or fewer Councillors. The exact change in individual salaries cannot be determined at this time, as it is dependent on the size of the pool (yet to be confirmed by the Remuneration Authority), the committee structure of Council (post the 2022 election) and how that Council chooses to distribute the governance pool including additional remuneration for roles with additional responsibility (such as the Deputy Mayor and Committee Chairpersons).

⁴ <https://www.iod.org.nz/resources-and-insights/starting-a-board/what-makes-a-good-board/#>

⁵ 2019 election statistics (DIA website)

⁶ Usually Resident Population - 2018 census

Wards, at large or mixed representation

32. Previous consultation and representation reviews have identified communities of interest exist. Many communities of interest identified are based on urban populations. A significant majority of the New Plymouth District population resides in the New Plymouth city urban area. In comparison, other identified communities of interest are very small in population size. As a result, these smaller communities have insufficient population to enable direct representation for each community. The Council must therefore consider how best to combine the communities of interest into one or more larger wards while ensuring effective representation.
33. There are three options available to the Council:
- a) At large (where all electors can vote for all candidates)
 - b) By ward (where electors in a ward can only vote for candidates in that ward)
 - c) A combination of both (where an elector in a ward can vote for candidates standing in their ward, and can also vote for candidates who have chosen to stand at large).
34. An appendix to this report presents fully assessed options for all three options.
35. In determining their initial proposal, the Council needs to consider the following factors of effective representation for New Plymouth District Council:
- a) Avoiding arrangements that may create barriers to participation (eg not recognising residents' familiarity and identity with an area during elections)
 - b) Not splitting recognised communities of interest between electoral subdivisions (for example splitting smaller urban areas such as Inglewood or Waitara urban areas)
 - c) Not grouping together two or more communities of interest that have few common interests.
 - d) Accessibility, size and configuration of an area, including:
 - i) The populations reasonable access to its elected members (and vice versa)
-

-
- ii) The elected members' ability to:
- Effectively represent the views of their electoral area
 - Provide reasonably even representation across the area including activities such as attending public meetings and opportunities for face-to-face meetings.
36. Previous Councils have undertaken representation reviews in the context of a First Past the Post electoral system. Under that electoral system, the highest polling candidates are successful (whether or not they have obtained a majority of the vote). In 2017, the Council resolved to implement a Single Transferable Vote (STV) system. The STV system is a proportional system in that every elector has one vote that is distributed proportionally across candidates (based on each elector's candidate rankings). Successful candidates must achieve a majority of votes (when the proportional votes of each elector are added together). The Local Government Commission [guidelines](#) reiterate that five to seven members is preferable for wards or constituencies using STV (the minimum being three) to gain the full benefits of proportional representation under STV).

Fair Representation

37. The number of Councillors will affect how communities of interest are represented.
38. The LEA⁷ requires that the electors of each ward receive fair representation. Every Councillor must represent the same number of people plus or minus 10 per cent. This means that all votes are of approximately equal value. By dividing the total population (of the district) by the number of Councillors a representation ratio can be determined.
39. An at large system meets the fair representation requirements of the Local Electoral Act 2001 as all elected members represent the total population equally.
40. Where a ward system is in place (whether stand-alone or as part of a mixed system), the population of the ward is divided by the number of elected members for that ward to determine a representation ratio for that ward.
41. To ensure compliance with the Local Electoral Act 2001, the representation ratio for each ward Councillor must be no more than 10 per cent greater or less than the representation ratio for the whole district. This is known as the "+/- 10 per cent threshold".

⁷ s19V LEA

-
42. An appendix to this report presents fully assessed options including whether or not they comply with the +/- 10 per cent threshold.
43. The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides four grounds for not complying with the fair representation requirements. These grounds are:
- To provide for effective representation of communities of interest within:
 - Island communities
 - Isolated communities
 - Where compliance would limit effective representation of communities of interest by:
 - Dividing a community of interest
 - Grouping together communities of interest with few commonalities of interest
44. The Local Government Commission has an expectation that the Council's proposal will meet the fair representation requirements of the LEA. While there are limited grounds for non-compliance, it is the Commission's expectation that these are not the default or starting point when determining a proposal. Any decision which does not comply must be backed up with supporting arguments and relate to one of the grounds listed above.
45. Many of the previously identified communities of interest (such as Ōākura, Ōkato, Inglewood, Waitara) do not meet the population size requirements to enable direct representation. A previous Local Government Commission determination noted that:
- "The Commission does not consider that section 19T envisages that individual communities of interest need separate representation. Its sole requirement in this regard is that the representation of communities of interest must be effective"*
46. If the Council's decision is non-complying, it is automatically referred to the Commission. The Commission will treat that referral as if there had been an appeal.
47. Not all options presented in this report comply with the Fair Representation requirements in section 19V of the LEA.
48. Should the Council select a ward system, it must identify the names and boundaries of each of ward. In general, the names of any electoral subdivisions should:
- i) Use the most common or predominant, place or feature name. A feature name could be official or "recorded" which means it's been depicted in at least two official documents, such as maps and charts.
-

-
- ii) Names of electoral subdivisions should avoid duplication and confusion of names of electoral subdivision with those in other local authority areas.

Implications of establishing a Māori ward

- 49. In 2020, the Council resolved to establish a Māori Ward. The Māori Ward establishes an area where only those on the Māori Electoral Roll can vote for candidates in the Māori Ward. The Māori Ward sits alongside the General Ward(s) of each city or district.
- 50. The [Electoral Act](#)⁸ defines how Statistics New Zealand calculate the General and Māori Electoral Populations are calculated. Statistics New Zealand have calculated the New Plymouth District the General Electoral Population has 72,780 and the Māori Electoral Population as 6,885.
- 51. Currently, the New Plymouth District Council has 14 Councillors. The Local Electoral Act 2001 determines how many Councillors the Māori Ward elect and how many the General Ward(s) elect. For New Plymouth District Council to have two Councillors elected from the Māori Ward, the total number of Councillors would need to increase to 20 (two from the Māori ward and 17 from General Wards).
- 52. The representation review assessments contained in this report relate only to the General Ward(s). One member will be elected from the Māori Ward (a Representation Ratio of 1:6885).

Community Boards

- 53. Local Government reform (1989) first established Community Boards. Over 140 Community Boards now operate in urban and rural areas throughout the country. Not all Councils have Community Boards.
- 54. The role of Community Boards is set down in the Local Government Act 2001⁹. Every Community Board operates differently, reflecting the variety of communities they represent and the various ways Councils have established their governance structures.
- 55. Delegation of decision-making authority does not form part of the representation review process. Whether or not to delegate authority is a decision Councils make following each triennial election.

⁸ s3 Electoral Act

⁹ s52 LGA

Providing fair and effective representation

56. As part of the Representation Review process, the Council must consider whether Community Boards are appropriate to provide fair and effective representation for individuals and communities.
57. The Council needs to decide whether there need to be communities or Community Boards within the District.
58. If the Council establishes Community Board(s), then for each Board, the Council must resolve:
 - the area covered by each Community Board; and
 - the structure / membership of each Community Board.

Size

59. Each Community Board can have a minimum of four elected members and a maximum of 12 total members.
60. The Council may appoint additional members, but can only appoint Councillors to Community Boards (ie external appointees are not permitted). If the Council has resolved to have an at large representation system, they may appoint any Councillors to each Community Board. If the Council has resolved to have a ward system, they may only appoint Councillors from the ward(s) in which the community sits.
61. Councillor appointees to an individual Community Board must total less than half the total number of members.

Subdivision of Community Boards

62. The Council can choose to divide a Community Board area into electoral subdivisions. This may be appropriate when a Community Board area has more than one distinct community of interest and the formation of subdivisions will provide more effective representation of these communities of interest.
 63. Should the Council wish to consider subdividing a Community Board area, the provisions applying to the division of are similar to those which apply to the division of a district into wards (ie the +/- 10 per cent threshold). The Local Electoral Act 2001 does not provide for a mixed system of representation for Community Boards.
-

Additional criteria for establishing Community Boards

64. Before determining the Community Board arrangements, the Council must consider¹⁰:
- i) Will the proposal promote good local government of the parent district and the community area concerned?
 - ii) Will the district and the community have the resources necessary to enable them to carry out their respective responsibilities, duties and powers?

Remuneration

65. Remuneration of Community Boards comes from outside the Governance Pool set by the Remuneration Authority for Councillors.
66. Nationally, there is a massive span in terms of representation levels of Community Boards (from 72 residents to 13,000 residents per board member). There is also a myriad of differences in Community Board roles and responsibilities nationally. In the 2019 Remuneration Authority Review of Community Board Member remuneration, the Remuneration Authority concluded that the *"primary function of the overwhelming majority of Community Boards is representation and advocacy"*.
67. The Authority concluded there is a relativity between a Community Board's population and the remuneration level of its elected members. The Remuneration Authority therefore sets the remuneration of each individual Community Board based on the population of the community each board represents.
68. Altering the number of Community Boards and/or the size of the community they represent will have an impact on remuneration. Council officers are unable to provide definitive guidance on those costs. As a broad indication, the current salaries for NPDC Community Boards are:

	Total 2020/2021 Salaries (Chairperson & 3 members combined)	Population size (2018 usually resident population)
Clifton Community Board	31,144	2,772
Inglewood Community Board	37,051	8,784
Kaitake Community Board	33,294	5,295
Waitara Community Board	37,051	8,679

¹⁰ s19W LEA 2001

Delegations

69. Delegations to Community Boards are a matter for consideration by the incoming Council following the 2022 triennial election. They are outside the scope of the Representation Review process.

APPEALS, OBJECTION

70. Following the consultation process and the Council's determination of a final proposal, the public have rights of appeal or objection.
71. Any submitter to the initial proposal may lodge an *appeal* about matters related to their original submission.
72. If the Council's final proposal differs from the initial proposal, then any person or organisation may lodge an *objection*. The objection must clearly state the matters to which the objection relates.
73. The Council must forward any appeals or objections to the Local Government Commission for final determination.
74. The Council must refer their final proposal to the Commission if the proposal does not comply with the +/- 10 per cent threshold.

NEXT STEPS

Legislation prescribes the Representation Review process

75. The Council must identify, and publicly notify an initial representation proposal.
76. Any person interested in the proposal is entitled to make a written submission. The Council must give submitters a reasonable opportunity to speak in support of their submission.
77. Subsequent to the hearing, the Council must consider all submissions (written and verbal) and determine the final representation arrangements. The Council must then publicly notify its final representation arrangements.
78. The community has the opportunity to appeal or object to the arrangements. If the Council receives appeals or objections on its final proposal it must forward them to the Local Government Commission for final determination.
-

79. The indicative timeline for the 2021 review is:

Determination of initial proposal	17 August 2021
Public notice	28 August 2021
Submission Period	28 August – 2 October 2021
Hearings	TBC
Determination of final proposal	9 November 2021
Public notice of final proposal	13 November 2021

SIGNIFICANCE AND ENGAGEMENT

80. In accordance with the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy, this matter has been assessed as being significant. The representation review will affect all of the community and could have a substantial effect on voting abilities for electors at elections. The decision is also potentially controversial as no system is likely to satisfy all residents. Full public consultation is required under the local Electoral Act 2001 and will be undertaken before the Council determines its final proposal.

OPTIONS

81. Having considered the limitations of the LEA, Council Officers have developed options based around three ward structures. Detailed assessments of each option are appended to this report. There is limited ability to consider options at the Council meeting (on 17 August 2021) outside of those appended is limited as it takes a significant amount of time to alter possible ward boundaries and assess the options. A desire to adopt a different option will result in a delay to the representation process and require Extraordinary Meetings to meet the statutory timeframes.

82. Council officers have assessed three options in relation to Community Boards. These are also appended to this report.

83. A general options assessment is set out below.

Financial and Resourcing Implications

84. The governance pool for Councillor salaries is determined by the Remuneration Authority. The Remuneration Authority do not take the number of Councillors into account when determining the pool. There could however be financial implications (increases or decreases) relating to:

-
- Administrative support (staff).
 - Provision of hardware and software.
 - Travel and communications costs.

Some of the options assessed will have financial implications (refer to the individual assessments).

85. Community Board salaries are not met from the governance pool. The current Long-Term Plan has budgeted for salaries and resourcing for 16 Community Board members (the status quo). An increase in the number of Community Board members and/or Community Boards is likely to increase both financial and non-financial resourcing. The disestablishment of Community Boards will decrease the financial resourcing required and may decrease the non-financial resourcing required. The quantum of change is unknown at this point in time.

Risk Analysis

86. No representation will be universally acceptable to the electors. Council officers anticipate that the Council's initial proposal will generate interest within the community.
87. It is not uncommon for the final determination to be made by the Local Government Commission. Some of the options assessed are non-complying. Should Council adopt a non-complying option, it would need to refer the final proposal to the Local Government Commission for final determination – regardless of whether appeals or objections are received.

Promotion or Achievement of Community Outcomes

88. A significantly smaller number of elected members may limit the ability for Councillors to engage with residents and may impact the Council's ability to deliver on the Community Outcomes

Statutory Responsibilities

89. When resolving its initial proposal the Council must act in accordance with the requirements of the:
- Local Electoral Act 2001
 - The consultation and decision-making provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 including:
 - Ensuring that the Council is aware of, and has regard to, the views of all of its communities; and
-

-
- Takes account of diversity of the community, and the community's interests and;
 - The interests of future as well as current communities; and
 - Provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to Council's decision-making processes.
90. The Council's final proposal must be determined having considered any submissions received and must clearly respond to the issues raised by submitters. Council needs to publicly notify its decision and the reasons for the decision. Appeal and objection rights to the Local Government Commission apply.
91. As per legislation, population data provided by Stats NZ and is sourced from the 2018 Census.
92. Any delegation to Community Boards would need to be considered by the incoming Council.
93. Some elected members have previously expressed a desire for an uneven number of elected members (Mayor and Councillors) on the governing body to minimise the necessity for a casting vote to be utilised. Council minutes list a casting vote being used six times since 2014. An uneven number of elected members on the governing body would also not necessarily mean an uneven number of members on committees. Council has the option to remove the ability for a casting vote through an amendment of Standing Orders (through a separate process).

Consistency with Policies and Plans

94. The options provided are consistent with Council's policies and plans.

Participation by Māori

95. Extensive pre-consultation was undertaken prior to the 2015 representation review. This included a hui with iwi and hapū representatives. At that point in time, feedback was largely around direct representation (ie establishing a Māori Ward).
96. The Council has now established a Māori Ward. Electors on the Māori Roll (for New Plymouth District) will elect one Councillor. The Māori Ward will effectively be an "at large" election for those electors with a representation ratio of 1:6,885.
-

-
97. The opportunity for a mixed system (voting in wards and at large) would enable those on the Māori roll to vote for the Māori Ward candidates and the at-large candidates. There has been [some commentary](#) in support for this system by members of the community, but levels of overall support are unknown.
 98. Te Huinga Taumatua will be able to provide a recommendation on a preferred initial proposal. Māori, including iwi and hapū representatives will be able to participate in the formal consultation process.
 99. The Representation Review process, and the legislative requirements are complex and interrelated. As noted above, Council officers are willing to meet with any individuals or organisations wishing to better understand the representation review system to inform the preparations of submissions.
 100. Hearing and consideration of submissions and determination of a final proposal is a matter for the full Council.

Community Views and Preferences

101. The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides that any person interested in the proposal is entitled to make a written submission. Submitters do not need to reside in the New Plymouth District or be on an electoral roll.
102. Council undertook pre-consultation prior to the 2015 Representation Review. Council officers have reviewed that feedback and believe that feedback is still relevant. A copy of the feedback received is attached to this report.
103. The Representation Review process, and the legislative requirements are complex and interrelated. As noted above, Council officers are willing to meet with any individuals or organisations wishing to better understand the representation review system to inform the preparations of submissions.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Historical Representation Arrangements (ECM8574708)
Appendix 2a	Option 1 – At Large – Options Assessment (ECM8574849)
Appendix 2b	Option 2.1 – Current Boundaries – Ward (ECM8574864)
Appendix 2b	Option 2.2 – Current Boundaries – Mixed (ECM8574872)
Appendix 2c	Option 3.1 – New Boundaries – Ward (ECM8574875)
Appendix 2c	Option 3.2 – New Boundaries – Mixed (ECM8574881)
Appendix 2d	Option 4.1 – New boundaries – Ward (ECM8574883)

Appendix 2d	Option 4.2 – New Boundaries – Ward (ECM8574886)
Appendix 2d	Option 4.3 – New Boundaries – Mixed (ECM8574890)
Appendix 2e	Option A – Community Boards – Status Quo (ECM8574897)
Appendix 2e	Option B – Community Boards – Urban and Rural (ECM8574905)
Appendix 2e	Option C – Community Boards – Disestablish (ECM8574910)
Appendix 3	Statistical analysis of potential ward structures (ECM8574954)
Appendix 4	Pre-consultation from 2015 (ECM6585029)

Report Details

Prepared By:	Julie Straka (Governance Lead)
Team:	Governance
Approved By:	Joy Buckingham (General Manager Corporate Services)
Ward/Community:	District Wide
Date:	23 June 2021
File Reference:	ECM 8531263

-----*End of Report*-----
