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Review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections

File No.: CP2018/07359

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide the Great Barrier Local Board an opportunity to give formal feedback on the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council’s representation arrangements have to be reviewed this year. The outcome will apply at the 2019 elections.
3. The Governing Body finalised the process for conducting the review in December 2017, following consultation with local boards.
4. The Joint Governance Working Party established by the mayor will develop a proposal for reporting to the Governing Body in July 2018.
5. The local board is now invited to provide its formal feedback on the review, for consideration by the Joint Governance Working Party.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) endorse the general approach to the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections, which is to make changes on an issue-by-issue basis and to not seek significant change.

b) endorse the Joint Governance Working Party’s position on the following matters with respect to the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections:
   i. that all Governing Body members are to continue to be elected by ward as decided by the Governing Body
   ii. that the current number of members in each ward is retained
   iii. that the Waitematā and Gulf ward non-complying variance (population per member) should be addressed by reducing the size of the isthmus part of the ward on both the east and the west of the ward as in “Option 1”, with the resulting changes for neighbouring wards as set out in that option
   iv. that the Rodney ward non-complying variance (population per member) should be retained on the basis that compliance would result in splitting communities of interest or joining disparate communities of interest
   v. that the area alongside the Kaipara Harbour does not have a community of interest with Warkworth, and that the Rodney Local Board is invited to provide feedback on the alternative options for subdivision arrangements.

c) endorse the following recommendations with respect to the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections, noting that they have yet to be considered by the Joint Governance Working Party:
   i. that the Botany subdivision non-complying variance (population per member) should be addressed by moving the southern boundary of the Howick ward southwards and that the Howick Local Board is invited to provide feedback on
the two alternative options

ii. that the Manurewa-Papakura ward non-complying variance (population per member) should be retained on the basis that compliance would result in splitting communities of interest or joining disparate communities of interest

iii. that the Waitamata Local Board consider whether subdivisions within the Board area are appropriate

iv. that the Upper Harbour Local Board consider whether subdivisions within the Board area are appropriate.

d) provide any other feedback on the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections.

e) delegate authority to the Chair to represent the board’s views on the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections should the Joint Governance Working Party seek further engagement with and/or feedback from the board prior to reporting to the Governing Body with a proposal in July 2018, or during the consideration of submissions following public notification.

Horopaki / Context

There are statutory deadlines

6. All councils must, under the Local Electoral Act 2001, review their representation arrangements at least every six years. Auckland Council, under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, must conduct a review of its representation arrangements no earlier than the 2013 elections and no later than September 2018.

7. The Governing Body considered conducting a review for the 2016 elections but resolved to defer this.

8. The Local Electoral Act 2001 requires the following timeline and process:
   - public notice of the council’s proposals by 8 September 2018
   - consideration of submissions
   - public notice of the council’s final proposals within six weeks of the closing date for submissions.
   - if there are no objections or appeals, the council’s proposals stand and are implemented
   - if there are objections or appeals, they are forwarded to the Local Government Commission for a decision.

9. Staff are planning to report the Joint Governance Working Party’s proposals to the Governing Body meeting on 26 July 2018.

Role of the Joint Governance Working Party and the process for developing the Auckland Council proposal

10. In 2017, the Governing Body endorsed a process for the review of Auckland Council’s representation arrangements for the 2019 elections that was then recommended to local boards. Local board feedback, which was generally supportive of the proposed process, was reported back to the Governing Body in December 2017.

11. The Governing Body, after considering local board feedback, made the following decision:

   That the Governing Body:
   a) receive the feedback from local boards.
b) note the mayor’s appointments to the Joint Governance Working Party as follows:

Cr Cathy Casey (Central), Cr Linda Cooper (West), Cr Daniel Newman (South),
Cr Wayne Walker (North), Angela Dalton (South), Phelan Pirrie (Rural North),
Richard Northey (Central) and Shane Henderson (West).

c) approve the draft terms of reference for the Joint Governance Working Party for
inclusion in the Auckland Council Committee Terms of Reference.

d) approve the following process for conducting the review of representation
arrangements:

i) the Joint Governance Working Party will develop Auckland Council’s initial
review of representation arrangements and present it to local boards and
the Governing Body for comments before the Governing Body makes the
statutory resolution for public notification for submissions.

ii) the Joint Governance Working Party will conduct the hearing of
submissions and report its findings to local boards and the Governing
Body before the Governing Body makes the final statutory resolution on
any representation changes, which will then be publicly notified for
objections and appeals.

iii) the Governing Body will review the process for hearing submissions under
(ii) at the time the initial proposals for change are known.

12. The rationale for (d)(iii) in the decision was to respond to some local board feedback
regarding the hearing of submissions. The legislation requires a final proposal to be publicly
notified within six weeks of the submission closing date. This may require a centralised
process. However, this will be reviewed once the nature of changes being proposed is
known.

Representation arrangements that may be reviewed

13. For the Governing Body, it is possible to review for members other than the mayor:

- whether members are elected by ward or at-large or by a mixture
- if by ward, the number of wards, names, boundaries and number of members for each
  ward.

14. For each local board it is possible to review:

- whether members are elected by subdivision or at-large or by a mixture
- if by subdivision, the number of subdivisions, names, boundaries and number of
  members for each subdivision
- the number of members for the local board
- the name of the local board.

Matters that are required to be taken into account

15. The Local Electoral Act 2001 (Act) requires the council to take into account:

- the effective representation of communities of interest
- fairness of representation.

16. Other requirements in the Act include:

- ward boundaries should align with local board boundaries as far as is practicable
- boundaries must align with mesh-block boundaries
when the council gives public notice of its proposal, it needs to give reasons for any changes from the 2016 elections.

17. The concept of effective representation of communities of interest can be explained by considering a single electorate which has two quite different communities and two elected representatives. The outcome of each election might mean that both representatives are elected by one of the communities with the result that the other community will not be represented. This might be solved by splitting the total electorate into smaller electoral areas, each having one representative. In the case of territorial local authorities, those smaller electoral areas are known as ‘wards’ and in the case of local boards, those smaller areas are known as ‘subdivisions’.

18. The concept of fairness means that the ratio of population to elected member for wards, in the case of the Governing Body, and subdivisions, in the case of local boards, should not vary across the region or local board area respectively. The legislation allows for a variance of up to 10 per cent. It further allows the council to not comply if compliance would result in splitting communities of interest or joining disparate communities of interest. The final decision on a proposal to not comply is made by the Local Government Commission.

19. A practical consideration is the distribution of voting documents. Each voter receives a pack of voting documents which is relevant to that voter (the pack contains voting papers for the Governing Body positions and local board positions relevant to that voter). Misalignment of boundaries can create additional combinations of Governing Body and local board positions. This leads to additional cost in terms of voting documents. This reinforces the legal requirement for ward and local board boundaries to align as far as is practicable.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

The general approach is to not make significant change

20. The Local Government Commission determined the current arrangements in 2010, following 736 submissions on its first proposal. There was a lot of public interest and the process was robust. There are no significant issues with the current arrangements.

21. There have been discussions at local board cluster meetings and by the Joint Governance Working Party. Significant change has been considered (such as some Governing Body members being elected at large) but the outcome of these discussions to date is to basically retain the status quo except where changes are required.

22. One significant issue though, which has been considered by the Governing Body, is the number of Governing Body members. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 sets this at 20 members, in addition to the mayor. All other councils are able to review the number of councillors.

23. The Governing Body, when it considered conducting a review of representation arrangements for the 2016 elections, decided instead to seek legislative change to allow it to review the number of Governing Body members. It also sought provision for re-aligning local board boundaries with ward boundaries, should ward boundaries need to change, and if there was support from local boards to keep boundaries aligned.

24. This submission was not successful. The Governing Body is not able to review the number of Governing Body members. Local board boundaries are not able to be changed other than through the separate process of applying for a local government reorganisation.

25. The council is continuing to advocate change, however any legislative change in the short term is unlikely to be effective for the 2019 elections.

Wards

Wards that do not comply with the 10 per cent rule

26. Based on statistics provided by the Local Government Commission (being a 2017 estimate) population ratios are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Population per member</th>
<th>Difference from quota</th>
<th>% Difference from quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Ward</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>-18,560</td>
<td>-22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Ward</td>
<td>169,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84,900</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Ward</td>
<td>156,800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78,400</td>
<td>-4,460</td>
<td>-5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ward</td>
<td>176,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88,250</td>
<td>5,390</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā and Gulf Ward</td>
<td>119,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119,100</td>
<td>36,240</td>
<td>34.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau Ward</td>
<td>84,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84,700</td>
<td>-8,240</td>
<td>-9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward</td>
<td>172,200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86,100</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei Ward</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>-3,160</td>
<td>-3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Ward</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75,100</td>
<td>-7,760</td>
<td>-9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau Ward</td>
<td>168,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84,450</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa-Papakura Ward</td>
<td>148,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74,450</td>
<td>-8,410</td>
<td>-10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Ward</td>
<td>74,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74,600</td>
<td>-8,260</td>
<td>-9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,657,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,860</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Final statistics will eventually be based on data provided by Statistics New Zealand at mesh-block level. Staff expect that final statistics will be very close to those that have been used in the review to date.

28. As stated above, one of the matters that must be taken into account in the review is fairness of representation. The legislation requires that the ratio of population to member should not vary by more than 10 per cent unless there are reasons for not complying with this requirement (on the basis of splitting communities of interest or uniting disparate communities of interest).

29. There are four wards that do not comply:
   - Waitematā and Gulf ward
   - Rodney ward
   - Ōrākei ward
   - Manurewa-Papakura ward.

**Review of the Waitematā and Gulf ward and neighbouring wards**

30. The Waitematā and Gulf ward has a population approximately 28,000 above the 10 per cent quota. The Joint Governance Working Party has considered three options to address this (maps are in Attachment A):
   - Option 1: boundaries on both the east and west of Waitematā are moved
   - Option 2: the eastern boundary with the Ōrākei ward is not changed and there is substantial change on the western boundary with the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward
   - Option 3: the western boundary with the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward is not changed and there is substantial change on the eastern boundary with the Ōrākei ward.

31. Each option has different flow-on effects to neighbouring wards.
32. The Joint Governance Working Party recommends Option 1. The other options disrupt communities of interest to a greater extent.

33. For example, Option 2 takes areas around Ponsonby and Grey Lynn away from the central city into the Albert-Eden-Roskill ward.

34. Option 3 places large areas of Ōrākei into Maungakiekie-Tāmaki. In the Local Government Commission’s first proposal for wards, Ōrākei and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki were combined. Following submissions, the Local Government Commission determined that Ōrākei and Maungakiekie-Tāmaki were distinct communities of interest and created separate wards. The commission took into account socio-economic differences and voting patterns.

35. The effect of Option 1 on the 10 per cent rule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>% Difference from quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā and Gulf</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden-Roskill</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of the Rodney ward

36. The Rodney ward needs to gain about 10,000 population to be only 10 per cent under the quota. The Joint Governance Working Party has considered three options (maps are in Attachment B):

- Option 1: the area north of the Whangaparaoa peninsula which is currently in the Albany ward is moved into Rodney (Orewa, Hatfields, Waiwera)
- Option 2: the southern boundary of Rodney ward is moved southwards
- Option 3: the council proposes the status quo, which is not complying, on the basis that any options to increase the population in the Rodney ward split communities of interest.


38. In Option 1, the area from Orewa to Waiwera shares a community of interest with the Hibiscus Coast.

39. Option 2 is difficult to achieve without splitting a community of interest. Option 2 as shown, moves the Rodney ward boundary south to include Whenuapai and Paremoremo and it borders Ranui and Westgate. The Whenuapai area is assumed to be south-looking rather than north-looking; for example, residents in Whenuapai would tend to go south for key activities like retail shopping or business, rather than north. Another option for a boundary is along the Upper Harbour motorway. However, this splits the Hobsonville community.

40. Further reasons for keeping the status quo include:

- ward and local board boundaries remain aligned (the Local Electoral Act requires alignment as far as is practicable)
- the current boundaries are the boundaries originally set by the Local Government Commission as representing communities of interest
- population is increasing and will continue to increase over time.
Review of the Manurewa-Papakura ward

41. The Joint Governance Working Party has not yet considered options for changing the Manurewa-Papakura ward boundaries.

42. In order to be only 10 per cent different to the average population to member ratio, the ward needs to gain a population of about 250. The Franklin ward cannot lose population, or it will become non-complying. Any change to the ward boundary will need to be at the northern end.

43. Staff have provided two options for local board comment back to the Joint Governance Working Party, in Attachment C:
   - Option 1: move the northern boundary of the ward on the western side of SH1 motorway up to Cavendish Drive
   - Option 2: move the northern boundary of the ward on eastern side of SH1 motorway northwards, just over the Redoubt Road ridge
   - Option 3: the status quo, which would need to be promoted to the Local Government Commission on the basis that it is not possible to achieve compliance without splitting communities of interest or uniting disparate communities of interest.

44. Staff recommend Option 3, given it is the least disruptive option, and that the degree of non-compliance is minimal. It also means that the ward and local board boundaries remain aligned (the Local Electoral Act requires alignment as far as is practicable).

Review of the number of members in wards

45. Wards are currently either single-member or double-member wards.

46. The Joint Governance Working Party has considered larger wards; for example, a southern ward based on the current Manukau, Howick and Manurewa-Papakura wards and having six members. Implications include:
   - the cost of a by-election across such a large ward if a vacancy occurs
   - voter turnout – those elected will tend to be elected by areas with higher turnout, meaning there will not be as much a spread of representation as there is now
   - the cap on campaign expenditure is increased
   - each of the six members will have the same large electorate to service.

47. The Joint Governance Working Party also considered splitting current double-member wards into single-member wards. If this was done using local board boundaries as defining communities of interest, only the Manukau ward, if split into two, would continue to comply. The Joint Governance Working Party is recommending no change to current ward arrangements.

Local boards

Local board population

48. The following table provides the population for each local board and the number of board members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Population per member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Great Barrier Local Board
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board Subdivision</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>122,300</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>54,200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemātā</td>
<td>108,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>84,700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>109,200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>79,700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoeto</td>
<td>87,800</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>54,500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>74,600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,657,330</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49. This table is provided for information. There is no legal requirement that the number of members should reflect the size of population. The 10 per cent rule only applies between internal boundaries of subdivisions. Staff are not aware of any reasons for changing the existing number of board members.

**Local board subdivisions that do not comply with the 10 per cent rule**

50. A table showing local board subdivisions in relation to the 10 per cent rule is in Attachment D.

51. There are two subdivisions that do not comply:
   - Botany subdivision of the Howick Local Board (at 16.84 per cent, which needs to reduce its population)
   - Wellsford subdivision of the Rodney Local Board (at -10.69 per cent, which will be addressed in response to a suggestion to change the Warkworth subdivision).

**Review of the Botany subdivision in the Howick Local Board area**

52. Maps showing the current subdivision boundaries and two alternative options are contained in Attachment E.
53. It is clear that the only way for the Botany subdivision to lose population is through the Howick subdivision extending southwards. There are two options proposed for consideration by local boards.

54. One option expands the Howick subdivision southwards on the eastern side of Botany Road only, while the second option expands the Howick subdivision southwards on both sides of Botany Road. Each option results in subdivisions that comply with the 10 per cent rule.

55. The Howick Local Board is invited to indicate its preferred option. This would be the option which has the least disruptive effect on existing communities of interest.

Review of the subdivisions in the Rodney Local Board area

56. A submission has been received from a resident, Mr Grant Kirby, living near the Kaipara Harbour, pointing out that the Warkworth subdivision extends from coast to coast. Mr Kirby was a former chair of the Local Government Commission. The submission states that the area alongside the Kaipara Harbour does not share a community of interest with Warkworth and suggests extending the Kumeu subdivision boundary northwards, to follow the Helensville electoral boundary.

57. Maps showing current subdivisions, the option of extending the Kumeu subdivision northwards and an option of extending the Wellsford subdivision southwards, are contained in Attachment F. Both options result in subdivisions that comply with the 10 per cent rule.

58. The Joint Governance Working Party agrees that those near the Kaipara Harbour do not share a community of interest with Warkworth and invites the Rodney Local Board to recommend its preferred option in view of its knowledge of current communities of interest.

Waitematā Local Board subdivisions

59. A suggestion has been received that the Waitematā Local Board should have a central subdivision. A map is contained in Attachment G showing what this might look like.

60. The Waitematā Local Board is invited to recommend whether subdivisions should be created in order to promote more effective representation of communities of interest and, if so, whether it supports the proposed option.

Upper Harbour Local Board subdivisions

61. A suggestion has been received that the Upper Harbour Local Board should have subdivisions to ensure there was representation from the western end of the local board area. A map is contained in Attachment H showing an arrangement of three subdivisions that complies with the 10 per cent rule.

62. The Upper Harbour Local Board is invited to recommend whether subdivisions should be created to improve effective representation of communities of interest and if so, whether it supports the proposed option.

Review of local board names

63. Staff noted comments at local board cluster meetings and other meetings that some current names may not be appropriate. These include:

(i) Howick Local Board and Ward: ‘Howick’ is only part of the local board area

(ii) Waitematā Local Board and Ward: Some people associate ‘Waitematā’ with a different area (for example the area of the Waitematā District Health Board)

(iii) Ōrākei Local Board and Ward: ‘Ōrākei’ is only part of the local board area

(iv) Albany Ward: ‘Albany’ is only part of the ward area.

64. The Great Barrier Local Board has recommended adding ‘Aotea’ to its name. This acknowledges a recent Treaty of Waitangi settlement with Ngati Rehua - Ngatiwai ki Aotea.
65. Apart from the Great Barrier Local Board proposal, staff are not aware of any other specific proposals and are not researching alternative names. Local boards should note that a name change has the potential to confuse the electorate and there are budgetary implications with changing associated stationery and signage.

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

66. The Auckland Council’s review of representation arrangements for the 2019 elections has implications for local boards. These are discussed in the body of the report. The report also provides comments on changes that affect the Governing Body, for local board information and feedback.

67. Local boards have supported a process where a Joint Governance Working Party develops the Auckland Council proposal for presentation to the Governing Body. The Joint Governance Working Party has joint local board and Governing Body representation. The Governing Body will make the resolution required by the legislation which will be notified for public submissions.

68. Following the closing date for submissions, the Governing Body must make the final statutory resolution within six weeks. The Joint Governance Working Party will consider submissions. So that the working party may liaise effectively with local boards, the local board is invited to delegate authority to the Chairperson or another member to represent the board’s views on the review. This is in the event that the Joint Governance Working Party seek further engagement with and/or feedback from the board prior to reporting to the Governing Body with a proposal in July 2018, or during consideration of submissions following public notification.

69. There will be an opportunity for the Governing Body, when it makes its first resolution, to further consider a process for local board involvement in commenting on submissions.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

70. The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides for councils to establish Māori wards for electing Governing Body members. There is no similar provision for local board elections. The process for electing local board members is no different for Māori as for others.

71. The Auckland Council Governing Body has considered the possibility of creating a Māori ward. A resolution to do so was required by 23 November 2017. The Governing Body supported the creation of a Māori ward in principle but decided not to proceed further until the number of Governing Body members was able to be increased.

72. When considering subdivisions and communities of interest within its area, it may be relevant to take into account tribal rohe boundaries.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

73. The review process is supported in-house. There will be costs associated with public notices and a payment to the Local Government Commission for preparing plans of boundaries and having them certified by the Surveyor-General. These costs are budgeted city-wide.

74. There are no financial implications for local boards. There will be down-stream council costs if the total number of local board members is increased (salary and support costs) or if there are changes to local board names resulting in costs associated with changing signage and stationery.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

75. The legislation requires deadline dates for certain decisions and public notification. Auckland Council has the greatest number of governance entities in the country (one Governing Body and 21 local boards) and there is a risk of not meeting these deadlines due to the need to involve all entities in the review.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

76. The Joint Governance Working Party will consider local board feedback in June 2018 and develop proposals for consideration by the Governing Body at its July meeting, when it will make its statutory resolution for public notification. This report provides the opportunity for local boards to have input.
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Waitematā ward

Current urban area

Recommended option – Option 1
Manurewa-Papakura ward

Option 1:
- move northern boundary on western side of SH1 motorway up to Cavendish Drive

This boundary is similar to the legacy Manurewa ward boundary of Manukau City Council.

Implementing this boundary change also affects the Manukau ward.
Manurewa-Papakura ward

Option 2:
- move northern boundary on eastern side of SH1 motorway

Implementing this boundary change will also affect the Manukau and Howick wards.

It will smooth what is currently an odd-looking boundary between the three wards.
## Local board subdivisions and the 10 per cent rule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Pop per member</th>
<th>Difference from quota</th>
<th>% Diff from quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellsford Subdivision</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>-763</td>
<td>-10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Subdivision</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>-243</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumeu Subdivision</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Flat Subdivision</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64,240</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus Coast Subdivision</td>
<td>53,300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Bays Subdivision</td>
<td>51,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>-263</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owairaka Subdivision</td>
<td>53,800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungawhau Subdivision</td>
<td>55,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109,200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie Subdivision</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>-971</td>
<td>-8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki Subdivision</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79,600</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakuranga Subdivision</td>
<td>45,800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,267</td>
<td>-1,422</td>
<td>-8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Subdivision</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>-1,389</td>
<td>-8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany Subdivision</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>16.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16,689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatoetoe Subdivision</td>
<td>51,600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara Subdivision</td>
<td>39,300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>-457</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87,900</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Local Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiuku Subdivision</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,675</td>
<td>-619</td>
<td>-7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukekohe Subdivision</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairosa Subdivision</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>-494</td>
<td>-5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74,650</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Botany subdivision

Current Howick Local Board subdivisions
Botany subdivision

Option 1

- move Howick boundary on the east of Botany Road southwards
Botany subdivision

Option 2
- move Howick boundary on the east and the west of Botany Road southwards
Rodney Local Board subdivisions

Current subdivisions

[Map showing subdivisions: Wellsford Subdivision, Warkworth Subdivision, Kumeu Subdivision, Dairy Flat SD]
Rodney Local Board subdivisions

Option 1
- move Wellsford subdivision southwards along Kaipara Harbour
Option 2
- move Kumeu subdivision northwards along Kaipara Harbour aligning with Helensville electorate
Waitematā Local Board

Option for a central subdivision
Upper Harbour Local Board

Possible subdivisions