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Representation review for the 2019 elections

Submissions sent directly to the review email address
(representationreview@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)

These are to be added to those attached in the report
which have been captured from those filling in the
submission forms online or by hard copy
Dear sir or madam,

Thank you for opening consultation on whether Parnell should join the Orakei Ward as part of a representation review of local ward boundaries.

As a Parnell resident, and also the former Auckland City Councillor who represented Hobson Ward between 2007-2010, and Hobson Community Board member 2001-2004, I have always considered Parnell to have closer links to Remuera and Orakei Ward than with suburbs like Westmere, Herne Bay, or the Gulf Islands.

Parnell was well represented when it was a part of Hobson Ward under the old Auckland City. Having represented the district politically for six years, I am unaware of a single complaint in my time as councillor or community board member that Parnell didn’t belong in communities of interest that included Remuera.

Its major transport links and communities of interest tend to also favour a closeness with Orakei Ward. Examples include:

- Parnell’s political history in the last few decades has been more strongly linked to Remuera than to the west of the CBD. For example, Parnell has been a part of Epsom Electorate since 1996. I also believe Parnell was a part of Hobson Ward in the old Auckland City since amalgamation in 1989 until 2010. Returning Parnell into Orakei Ward will in fact provide a better alignment in political boundaries than it has at present.

- Parnell’s major sports club, Parnell Cricket Club, is actually is physically located in Remuera

- Likewise, Parnell’s families are more likely to have sporting connections with Rugby, Netball and Football Clubs located in Ellerslie, Stonefields, and Kohimarama than Western Springs or Ponsonby.

- Tamaki Drive connections (servicing Orakei Ward)

- Brighton Road and Ayr St impacting Shore Rd as major traffic thoroughfares involving Remuera/Parnell

- train and bus networks from the east to the CBD servicing Parnell residents

- local newsletters and magazines sharing Parnell and Remuera distribution means that Parnell residents tend to be focused more on Remuera than Westmere for local news and business interests.

- Parnell and Remuera businesses and associations have traditionally had close linkages and historical symbiosis

- Large Remuera and Greenlane schools like St Kentigern School, Kings School, St Cuthberts and Diocesan School all have significant student intake from Parnell families.

I strongly support Parnell being moved from Waitemata Ward and into Orakei Ward for those reasons.

Yours sincerely

Aaron Bhatnagar

61 St Stephens Ave

Parnell
Submission by Alec van Helsdingen

Summary:

1. The Albany ward should be renamed “Upper North Shore” or “Harbour and Bays”

2. Population should be transferred from Botany to Howick subdivisions to ensure that Botany is within the 10% quota.

3. All local boards should have subdivisions for electing members of the local board.

4. The ideal number of members elected per subdivisions is 2-4. I describe issues with subdivisions electing 1 member or 5-8 members. Statistical analysis of 2016 election results shows lower voter participation in subdivisions or local boards electing higher numbers of members.

5. The Upper Harbour local board in particular should be divided into subdivisions because there are two communities of interest, the first consisting of Hobsonville, West Harbour, Whenuapai and Herald Island, the second consisting of the remainder of the local board.

6. The Pukekohe subdivision of the Franklin should be divided into two to better represent residents of the west of the town.

7. The misalignment between ward and local board boundaries resulting from bringing Waitemata and Gulf ward within quota should be rectified quickly, before the 2019 elections, either through a Local Bill or working with the government to get a Government Bill through parliament. This Bill could also address the problem of licensing trust and DHB boundaries not aligning with local boards.

8. The council should consider, and consult widely on, whether to adopt STV from 2022 onwards, particularly for the Mayoralty.

Ward Names

It is my view that the names of wards should reflect the names of the local boards they contain, or else if this is not practical be another name that is readily associative with the area.

I suggest that the Albany ward should have a name change. It is not obvious or logical to the typical voter or member of the public that the local boards named Upper Harbour and Hibiscus and Bays would belong to a larger ward named Albany. The name Albany reflects only a small part of the ward’s identity. People living in the Hibiscus Coast or in Hobsonville and West Harbour especially have few links or connections to Albany. I propose a name change to “Upper North Shore” or “Harbour and Bays”

Botany Subdivision

I disagree that the retaining the status quo for this subdivision is acceptable. It is already significantly over-quota and further growth is likely to increase this disparity further, meaning that at the next review drastic and controversial changes would need to be made to its boundaries.

I therefore suggest a transfer of population from Botany subdivision to Howick.

Other Subdivisions

Consistency across Local Boards
I suggest that instead of confusingly having some local boards elected at large and others by subdivisions, that a common method be used across Auckland for all Local Boards. For reasons I will elaborate on I suggest using subdivisions rather than electing at large.

**Number of members elected per subdivision**

Many voters have limited interest and engagement in local politics. They are likely to have little knowledge of the candidates and rely heavily on candidate statements. Being faced with a large number of candidates to vote for puts some voters off, while others will not use all the votes they are entitled to.

I did an analysis of 2016 election results and looked at how many voters (of those who bothered to vote at all) voted for local board candidates, and if so, how many of the votes they were entitled to were used.

For each local board I calculated the percentage of votes that voters had that were actually used. For example, in the Maungawhau subdivision there were 14,703 voters, each with 4 votes for local board candidates. This equates to 58,812 votes, but in reality only 43,325 votes were cast, which is 73.7% of the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Average Votes used (%)*</th>
<th>Average votes used ignoring blank and informal votes (%)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>100%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5***</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These averages are weighted for the different number of voters in each subdivision or local board

** This is a rather meaningless statistic as a vote for 1 candidate can only be either blank, informal or 100% used

*** The only areas to elect 5 candidates are Great Barrier and Waiheke. This probably explains the higher than expected figures.

Especially when ignoring blank and informal votes, there is a clear trend that areas electing 6-8 members, and to some extent those electing 4, have lower voter participation than those electing 1-3 members.

These figures may not look too bad, until it is considered how many voters are not fully using their votes. In a 8 member seat where 77.1% of votes are used, at least 26.2% of voters are not fully using their 8 votes\(^1\). Another thing to consider is that this non-participation by voters is in addition to the majority of people enrolled to vote who do not vote at all in local elections.

\(^1\) This calculation comes from imagining a scenario where voters either vote for 8 candidates or only 1. This gives the lowest possible number of votes who did not use all 8 votes. In practice the proportion will be a lot higher.
One Member seats have the issue that only one candidate, representing one party or ideology gets elected to represent their community. Other ideologies, parties and interests have no voice.

But having multi-member seats and at large voting does not necessarily solve this. There are many examples in past Auckland elections where one slate of candidates representing one party or grouping has won all the seats, because each of their candidates has received a similar number of votes, and no other candidate has surpassed even the weakest of them. For example the eight “Manurewa Action Team” candidates in 2016 together received 53.4% of the vote, but all 8 seats of the Manurewa Local Board. The next biggest grouping, Labour, received 22.6% of the vote and 0/8 seats. I am not suggesting that a proportional system is used; it is inevitable that FPP will not be proportional. But such largely unproportionable results like this cannot be good for democracy and decision making, especially when all the members come from the same party. I believe it is important that there is at least one local board member who represents a different ideology or party to the majority, to act as an “opposition” and hold the local board to account.

My suggestion is that all local boards will have subdivisions, and that most subdivisions should elect 2-4 members. This means that each community will be represented by multiple politicians with different skills, interests and beliefs. The chance of one slate of candidates sweeping all the available seats is lessened because they must be able to win in each and every subdivision.

Upper Harbour

I am currently a resident in the Upper Harbour local board. In addition to my above arguments against at large voting, I suggest that there are naturally two separate communities of interest in Upper Harbour. Whenuapai, Herald Island, West Harbour and Hobsonville are separated from the rest of the board by water. These areas are more linked to West Auckland in transport and economically, while the rest of the local board such as Greenhithe, Unsworth Heights, Schnapper Rock and Albany is clearly part of the North Shore.

I suggest therefore that two subdivisions are created in Upper Harbour. The boundary should if possible align with the Waitakere Licensing Trust (with the exception of Herald Island, which is not part of the trust area but clearly linked with Whenuapai and Hobsonville). If this is not possible, then either Hobsonville should be grouped with communities in the eastern part of the local board or Greenhithe should be grouped with communities in the western part of the local board.

Pukekohe

I was previously a resident of Pukekohe for 16 years. It was very noticeable, as can be seen in Census data, that the socio-economic and ethnic make up of the western part of the town, especially the north-west, was markedly different to the remaining areas of Pukekohe. I therefore suggest that the Pukekohe subdivision of the Franklin Local Board be divided into two. One subdivision should include the western part of Pukekohe, while the other should include the east of Pukekohe and the surrounding rural areas. Because the people of Pukekohe North (as the north west part of Pukekohe is called) have very different voting patterns and political beliefs to the surrounding areas, their opinions are often drowned out by the greater number of voters in these surrounding areas.

Local Boards

I urge the council to rectify the misalignment between ward and local board boundaries that will result from bringing the Waitemata and Gulf ward within quota. These differing boundaries will greatly confuse voters, complicate administration, and break the link between ward councillors and local boards.
I would suggest that the council either introduces a Local Bill to parliament or works with the government to have a bill placed before parliament. This Bill should allow the local board boundaries in the affected wards to be changed, and further, I believe it should be a requirement that all local boards are entirely within 1 ward. This should be done in the time for the 2019 local elections.

Another issue that I think should be solved through this sort of legislation is the problem of licensing trust and DHB boundaries not aligning with local board boundaries. This creates enormous complexity at elections and means that the number of different versions of voting papers that have to be sent out is very large.

**Use of STV**

It is my opinion that the Single Transferrable Vote (STV) system has several advantages over the existing FPP system. I particularly believe that the Mayoralty of Auckland should be elected with STV. Obviously, a change in the electoral system of this magnitude needs to be widely consulted on, therefore I recommend that this is done in 2020 and 2021 so that it could be implemented, if the council and public opinion agree, for the 2022 elections.
Auckland Youth Advisory Panel  
Te Rōpū Kaitohutohu Take Taiohi  

Feedback on the Auckland Council Ward Representation Review  

September 2018  

Hutia te rito o te harakeke  
Kei hea te kōmako?  
Rere ki uta, rere ki tai  
Ki mai koe ki ahau 'he aha te mea nui o te ao'?
Māku e ki atu  
He tangata, he tangata, he tangata  

If you cut the heart from the (harakeke) plant  
Where will the bellbird sing?  
It will fly inland, it will fly seawards  
If you ask me 'what is the most important thing in the world?'  
My reply to you is - people, people, people! (Metea & Jones, 1995)

This well-known whakataukī, above speaks of the need to achieve a healthy, sustainable balance between the environment, our values, and future development. It reminds us of the importance of making inclusive decisions centred around 'the heart' of the community. It is relevant to reflect on this whakataukī when considering decisions such as the ward representation review.

The Youth Advisory Panel, thanks the council for the opportunity to provide feedback on ward representation review proposals. It also thanks the efforts of the review team and staff in supporting them to understand the proposal and make informed feedback.

Mandate

The demographic advisory panels are one of council’s engagement mechanisms for hearing from diverse communities. They provide advice to the governing body and council staff on regional policies, plans and strategies and any matters which are of concern to those communities. The Youth Advisory Panel is made up of 21 members representing the areas of each of the wards and boards of Auckland Council. Their priorities are shaped by the goals of I Am Auckland: Auckland’s Strategic Plan for Children and Young People.

In July 2017, the Youth Advisory Panel agreed on four priorities area that they wanted their work programme to focus on:
• environment and sustainability
• transport and accessibility
• homelessness
• youth engagement and civic participation.

Feedback on the representation review aligns strongly with the youth engagement and civic participation priority for the Youth Advisory Panel.

Process

A small working group was formed to develop draft feedback on the representation review proposal. This group met with relevant staff from Auckland Council who have explained the reason for the review and proposals. The thoughts in the feedback below are a reflection of what the panel thinks about the various proposals. This submission was formed after a working group met with a Principal Advisor from Auckland Council who is designing the policy piece.

The working group presented this feedback to the Youth Advisory Panel at its meeting on 10 September 2018 and the feedback included in this document was endorsed by the panel.

Proposal 1 Ward Boundary Change (affecting Waitematā & Gulf, Ōrākei, Albert-Eden-Roskill, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, and Whau)

The Youth Advisory Panel does not support the changes being suggested in Proposal 1. There is strong concern in removing Westmere from central city, as well as the proposed split of Grey Lynn through Richmond Road as it is a close-knit community why it not be rather split on the natural border?

The panel also believes that Parnell’s communities of interests align more strongly with the central city and the Waitemata & Gulf Ward more so than the Ōrākei Ward.

Proposal 2 - Splitting Manukau Ward into two

The Youth Advisory Panel strongly opposes splitting the Manukau ward.

We strongly suggest Auckland Council makes a case to the Local Government Commission to keep status quo or to increase councillors to support rapid growing population and the demographically diverse communities of the Manukau. Current councillors for this area may already feel quite stretched - an increase in councillors would assist in this process.

This submission is based on two points - addressing the 10 per cent rule and the representation on measuring the success of fair and effective representation for individuals and communities. True representation of this community could be divided based on ward changes based on voter turnout which tends to be lower in the Maori and Pacific communities. As a panel, we would look forward to discussing this further if needed.

Proposal 3 - Moving Rodney Local Board Subdivision Boundaries

We support the boundaries as they currently stand, and affirm the council’s decision to not move them, this is due to the recognition that this would be taking people out of a community in which they comfortably associate into one that they may not. There is a stark difference in the priorities of wards in North Auckland, and you cannot easily assimilate them.
Proposal 4 - Renaming the Great Barrier Local Board

We support renaming the Great Barrier Local Board under the conditions this has been gifted or well supported by mana whenua.

Any other comments?

The Youth Advisory Panel records some concerns about the reasons behind splitting the wards.

It seems to come across to us as a game to meet number requirements rather than reflect our communities’ interests.

Furthermore, it appears to be selectively applied e.g. Rodney Ward not being changed despite not meeting legislation. The panel suggests Council advocates for a review of this legislation as it seems unnecessary.
The Ellerslie Business Association does not support the proposed boundary changes effecting the Ellerslie ward. This change splits communities of interest in many ways and in addition there is concern that the proposal will cause Ellerslie to be poorly represented due to the huge number of projects occurring in the Maungakiekie area.

Ellerslie as a community has a long and rich history that has always been tied to the Ellerslie Racecourse. Its creation and growth were overwhelmingly catalysed by development of the racecourse and the effects are continuing today.

The Ellerslie Business Association works closely with the Ellerslie Racecourse for promotions, publicity and many of our businesses have supplier relationships with them. Ellerslie is simply synonymous with the Racecourse and it is inconceivable that we are not considered a community of interest together. The community has a huge sense of belonging with the racecourse and this needs to continue.

The village itself was fundamentally changed after the implementation of the motorway which effectively split Ellerslie in two and this split remains today as a boundary for many organisations including sports clubs, schools and other community groups. Most organisations define their boundaries from the motorway east and many sports clubs participate in Eastern Zone competitions.

Primarily all sports that Ellerslie residents take part in take place in the Orakei Ward. Local students participate in sports that are run out of the Orakei ward including facilities being used by Ellerslie AFC (Michaels Park, Ngahue Reserve, Liston Park) and whose teams participate in the Eastern Suburbs competition, Auckland University Cricket (Colin Maiden Park, Glover Park) College Rifles Rugby club, University Rugby Club (Colin Maiden Park), Auckland Netball Centre.

In addition, the Ellerslie Business Association has a strong working relationship with other businesses associations in the ward primarily due to common interests and commonalities. The communities of Remuera, St Heliers and Mission Bay are similar to Ellerslie in being a ‘village’ style shopping experience and exclude commercial areas. We meet monthly and support each other as part of being communities of interest.

This is in great contrast to business areas in Maungakiekie Ward such as Penrose, Onehunga and Mt Wellington that are large and highly industrial that Ellerslie has very little in common with. Our business communities are very disparate.

Our Marketview data shows a similar pattern. 33% of spend in Ellerslie comes from the immediate neighbouring Orakei Ward. Only 11% comes from Mt Wellington North, One Tree Hill East, Ferndale, and Hamlin which are in the Maungakiekie ward. This demonstrates that Ellerslie people shop and spend much more in Orakei with much smaller numbers of people visiting Ellerslie from the surrounding Maungakiekie suburbs.
Also statistics show the Ellerslie population make up has much more in common with the Orakei ward compared to Maungakiekie ward. The statistics below are from Statistics New Zealand website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maungakiekie Local Board Area</th>
<th>Ellerslie</th>
<th>Orakei Local Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>33.4 years</td>
<td>35.8 years</td>
<td>40.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$42,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Qualifications</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples with Children</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent Families</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing – Own the dwelling in which they live</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other fundamental concern that the Ellerslie Business Association has with this proposal concerns effective representation. There are a huge number of project underway or about to commence in the Maungakiekie ward. These include:

The Onehunga Framework plan including:

- The Onehunga Town Centre redevelopment
- the East-West Link, connecting State Highway 1 and State Highway 20
- the redevelopment of Onehunga Wharf, with the retention of existing commercial fishing operations.
- light rail between the city centre and Auckland Airport
- Oranga Housing development (1200 homes being built by Housing NZ subsidiary HLC)

Plus these projects of major significance:

- East-West Link Project
- Auckland Manukau Eastern Transport Initiative (AMETI) including Panmure being named in Panuku’s plan as an unlock location
- Tamaki Redevelopment Company projects – Australasia’s largest housing project with 7500 homes scheduled to be built

All of these projects are taking place in the Maungakiekie ward this is a huge number of very important projects for the Maungakiekie councillor to oversee. Ellerslie Business Association is
concerned that with all these projects Ellerslie is not going to have effective representation due to the workload involved nevertheless adding additional areas and responsibilities. Ellerslie Business Association is concerned that projects in and around our area will be forced to the periphery and not receive the fair representation required.

The Ellerslie Business Associations preferred approach would be to address the disparity in Waitemata by the Governing Body seeking legislative change to allow it to review the number of Governing body members. A second member for Waitemata and Gulf wards could then be appointed, meaning minimal changes elsewhere.
Submission on the Proposed Changes to the Waitemata and Gulf Ward Boundaries

The Grey Lynn Residents Association strongly opposes the boundary changes that have been proposed for the western edge of Waitemata and Gulf Ward.

The current boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward runs along Meola Creek through to the motorway and this forms a much more natural and logical western boundary for the ward than the proposed boundary. This western boundary of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward is also the Waitemata Local Board boundary and it makes good sense for these boundaries to be aligned.

We note that the Local Electoral Act 2001 does allow for the population within a ward to be out of step with the general pattern across the city, where moving the boundaries would result in communities of interest being split, and the joining together of disparate communities. We believe that altering the western boundary in the way proposed will result in communities of interest being split.

The proposed boundary line runs directly through the western part of Grey Lynn splitting a community of interest. Places like Grey Lynn School and St Columba Church which are an integral part of the Grey Lynn community would no longer be with the rest of Grey Lynn. This division would also split the shopping centres at Surrey Crescent and West Lynn down the middle with shops on one side of the street being part of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward while their neighbours on the opposite side would be in the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. We cannot understand how this boundary can have been put forward as a logical dividing line when it so clearly splits one part of our community from the other. The Surrey Crescent and West Lynn shopping centres, Grey Lynn School, St Columba Church and the surrounding areas are all part of a cohesive community, so running a boundary line through and beside them seems completely nonsensical.

We also note that local board boundaries are supposed to align closely with the ward boundaries. At the moment the board and ward boundaries are aligned in our area. The proposed changes would result in a considerable misalignment of the boundaries of these two bodies resulting in some very confusing electoral arrangements. Someone living on the eastern side of Richmond Road would be able to vote for the Waitemata Local Board representatives and a Waitemata and Gulf Ward councillor, while their neighbours on the other side of the road could vote for Waitemata Local Board members and an Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward councillor. This will undoubtedly be confusing for members of our local community and will hinder their ability to engage with their local board and councillor on local matters. This will have particular relevance at the local shopping centres. Recently there was an issue at the local West Lynn shopping centre and members of the community contacted the Waitemata Local Board and Councillor Mike Lee for assistance. If the proposed boundary changes go ahead then any similar situation will see the local community having to engage with one councillor for issues on one side of the street, and another for issues on the other side. This would be a ridiculous situation that will hinder the ability of councillors and locals to work together to resolve local issues.
Grey Lynn Residents Association Inc.

There are numerous sports clubs that serve the Grey Lynn area which are located just inside the western edge of the current Waitemata and Gulf Ward. The boundary changes would mean that these sporting groups would be removed from our ward becoming a distant part of the large Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward but still within the Waitemata Local Board area. This would be far from ideal for our community and these local sporting groups.

The proposed boundary changes include moving the boundary in from the eastern side of the ward, thus removing Parnell and Newmarket from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward and incorporating them within the Orakei Ward. The proposal also includes the removal of Eden Terrace from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward and its inclusion in the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward. We support these boundary changes if it is considered necessary to decrease the population of the ward.

Another area which might sensibly join Parnell and Newmarket in their move from the Waitemata and Gulf Ward to the Orakei Ward is Grafton. The motorway gully from the Strand through Grafton gully forms a natural boundary, with the city on one side, and Parnell, Grafton and Newmarket on the other, so it seems logical to group these suburbs together in a move from Waitemata and Gulf Ward to Orakei Ward. We support moving the eastern boundary of the ward in this way if it is considered necessary to decrease the population of the ward.

However, we question why it is necessary to amend the ward boundaries at all. The reasoning put forward is that the proposed ward boundary changes will provide the provide the city with more equitable representation. In their calculations the Representation Review Joint Working Group has used census population figures for each ward, and the number of councillors that can be elected within those wards, to gauge the relative under or over representation for each ward. Through this formula the Waitemata and Gulf Ward was found to be very underrepresented. However, the formula used does not take into account the proportion of electors within the ward, something that is markedly different in our ward as compared with other Auckland wards. The Waitemata and Gulf Ward is unusual in that it has a relatively low proportion of electors per population with around 51% of its population enrolled to vote. Within the rest of Auckland the proportion of electors per population is markedly different with around 66% of the population enrolled to vote across the city. The relatively low proportion of electors in the Waitemata and Gulf Ward is probably because of the significant numbers of tourists, international students, temporary workers and other visitors that are counted as part of the population of the ward on census night. Most of these people will not be eligible to vote because they do not meet the necessary criteria to become electors. When these factors are taken into consideration, we believe that the Waitemata and Gulf Ward cannot be considered underrepresented and there seems to be no good reason for altering the western boundary of the ward in the name of equitable representation.
Auckland Council Representation Review
Free Post
Private Bag
Victoria Street West
Auckland 1142

11th September 2018

Dear Sirs

Re: Representation Review – Auckland Council

The Association wishes to make a submission on the Representation Proposal for Auckland.

The Association is concerned that in the Rodney Ward the communities of interest for division of the Local Rodney Board hasn’t been given any weight.

The Association does not accept that one Ward Councillor for Rodney is the best solution. That Councillor has to cover approximately 46% of the Auckland Council geographical area, whilst the balance of 54% is covered by 13 Wards and 19 Councillors.

The area required to be covered by one Councillor is vastly diverse with several non-connected communities of interest with the Rodney Ward. Those communities of interest have no-one acceptable centre that could be treated as a base for the Rodney Local Board.

We believe that the Council should not treat Rodney as a urban type Board area, but use the geographical separation as a reason for a split in the Rodney Board.
2.

We accept the ideal situation would be to split Rodney into two Boards:-

1. The first Board based in Warkworth as a centre including the Wellsford subdivision.
2. The second board based in Kumeu as a centre including the Dairy Flat subdivision.

This would result in 2 Boards with about 5-6 members per Board based on and centred on each community of interest, not as a present with completing areas for the limit Rodney Board finance.

We see the following advantages:-

1. Council would recognise the respective growth areas of Warkworth & Kumeu.
2. Each board would have a recognised but different community of interest served by a elected member serving their area.
3. Council could strengthen the administrative bases in Warkworth & Kumeu, where the population growth actually is.
4. The current administration centre (Orewa) is outside the Rodney board area requiring travelling from both areas for the public.
5. Council are currently looking at an new administrative centre to serve Rodney when the twin centre option would be better for the community.
6. The Council have only used the population figures to justify the Ward boundaries and have combined separate Boards, Waiheke & Great Barrier into the Waitemata Ward for a Ward Councillor.
7. The growth in Kumeu & Warkworth over the next 5 years will make the twin Board concept viable.
8. Travel time by vehicle from Kumeu to Warkworth is 1 hour in normal traffic, resulting in one of the longest commute within a Board area.
3.

9. We are aware of the pending High Court action in Wellington by the Northern Action Group in Warkworth. That group NAG still want a complete break away scenario from the Auckland Council. Not a matter discussed with or supported by our Association.

10. The Council and communities financial resources will better spent by a twin Board concept, which will advance both areas into the future.

We ask the Council to seriously consider this submission.

We will attend any meeting if required.

Yours faithfully

Pete Sinton
Chairman

Ph. 412-2016
Mob 021-637-772
e.mail petesinton@townplanner.co.nz
SUBMISSION ON AUCKLAND COUNCIL REPRESENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2019 ELECTIONS REGARDING PROPOSED ALBERT-EDEN-ROSKILL WARD.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 (section 19V) requires that the population that each Auckland Council member represents must be within the range 82,860, plus or minus 10% (74,574 to 91,146), unless particular community of interest considerations justify otherwise.

The proposed population for Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward is 182,400 (91,200 per member), which is 108 people above the upper limit.

1. The fundamental principle is that votes should have equal value, with an allowable tolerance to a maximum of 10%. Substantial community of interest reasons are required to justify any deviations outside the 10% tolerance. The proposed Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward has contiguous land borders with the proposed Waitemata and Gulf Ward, which is within the allowable tolerance for population per member. No substantial reasons for the deviation outside the maximum tolerance have been provided.

1. If the final ward boundaries remain outside the 10% tolerance, a legal challenge will result in both significant extra costs and delays for Auckland Council, and if successful, further costs and delays while new boundaries within the 10% tolerance are drawn up and re-advertised. These extra costs and delays will be entirely due to the failure of Auckland Council to propose wards meeting the requirements of the Local Electoral Act for population tolerances not exceeding 10%.

2. RECOMMEND that (without altering the Local Board boundaries) the population of Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward be reduced to under 182,292 (to within the 10% tolerance), by –

Transferring from Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward to Waitemata and Gulf Ward the area north-east of the centre line along Haslett Street, west of Ian McKinnon Drive from Haslett Street to Newton Road, and east of the Northwestern Motorway from Newton Road to Haslett Street.

Submitted by Liberal Democrats NZ -

Bryan Mockridge, 22 A Commissariat Road, Penrose, Auckland 1060 (Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward)
bryanmockridge@gmail.com; Phone (09) 971 2954; Mobile 021 492 296.

Paul Thompson, 48 Sayegh Street, St Heliers, Auckland 1071 (Orakei Ward)
paul_tommy_thompson@hotmail.com; Phone (09) 575 3365; Mobile 021 465 823;
SUBMISSION ON AUCKLAND COUNCIL REPRESENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2019 ELECTIONS REGARDING PROPOSED MANUREWA-PAPAKURA WARD.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 (section 19V) requires that the population that each Auckland Council member represents must be within the range 82,860, plus or minus 10% (74,574 to 91,146), unless particular community of interest considerations justify otherwise.

The proposed population for Manurewa-Papakura Ward is 148,900 (74,450 per member), which is 248 below the lower limit.

1. The fundamental principle is that votes should have equal value, with an allowable tolerance to a maximum of 10%. Substantial community of interest reasons are required to justify any deviations outside the 10% tolerance. The proposed Manurewa-Papakura Ward has contiguous land borders with the proposed Otara-Papatoetoe Ward, which is well above the average population per member. No substantial reasons for the deviation outside the maximum tolerance have been provided.

1. If the final ward boundaries remain outside the 10% tolerance, a legal challenge will result in both significant extra costs and delays for Auckland Council, and if successful, further costs and delays while new boundaries within the 10% tolerance are drawn up and re-advertised. These extra costs and delays will be entirely due to the failure of Auckland Council to propose wards meeting the requirements of the Local Electoral Act for population tolerances not exceeding 10%.

2. RECOMMEND that (without altering the Local Board boundaries) Manurewa-Papakura Ward be expanded to increase its population to over 149,148 (to within the 10% tolerance), by –

   Adding (from Otara-Papatoetoe Ward) the area south of Cavendish Drive and south of Te Irirangi Drive to Hollyford Drive, west of Hollyford Drive, north of Redoubt Road from Hollyford Drive to the Southern Motorway, west of the Southern Motorway from Redoubt Road to the Southwestern Motorway, and north of the Southwestern Motorway to Cavendish Drive.

Submitted by Liberal Democrats NZ -

Bryan Mockridge, 22 A Commissariat Road, Penrose, Auckland 1060 (Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward)
bryanmockridge@gmail.com; Phone (09) 971 2954; Mobile 021 492 296.

Paul Thompson, 48 Sayegh Street, St Heliers, Auckland 1071 (Orakei Ward)
paul_tommy_thompson@hotmail.com; Phone (09) 575 3365; Mobile 021 465 823;
SUBMISSION ON AUCKLAND COUNCIL REPRESENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2019 ELECTIONS REGARDING PROPOSED ORAKEI & MAUNGAKIEKE-TAMAKI WARDS.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 (section 19V) requires that the population that each Auckland Council member represents must be within the range 82,860, plus or minus 10% (74,574 to 91,146), unless particular community of interest considerations justify otherwise.

The proposed population for Orakei Ward is 91,900, which is 754 above the upper limit.
The proposed population for Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward is 91,500, = 354 above the upper limit.

1. The fundamental principle is that votes should have equal value, with an allowable tolerance to a maximum of 10%. Substantial community of interest reasons are required to justify any deviations outside the 10% tolerance. The proposed Orakei Ward has contiguous land borders with the proposed Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward, which has contiguous land borders with the proposed Mangere-Otahuhu Ward, where the population is below the average per member. No substantial reasons for deviations above the maximum tolerance are provided.

2. If final ward boundaries remain outside the 10% tolerance, a legal challenge would result in both significant extra costs and delays for Auckland Council, and if successful, further costs and delays while new boundaries within the 10% tolerance are drawn up and re-advertised. These costs and delays will be due to the failure of Auckland Council to propose wards that meet the requirements of the Local Electoral Act for population tolerances not within 10%.

3. RECOMMEND that (without altering Local Board boundaries) both Maungakiekie-Tamaki and Orakei Ward populations be reduced to under 91,146 (to within the 10% tolerance) by:

(a) Transferring Stonefields from Orakei Ward to Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward (the area southeast of Ngahue Drive and southwest of College Rd eastward of Ngahue Drive). Stonefields neighbours the Lunn Avenue shops and residential Mt Wellington, but it is isolated from the rest of Orakei Ward by recreational and industrial areas;

(b) Retaining in Orakei Ward the St Johns area west of the Main Trunk Railway Line, east of St Johns Rd to College Rd, east of College Rd and north of the boundary eastwards from College Rd to the Railway Line. This area is immediately adjacent to the rest of St Johns and Meadowbank residential areas, but is separated from Glen Innes by the Railway Line, and from Stonefields by Industrial and Recreational areas;

(c) Transferring the Panama Road Residential Area from Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward to Mangere-Otahuhu Ward (the area west of the Mt Wellington Highway and south of Panama Rd, including both sides of Panama Rd, and north of Otahuhu Creek). This area is immediately adjacent to Otahuhu residential areas, but is separated by several industrial areas from the residential areas of Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward.

Submitted by Liberal Democrats NZ -

Paul Thompson, 48 Sayegh Street, St Heliers, Auckland 1071 (Orakei Ward)
paul_tommy_thompson@hotmail.com; Phone (09) 575 3365; Mobile 021 465 823;

Bryan Mockridge, 22 A Commissariat Road, Penrose, Auckland 1060 (Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward)
bryanmockridge@gmail.com; Phone (09) 971 2954; Mobile 021 492 296.
SUBMISSION ON AUCKLAND COUNCIL REPRESENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR 2019 ELECTIONS REGARDING PROPOSED RODNEY WARD.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 (section 19V) requires that the population that each Auckland Council member represents must be within the range 82,860, plus or minus 10% (74,574 to 91,146), unless particular community of interest considerations justify otherwise.

The proposed population for Rodney Ward is 64,300, which is 10,274 below the lower limit.

1. The fundamental principle is that votes should have equal value, with an allowable tolerance to a maximum of 10%. Substantial community of interest reasons are required to justify any deviations outside the 10% tolerance. The proposed Rodney Ward has contiguous land borders with the proposed Albany and Waitakere Wards, both of which are above the average population per member. No substantial reasons for the deviation outside the maximum tolerance have been provided.

2. If the final ward boundaries remain outside the 10% tolerance, a legal challenge will result in both significant extra costs and delays for Auckland Council, and if successful, further costs and delays while new boundaries within the 10% tolerance are drawn up and re-advertised. These extra costs and delays will be entirely due to the failure of Auckland Council to propose wards meeting the requirements of the Local Electoral Act for population tolerances not exceeding 10%.

3. RECOMMEND that (without altering the Local Board boundaries) Rodney Ward be expanded to increase its population to over 74,574 (to within the 10% tolerance), by –
   (a) Adding (from Albany Ward) the Whenuapai and Herald Island area (north of the Upper Harbour Motorway from Clark Point to Northside Drive, and north of Northside Drive and east of the Northwestern Motorway to Brigham Creek, south of Brigham Creek and the upper Waitemata Harbour to Clark Point);
   (b) and adding (from Waitakere Ward) the adjacent area north of Red Hills Road, west of Don Buck Road, north of Hobsonville Road to Trig Road, west of Trig Road to Northside Drive, south of Northside Drive to Totara Creek, west of Totara Creek to Brigham Creek Road, and south of Brigham Creek Road and the Northwestern Motorway to Ngangetepara Stream, and east of the existing Rodney boundary along the Ngangetepara and Waiteputa Streams to Red Hills Road.

Submitted by Liberal Democrats NZ -

Paul Thompson, 48 Sayegh Street, St Heliers, Auckland 1071 (Orakei Ward)

paul_tommy_thompson@hotmail.com; Phone (09) 575 3365; Mobile 021 465 823;

Bryan Mockridge, 22 A Commissariat Road, Penrose, Auckland 1060 (Maungakiekie-Tamaki Ward)

bryanmockridge@gmail.com; Phone (09) 971 2954; Mobile 021 492 296.
WAITEMATĀ AND GULF WARD BOUNDARY CHANGES

INTRODUCTION

Every six years, councils throughout New Zealand must review their representation arrangements, including whether their wards properly reflect their populations.

Changes to Auckland Council's ward and local board subdivision boundaries are proposed under the Local Electoral Act. The proposed changes will affect how some people would vote at next year’s local body elections and the following one if another review is not conducted.

Auckland’s rapid growth, particularly in the CBD has caused Council to reassess the now uneven numbers of people each Councillor represents.

The ratio of people to elected member in a ward should not vary from the average across the whole of Auckland by more than 10 per cent. This is to ensure “fair and effective representation for individuals and communities”. The Waitematā and Gulf Ward currently has 43.73% more than the average, which is the primary reason for the proposed boundary adjustment.

In order for it to comply with the 10 per cent rule, it is proposed to move the communities of Parnell and Newmarket from Waitematā and Gulf Ward to the Ōrākei Ward and move part of Elerslie and the community between College Road and the Glen Innes Railway Station from Ōrākei to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward

The boundary of the Local Boards would remain unchanged, thus Parnell would still be under the Waitematā Local Board.

PARNELL FEEDBACK

We are very supportive of Parnell and Newmarket being in the same Ward.

Parnell and Newmarket have a symbiotic relationship, mostly as a result of transport corridors. While Parnell is a Town Centre and Newmarket a Metropolitan centre, we share access via a main arterial road corridor into the city as well as a railway link. We are both considered on the city fringe and thus also share common frustrations when most of council...
infrastructure funding is devoted to the City Centre. Another commonality we share, is that a large portion of our demographic patronage comes from suburbs currently in the Ōrākei Ward.

We would question why The Domain has been proposed to remain with the City Centre, for the same noted challenges around transport and access, which it shares with both Parnell and Newmarket.

Our relationship with the Waitematā Local Board is of importance. In the last few years, Parnell has focussed its intent on building relationships with the Waitematā Local Board and lobbying for a Local Area Plan and were gratified when the draft of the Parnell Plan was supported by the Local Board. We are in the formative stages of this important piece of work, which we envisage will realise several of our long held ambitions for Parnell and provide a long-term plan to address lack of infrastructure funding as well as connectivity in Parnell and it is of utmost importance that we do not loose support and impetus at this stage, due to changes stimulated by local elections.

CONCLUSION

We understand the need for the boundary changes and reasons the current proposal has been tabled. In the interest of our members, we need to work closely with local government to secure the best future for Parnell, so look forward to the outcome in which both the Ward Councillors and Local Board representatives will assist us in making Parnell the most sought after city fringe precinct in which to do business.

Cheryl Adamson
General Manager
Parnell Business Association
cheryl@parnell.net.nz

Parnell Business Association, submission to the consultation on Waitematā and Gulf Ward boundary changes, Sept 2018
Waitemata Boundary Objection August 2018

1. I strongly oppose Option 1, the Waitemata proposal to move Grey Lynn streets running southwest of Surrey Cres and Westmere/Coxes Bay/Western Springs to the west of Richmond Rd to the Eden-Albert-Roskill ward. A ward boundary along Surrey Cres and Richmond Rd divides communities of interest, their recreational and commercial activities, and destroys community identity and cohesion.

Grey Lynn/Westmere/Coxes Bay/Herne Bay/St Mary’s Bay/ Freemans Bay/Ponsonby, Newton and Arch Hill are part of a historic and diverse community of suburbs that share common retail, recreation, cultural and other infrastructure and resources. Memberships and participation at local sporting and cultural facilities are drawn largely from the wider areas of the present ward.

The proposal to divest Waitemata of its western corner will alienate a significant part of that community and remove governance of critical local assets from its local voting base. Decisions impacting on sports clubs, cultural and educational facilities will no longer be made locally, but will be administered from the distant Albert-Eden-Roskill ward sprawling far to the west and south, with no affinity to Western Bays’ residents and primary stakeholders.

The boundary change splits Grey Lynn and West Lynn shopping areas between two wards, and removes Grey Lynn Library, Grey Lynn and St Josephs Primary schools, Western Springs College, two local churches, Ponsonby Rugby and Western Springs Football clubs, Hawkes Sea Scouts, Western Springs Park and outer fields, Seddon Fields and Meola Reef, TAPAC and local performing arts facilities from their historic and predominant contributing catchments.

Meola Reef, MOTAT and park greenspaces form a natural boundary for the Grey Lynn/Westmere/Coxes Bay catchment and SH16 another natural boundary between Grey Lynn/Western Springs. These areas are suburban and will grow less intensively than more urban areas of the city and ward. They should all remain within the Waitemata boundary.

2. I support the change to move Newton/Eden Tce area south of SH16 motorway to the Eden-Albert-Roskill ward. They were historically part of Eden-Albert ward, are physically divided from Waitemata and logically should be reunited with the Kingsland, Western Springs catchments and the community infrastructure and resources they commonly share.

3. I support the move of Parnell and Newmarket to Oakei with the addition of Grafton. The Grafton community has always been aligned and focussed toward Parnell/Newmarket and was historically part of Oakei (old Hobson) Ward, along with the Auckland Domain. Grafton has much less affinity with the redrawn Waitemata ward, and SH16 and the Strand motorway gully form a natural boundary for all three suburbs from the Waitemata (city) area.

4. I strongly support a change to Local Government (Auckland) Act to restore equity to Auckland and allow for fair and effective representation as required by the Local Government Act. The inconsistency of the Local Government (Auckland) Act and its inability to review levels of representation as allowed by other councils, is being increasingly highlighted with intensification and inner-city residential growth. Higher representation ratios on the governing body will drive greater misalignment between ward and board boundaries, particularly evident in the Waitemata catchment. Auckland Council needs the legislative flexibility to preserve communities of interest while still retaining fair and effective representation as required by the Act.

Penny Sefuiva, Grey Lynn, penny@sefuiva.co.nz
Auckland City Council (Western Bays) 1992-2007
M 021 242 0863
Submission on proposed boundary changes to Ōrākei ward

Introduction

Our submission is in support of the proposed changes to the Ōrākei ward boundaries.

While we would have preferred to see the former boundaries remain, in particular common boundaries with the Ōrākei Local Board, we accept the reasons for the proposed changes.

About the Submitter

This submission is made by the committee of the Stonefields Residents Association (“SRA”) on behalf of residents of Stonefields. The SRA is an incorporated society with a committee elected annually by residents at its AGM. It has 550 members within the suburb of Stonefields.

In order to inform residents of proposed boundary changes and solicit feedback, we posted the changes to our widely-read Facebook page (800 followers) and on our website, and we invited Councillor Simpson to speak on the subject to the 80 residents present at the SRA’s AGM in August 2018.

In each forum, residents appeared to be generally supportive and raised no concerns regarding the proposed boundary changes. If the proposal had seen Stonefields removed from Ōrākei, we are confident that residents, like the committee, would have opposed this.

Submission in favour of proposal

1. The committee of the SRA is generally supportive of the Ōrākei ward boundary changes as proposed.
2. We would like to explicitly confirm our support of changes in respect of Stonefields and its continuing inclusion in Ōrākei ward.
3. Stonefields is a new, master-planned suburb with a very strong sense of community. This is fostered by the design of the suburb and its attractiveness to a range of residents, from younger families who are drawn by the quality housing, safe neighbourhood and highly-regarded school, to older “downsizers”, many of whom
have moved from within the Ōrākei ward or nearby suburbs. It has the second highest median income in the Ōrākei ward (just behind St Heliers) and its residents are extensive users of the community, educational and business services, transport and recreational facilities within the ward.

4. We believe this character and usage of services provides strong support for its inclusion in the Ōrākei ward where representation can be fully aligned to our residents’ interests.

Opposition to alternative scenarios

We are aware that there could be alternative boundary options that would affect Stonefields, in particular options that would involve moving all of Stonefields out of Ōrākei into the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki subdivision.

We would oppose this on the basis that:

1. It would move representation for Stonefields away from the services, facilities and networks that residents use extensively, to a ward with much lower usage and fewer connections to residents.
2. Stonefields has a strong and consistent community character as noted above which fits well with other communities in the Ōrākei ward.
3. While the current proposal splits representation for some suburbs—which we accept is not ideal—it reinstates it elsewhere, for instance in now including all of Remuera in Ōrākei.
4. Where splits in suburbs are proposed such as St Johns or Ellerslie, the characters and the locations of these areas are more closely aligned to Tāmaki than is Stonefields, supporting their inclusion in Tāmaki.
5. Indeed, in respect of location, the maunga and the walls of the former quarry create a natural southern barrier for Stonefields residents. This perhaps partly explains why there are fewer connections and lower use of facilities south of the mountain by residents.

Contact details

Submitted on behalf of the Stonefields Residents Association, Inc

by Martin Taylor

Chairman, Stonefields Residents Association, Inc

10 September 2018

community@stonefields.org.nz
10 September 2018

E-mail: representationreview@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Submission on Ward boundary changes proposed by Auckland City Council

Every six years, councils throughout New Zealand must review their representation arrangements, including whether their wards properly reflect their populations.

The outcome of the review applies at the next local body election (2019)

Auckland currently has 13 wards; Albany, Albert-Eden-Roskill, Franklin, Howick, Manukau, Manurewa-Papakura, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, North Shore, Ōrākei, Rodney, Waitākere, Waitomatā and Gulf, and Whau.

An Auckland Council review of the ratio of population to number of elected members showed four wards did not comply with the 10% (more or less than the average) guideline: Manurewa-Papakura, Ōrākei, Rodney, and Waitomatā and Gulf. The guideline states that:

The Waitomatā and Gulf Ward population differs from the average per member by 43 per cent.

In order for it to comply with the 10% rule, it is proposed to:

- move the communities of Parnell and Newmarket from Waitomatā and Gulf Ward to the Ōrākei Ward
- move part of Ellerslie and the community between College Road and the Glen Innes Railway Station from Ōrākei to the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Ward
- move the communities of Westmere, west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace from Waitomatā and Gulf Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward
- move small areas of Onehunga and Royal Oak to become part of the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward
- extended the Whau Ward’s eastern boundary to encompass a small area of Mount Roskill that was previously in the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward.
St Mary’s Bay Association Inc

The St Mary’s Bay Association Inc (SMBA) represents the interests and viewpoints of its members, residents of the suburb of St Mary’s Bay, on a range of issues. The suburb of St Mary’s Bay adjoins Ponsonby, Herne Bay, Wynyard Quarter and the Westhaven marina, and forms part of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward of Auckland Council.

The SMBA contends that recent and ongoing population movements in the Waitemata and Gulf Ward create exceptional circumstances regarding the 10% ratio. In order to consider (a) effective representation of communities of interest and (b) fair representation, these exceptional circumstances should be taken into account. Of particular interest is the inner city and the number of “electors” within that growing population.

The City Centre has become a primary residential zone and the principal focus of the Auckland Council’s strategy of population intensification. The urban subdivision of the ward contains by far the highest number of non-citizen residents in New Zealand, with a high concentration of international students, long-staying visitors and transient temporary work permit holders.

The total population of the ward is now 119,100 people. In terms of representation it is important to bear in mind the number of electors in the ward, not simply the number of people. The total number of electors in the Waitematā & Gulf ward is 60,685, from a total population of 119,000. Thus, only 51% of the ward’s population is entitled to vote in council and other local body elections. This is the lowest percentage of any of the 13 wards. By comparison, in Orakei Ward 72% (65,339) of its 91,500 population is entitled to vote and in Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward, which has two elected members, 67% of people are entitled to vote, (population 114,303 and 57,152 electors per member); in Albany 70% (59,286) of residents (84,900) may vote. Further, the ratio of electors to population Auckland-wide is almost 66%. (Population 1,657,200, electors 1,085,520.)

In terms of electors per member Waitemata and Gulf has a lower ratio of electors per member (51%) than Orakei (72%), which is the highest of any of the 13 wards. Therefore, the council proposal to move meshblocks of electors from Waitemata and Gulf and add them to Orakei ward will further distort these percentages.

Note: In 2010 in Waitemata and Gulf the ratio of electors to population was 58%. Since then, the population has increased by 40,000 residents but the number of registered electors has increased by only 14,900, therefore the ratio of electors to population has fallen to 51%, possibly due to the city centre’s very large and rapidly growing non-citizen, non permanent resident and likely transient population.

The SMBA submits that the relocation of the historic “village” suburbs of Parnell and Newmarket into the Orakei Ward and the small “village” communities of Westmere, west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace into the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward is likely to exacerbate the already very low ratio between population and electors in the inner city area of the Waitemata and Gulf Ward. The number of registered electors in the historic suburbs mentioned above is relatively high, but very low in the CBD. By leaving the CBD untouched and shifting established communities, like pieces on a chessboard, into other wards, the population/electors ratio in the Waitemata and Gulf Ward could fall even lower than the current already low 51%.
In addition, a strong community of interest based on a common historical and geographic identity has built up, especially over the last eight years, reinforced by the identical boundaries of the Waitematā Local Board Area and the Waitematā & Gulf Ward.

The St Mary’s Bay Association submits that:

- The Auckland council proposal to shift Parnell and Newmarket from Waitematā and Gulf Ward to the Ōrākei Ward, and the proposal to move the communities of Westmere, west of Surrey Crescent and Eden Terrace from the Waitematā and Gulf Ward to the Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward, does not comply with either effective representation of communities of interest or fair representation.

The St Mary’s Bay Association requests that:

- Auckland Council reconsider the disadvantages of the above approach and reconsider the unique and special nature of these “village” inner city areas and the CBD area. To insist that they comply with the “10% rule” will, in fact, achieve only unfairness of representation, lower voter turn out and dilution of community spirit. The 10% rule should be based on numbers of electors, not population.

Signed on behalf of SMBA by

David Abbott

Chair

St Mary's Bay Association Inc.

11 September 2018

Address for service:

PO Box 47-376, Ponsonby, Auckland 1144, or
dabbott@xtra.co.nz and wendymof@xtra.co.nz
Grafton Residents Association

Submission on Electoral Boundaries and Representation

September 2018

Contact:
Richard Leckinger
cchair@grafton.org.nz
+64 21 911 755
Introduction

The Grafton Residents Association (GRA) was established in 1962 to represent the views of residents and ratepayers to Auckland City Council and its descendants.

Grafton East and Grafton West are both census areas dominated by a mix of resident students and professionals in a long established historical neighbourhood. The student population skews Grafton well down the deprivation index because of their low income, but its population is highly educated and upwardly mobile.

This recent google map is a pretty good indication of historical and current public conceptions of Grafton’s community of interest, and highlights the historic damage inflicted by Auckland’s motorways. Grafton is bounded by Symonds Street to the west; Mount Eden & Boston Roads to the south; Park Road & the Domain to the east.

![Modern day conception of Grafton.](image)

As a community of interest, Grafton fits appropriately within the Waitematā and Gulf Ward and Waitematā Local Board areas along with similar communities that surround Auckland’s Domain.

We wish to be heard orally in support of this submission if this is possible. Please contact our Chair Richard Leckinger at chair@grafton.org.nz or on +64 21 911 755.

Executive Summary

The Grafton Residents Association (GRA) strongly opposes Proposal 1 in general and in particular the vivisection of our community of interest along the southern end of Waitematā and Gulf Ward.

Many parts of Proposal 1 will still require a sign off from the Local Government Commission for multiple Ward areas. GRA contends that it is better not to slice and dice the Waitematā and Gulf Ward when the real problem lies with the Super City legislation.

In practical terms Waitematā residents are not under-represented. If the southern third of Grafton is calved off into Albert-Eden, the electorate to representative ratio in the Ward will become even more
skewed, exacerbating what is arguably our over-representation. The proposed change in Grafton will remove established electors from the Ward, and leave the heavy concentration of students and non-electors within it, exacerbating the problem.

The solution to this issue is turning the Waitematā and Gulf Ward into a two councillor Ward after the flawed Super City legislation is aligned with the rest of New Zealand. It is preposterous that the fastest growing centre in New Zealand is forbidden to adjust it’s representation in line with its population.

GRA would like to incorporate by reference all the points in Cr Mike Lee’s response to the recommendations of the representation review.

GRA supports Proposal 2 because it is based on the very principals that make Proposal 1 repugnant. Having Wards align closely (or identically) with Local Boards makes huge sense and keeps voter confusion and election costs contained. If the affected communities in Manukau agree with this proposal, then so does GRA.

GRA does not have a grasp of the communities of interest in the Rodney area and cannot comment on Proposal 3.

Assuming the proposal to rename Great Barrier Local Board has the support of it’s residents, including and with particular regard to the wishes of Ngāti Rehua – Ngātiwai ki Aotea, GRA supports Proposal 4.

**Proposal 1**

The Grafton Residents Association (GRA) strongly opposes Proposal 1 in general and in particular the vivisection of our community of interest along the southern end of Waitematā and Gulf Ward. This proposal re-inflicts the wounds Grafton suffered in 1957 when the southern motorway cut through our community, and the further wounds inflicted as spaghetti junction expanded.

The contortions that the Waitematā and Gulf Ward and its immediate neighbours are being subject to are the tail wagging the dog. They are in response to a perceived fair representation issue that doesn’t fully exist. The real culprit is the flawed Super City legislation and it’s ideological opposition to allowing representation to grow with and reflect New Zealand’s fastest growing city.

GRA would like to incorporate by reference all the points in Cr Mike Lee’s response to the recommendations of the representation review. We all know that the best solution to this situation is a second councillor for the Waitematā and Gulf Ward. This would preserve the carefully considered communities of interest that the Local Government Commission mapped out in the form of our Local Boards.

Maintaining the alignment of the Wards and the Local Boards is the surest way to avoid confusion, costs, and maintain communities of interest. Given that Proposal 1 still requires exceptions from the Local Government Commission for several Wards, it would be better to preserve the status quo until the Super City legislation can be fixed.

This carve up is at odds with Auckland Council’s 2050 and 10 year LTP plans and the thriving communities strategies they incorporate.

Calling the southern third of Grafton “Eden Terrace” and moving it into Albert Eden separates us from two of our most active community churches and many of our historical landmarks, including the Grafton Library, now Galbraiths. It adds further insult by denying the existence of Newton, another community of interest that has almost completely disappeared under the motorway.
Map 1b was drawn lazily along the lines of the motorway, without consideration of communities of interest. It should be rejected. The vagaries of census meshblocks mean that a portion of Grafton north of the motorway, including a pocket park and a single town-house row on Carlton Gore Road will be removed to Albert Eden. How can this be explained to residents in any sensible way, and what will it cost to manage the electoral ballots for such bizarre boundaries? There are sound reasons why the Local Government Commission kept our community together within both the Waitetūa Ward and Board area.

Grafton identifies itself with the Auckland Domain, as do our neighbours in Newmarket, Parnell and Judges Bay. Together, we are a single community of interest long helmed to our commons – the Auckland Domain. For this reason we oppose the proposals in map 1c to move these communities out of the Waitetūa and Gulf Ward and into Ōrākei Ward.

s19V(1) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 requires that the Commission must ensure that the electors of the ward or constituency or subdivision receive fair representation, while only having regard to the population. There is a clear hierarchy of intention in these italicised words. Proposal 1 puts this hierarchy on its head, and makes a mess of a number of communities of interest in the process. Ironically, the logic presented in support of Proposal 2 supports our interpretation of this hierarchy.

Calving off a third of Grafton exacerbates the practical over-representation in Waitetūa, as what remains of Grafton is dense with non-elector and student populations, reducing effective and fair representation and dividing our community.

The complexity of these changes, precisely because they impact communities of interest, will sow confusion and will likely be a turn-off for voters, reducing turnout in next year’s elections.

Proposal 2

The oft repeated logic that splitting Manukau Ward along Local Board lines because they represent communities of interest plays right into GRA’s argument against Proposal 1. Local Boards were initially crafted along lines of communities of interest, and should continue to be so. We support the principals underpinning this proposal. Having Wards align closely (ideally identically) with Local Boards makes huge sense and keeps voter confusion and election costs contained. If the affected communities agree with this proposal, then so does GRA.

Proposal 3

GRA has no opinion about what constitutes communities of interest in the Rodney Local Board and cannot comment on this proposal.

Proposal 4

Assuming the proposal to rename Great Barrier Local Board has the support of it’s residents, including and with particular regard to the wishes of Ngāti Rehua – Ngātiwi ki Aotea, GRA supports this proposal.

Conclusion

In conclusion, GRA believes that Proposal 1 is deeply flawed and overcomplicates an issue that can best be resolved by aligning the Auckland Council legislation with the legislation governing all other local jurisdictions in New Zealand. As a waiver must be sought from the Commission regardless of the path chosen, it would be better to keep the communities aligned as the Commission itself intended.
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REPRESENTATION REVIEW – PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARY CHANGES IMPACTING NEWMARKET

Background:

Every six years, councils throughout New Zealand must review their representation arrangements, including whether their wards properly reflect their populations. Auckland Council is proposing changes to its ward and local board subdivision boundaries. The Council is obliged by the Local Electoral Act 2001 to ensure that the population of electors in each ward does not vary by more than 10% from the population of electors in all other Wards. The Waitemata and Gulf ward currently has 43.73% more than the average, which is the primary reason for the proposed boundary adjustment.

The review is designed to ensure the public interest is fairly represented on the council as ward populations grow or change over time.

Auckland Council is seeking feedback on its initial proposal.

Summary of Changes Affecting Newmarket:

The council proposes to change the ward boundary between the Waitemata and Gulf, and Orakei. The proposed change would not alter the boundary between the Waitemata and Orakei local boards. This change would mean that the Newmarket BID area will fall within the Orakei Ward, whereas it previously fell entirely within the Waitemata and Gulf ward area.
Our Feedback on this Proposal:

The NBA enjoys productive working relationships across the political spectrum in both wards at governing body, and local board levels. Taking on board the rationale for the changes, the NBA is supportive of the ward boundary proposal to shift Newmarket and Parnell into Orakei. Historically Newmarket has shared a synergy and alignment with Orakei and it seems a logical move. The material impact on the Newmarket precinct is minimal. Our understanding is that if this proposal doesn’t proceed, other changes may be imposed to address the population ratio imbalance. We feel this proposal would achieve a positive outcome.

Mark Knoff-Thomas
Chief Executive
Newmarket Business Association
To whom it may concern,

I live in the Waitemata Ward and am happy with boundary changes to join up with Orakei Ward. The communities on the boundary have such similar challenges and opportunities as the Orakei ward and will work well being considered and managed together.

Many thanks,
Ashleigh

We are two Auckland Ratepayers living in Grey Lynn

This submission is in response to the proposed ward boundary changes that directly affect areas of our immediate suburb, specifically Surrey Road shops and West Lynn shops.

We recognise the need for the changes and that it is a complex issue.

Our main concern is that the community of Grey Lynn will be divided.

A shopping area should be considered as a whole and the idea that a boundary divides shops on one side of the road from those on the other is not acceptable.

Both sides of Surrey Road shops should remain in the same ward as should West Lynn shops.

I would suggest the following as one amelioration:

To Mt Eden

Take the new border down Meola Road, take in the entire south side of Garnet Road, Old Mill Road and down the Bullock Track. This would leave most of Grey Lynn undivided but Westmere shops would all be in the same ward.

In addition, to add population, one could extend the line through William Denny to Fife Street, so that essentially all of the Westmere littoral would remain in the same ward. Indeed, if appropriate, you could add the Westmere sides of Warwick and Livingstone and draw the northern boundary along Kingston.

Thus essentially Westmere moves to Eden and Grey Lynn remains in Waitemata.

Otherwise, we support the recommendations of the GLRA.

Yours sincerely

Christopher and Louise Johnstone

Dear Board, I think your representation arrangements for the 2019 local elections (as outlined in the N.Z Herald) look reasonable and reasonably just.

Keep up the good work.

God bless

Regards

Dean Foster
Hello

This seems like a sensible and pragmatic proposed change, as that ward is huge. Splitting into 2 may ensure voters can select a candidate from each given ward, who should have an affinity with that ward, hopefully to best represent the views of the citizens of that smaller ward, as their issues may be different to the other newly divided half of the “old” Manukau ward.

Thanks for the opportunity

Don Howarth
Howick

Yes please we need split in the boundaries as the Electorate does

I am in favour of a split

(Hindu Heritage)

I wish to object to the proposed plan. The West Lynn and Grey Lynn communities will be severely affected by this boundary line. These communities and the schools and neighbours have a great dynamic. This was tested recently by the Auckland Transport flawed cycle way and bus stop changes. This proposal will tear the fabulous community literally in half. The boundary line running through Richmond Road and Surrey Crescent does not make sense at all. This is a supportive community, one many neighbours share and to split the business schoold, churches and vibrant community does not make sense.

Regards

Jane Jackson

To whom it may concern,

I would like the following to be passed on to the relevant body, as a late submission.

Despite a council process of public advertisement on 8 August, I only found out about the proposal to change ward boundaries because I bumped into someone in the street on Saturday 8th September, 3 days before submissions closed. I am disappointed that as an affected person, this information was not made readily accessible to me – but the way council communicates with its ratepayers is another issue…..

I want it made clear that I do not support the changes to the Waitemata ward boundary despite, on paper, the boundary being 43% rather than complying with the 10% rule. There are two main reasons I do not support this change:

First, the 43% is based on population count, but if you were to analyse the ward by electors, I believe you would find a high proportion of the people living within the ward are not electors. Intensification of the inner city, through apartment buildings, has skewed the population figures. Many of these apartments are occupied by international students on short-term visas who will never become electors. The rest of the ward should not be penalised for inner city intensification. What account has been taken of the fact that
continued intensification will mean we have to go through the same process again in the next 6-yearly review?

Secondly, but more importantly, the proposal to divide Waitemata ward by shearing everything west of Surrey Crescent/Richmond Rd t and moving it to the Albert/Eden/Roskill ward separates me from my community of interest – the same community of interest that was formally and legally recognised with the setting up of wards when the ‘super city’ was created, and also the community of interest that I engage with, shop with and, vote with on a day-to-day basis.

Jenni Percy

To whom it may concern,

As a Parnell resident, I strongly support Parnell joining Orakei Ward as part of a representation review.

I have always considered Parnell to have closer links to Remuera, Orakei and Mission Bay than with suburbs like Westmere and Waiheke Island.

Our family are enthusiastic participants in both Eastern Suburbs Associated Football Club and Parnell Cricket Club, which are located in Kohimarama and Remuera respectively. Parnell’s community of sporting interests are less so with the sports clubs of Westmere, Western Springs and Ponsonby.

Our shopping and family activity is far more likely to be centred around Orakei Ward than the CBD or west of the city. For example, grocery shopping in Eastridge, Remuera or Stonefields, the Remuera library and visiting retirement villages in Remuera.

Many Parnell children are educated in Remuera and other schools, and will use transport links of mutual importance to both Parnell and Remuera.

In short, I feel Parnell’s interests are located in Orakei Ward rather than Waitemata Ward.

Yours sincerely

Mara Bhatnagar

Should NOT be added into Orakei as it has its own unique history and culture as New Zealand’s first suburb Time will increase its population and there is no real cause to devolve its sense of history and place.

Sent from my iPhone Mary Barry & Tom Curham

Hi There,

Just wanted to voice my opinion on the boundary changes.

I live in the Waitemata Ward and am happy with boundary changes to join up with Orakei Ward.

Thanks,
Scott

Dear Sir

I understand the reasons for the proposed move of Parnell from Waitemata to Orakei. There is considerable community of interest between the areas and believe that the change would be positive.

However I am concerned that the Local Board boundaries are not part of this process. Having Local Boards aligned with ward boundaries makes sense for a number of reasons especially having clear lines of communication between communities, representatives and the council. With this non-alignment Councillors have to deal with more than one Local Board and Local Boards have multiple Councillors covering their area. This is dysfunctional to say the least. As such I suggest that Local Board boundaries also be amended prior to the next election cycle.

Also I would like to suggest that Ward and Local Board names should not be named after just one of the suburbs in the area. Waitemata is fine but Orakei distances the residents of other suburbs in the area.

I realise that submissions have formally closed on this but would appreciate consideration of the above as a late submission.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Goodman
REPRESENTATION REVIEW
COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PUKETAPAPA LOCAL BOARD

The following comments are in support of the practical application locally of the resolutions passed unanimously by the Board at its May Business meeting and conveyed to the Political Working Party by Chair Harry Doig and Member David Holm at its 21 September meeting.

Firstly, we would like to congratulate all you councillors on being the most willing horses in the history of democratic representation in New Zealand. On average you are responsible for regional decisions affecting over 80,000 people each. This is more than double the average constituency of all other regional councils in New Zealand except Environment Canterbury which has an average population per member of 43,700 and of course is currently unelected.

You would also be well aware that in our city you each have significantly more responsibilities than regional councils. Maybe supercities breed superwomen and supermen!

We may appear to be overlooking Your Worship the Mayor who now faces a constituency with 1.65 million people and much faster population growth than most. He also is a willing horse, but he does enjoy a substantial team of trainers, jockeys and stablehands.

There is no way in which the current legislative arrangements for Auckland can be described as fair representation. This is particularly ironic when you make comparisons with our meticulous arrangements for electing MPs designed to ensure that every vote including those in Maori seats has very nearly equal value. The political parties who set up the cap of 20 councillors for Auckland and have resisted your requests to adjust it can only be labelled as hypocritical. They have made Auckland voters second class compared with other Kiwi voters.

However it is not just the 20 councillor cap that is shortchanging some parts of Auckland. The bizarre hybrid of two member and one member wards has created more anomalies. The 14 of you who are proposed to represent populations with 2017 estimates of between 148,900 and 177,800 have almost impossible tasks to be accessible to your people and to focus on all their varying communities of interest. Yes you can work in pairs, which at present in many cases is aided by having shared a political ticket (but not in the case of Albert Eden Roskill). However, all your constituents are likely to think that your job is to represent all of them. This means that they have to compete furiously to get your attention or they give up and give Auckland Council very low rankings for effectiveness.

A fair comparison is made with MPs in parliamentary electorates each of which services around 60,000 people, each with more resources than councillors. In Albert Eden Roskill we now have three general electorate MPs – Jacinda Ardern, David Seymour and Michael Wood and Maori constituents can approach Peeni Henare. On top of that list MPs Melissa Lee, David Parker, Paul Goldsmith and Parmjeet Parmar have offices in or close to our area. All up, there are eight offices available for public access on national issues in our ward as against two councillors based in the CBD for regional issues.
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COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PUKE TAPAPA LOCAL BOARD

The Local Government Commission when setting wards for 2010 stated that two member wards were favoured to avoid splitting communities of interest, minimise the impact of boundary changes and provide more diversity of representation. However, it also acknowledged that “large wards may mean that representatives are too remote to effectively engage with local communities and the cost of campaigning may be prohibitive for many candidates.” The truth of the last point is likely to be evidenced when the candidate spending declarations for the Howick by-election are revealed and can be compared with those for the Maungakiekie – Tamaki by-election.

We would argue that in many parts of Auckland, especially Albert Eden Roskill, the disadvantages of large wards cited above much outweigh any advantages. The commission in 2009 did accept that this was the case for Orakei and Maungakiekie – Tamaki and split them. This has proved a wise decision, disproving the argument that two member wards provide more diverse representation than one member wards.

The second supposed advantage of two member wards “to minimise the impact of boundary changes” has in this review been overturned by the massive difference in population trends between Waitakere and Gulf ward and the average. The Political Working Party has applied this concept by concentrating all the adjustment for the Waitakere population increase on to the four isthmus wards. This means that they all are now over quota by 17.2%, 15.9%, 10.4% and 7.3% while in the rest of the city only Waitakere ward (6.5%) is over quota. The isthmus under representation contrasts with over representation in Rodney (22.4% under quota) Franklin 10% under and Howick 9.4%. A vote in Rodney is 38% more valuable than one in Albert Eden Puketapapa. In other words, when deciding how to elect local MPs Parliament has clearly decided that the disruption caused by boundary changes should not be an obstacle to achieving fair representation so why apply so rigorously resist such changes here?

Puketapapa’s business meeting resolution included acceptance that ward and local board boundaries could no longer coincide if fair representation was to be achieved. We did not therefore oppose the initial proposal by the Working Party to move Lynfield (part of our board area) into the Whau ward.

This leaves the issue of communities of interest. Most submitters in this review have emphasised the importance of this, in some cases suggesting that fair representation for so called transient members of their community should be disregarded in deciding on ward populations. Donald Trump would applaud.

Some parts of the city see communities of interest as being very broad as is the case in Manukau, justified by their ethnic concentration. Others, notably Rodney, highlight differences from near neighbours like Orewa. The Working Party’s final report was receptive to both views.

It should be noted that communities of interest do not need to be catered for solely through ward boundaries. Local Boards and their subdivisions are a key focus for communities of interest. These need not be tied to population numbers in the same way as wards. Puketapapa’s population is now very close to Rodney’s 64,000 but we have six local board members versus nine for them. This is not begrudged given the size of the Rodney area and travelling distances.
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COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PUKE'ATAPAPA LOCAL BOARD

In unanimously resolving in May in favour of single member wards and not tying ward boundaries to local board areas the Puketapapa Local Board gave priority to fair representation over communities of interest. However under the current proposal we would be betraying the interests of our community if we continue to support a ward which could easily elect two councillors who are identify more closely with the other two thirds of the ward population.

When it became apparent that the Working Party would promote one member wards only in Manukau, Puketapapa Local Board Member David Holm decided to submit on why this might be more appropriate for Albert Eden Roskill. His two page paper on this is attached to the minutes of the final Working Party meeting. It identifies four key differences between the western and southern parts of Albert Eden Roskill and the eastern and northern suburbs. These are: - socioeconomic status linked to residential property values; involvement in major housing and transport redevelopments (likely to require crucial resident inputs into council decisions), population trends and environmental focus.

It also points out that all four wards neighbouring Albert Eden Roskill are single member. Being single member is helping councillors in those wards mitigate the extra workload issues caused by being over quota. Taking this into account our ward’s representation is not second class or third class but fourth class.

David Holm’s suggestion for boundaries of two new wards (which fitted neatly into the original Working Party proposal for Albert Eden Roskill boundaries) would need to be altered now that Westmere is proposed to return to Waitakaruru and Gulf and Lynfield to Albert Eden Puketapapa. We are grateful for these changes but the major difference in communities of interest in the two member ward remains. However, it need not be too difficult to subdivide the ward without any more changes to neighbouring wards. The logical partners for Puketapapa in the western and southern ward are parts of the Owairaka subdivision of the Albert Eden Local Board which share the Oakley Creek (Te Auaungatuku) catchment, have similar socioeconomic profiles and are also involved in the big Housing New Zealand developments. Puketapapa and Albert Eden Local Boards have worked closely together on these issues.

We therefore request you to add the following to your recommendation to the Local Government Commission:-

request the Local Government Commission to investigate differences in communities of interest in the proposed Albert Eden Puketapapa ward with a view to facilitate the election of councillors each able to focus on the varying needs and issues of residents in different localities. This investigation should identify whether the 177,300 population would be better represented in two single member wards.

We appreciate that the Working Party has been tasked with a very onerous job because of the draconian 20 member cap which they cannot now alter. However opting largely for the status quo in a dynamic city like Auckland is not good enough. The Council should redouble its efforts to persuade MPs that Aucklanders should be treated equally with the rest of New Zealand as they are in parliamentary elections.
Key Arguments For Two One Member Wards For Albert Eden Roskill

1. The Population to be served is not provided with fair representation.

The proposal for two councillors to represent 182,400 people requires excessive workloads. This is mostly caused by the limit on the number of Auckland councillors imposed by current legislation. The only other constituencies larger than this in the country are mayoral constituencies in larger cities. However mayors receive access to much greater resources to service their communities than do Auckland councillors. Electorate members of Parliament are also provided with more resources and have constituencies averaging around 65,000 people.

2. The Costs of Campaigning in this sized ward reduces voters’ choices.

Candidates willing to stand for wards of 90,000 population will be deterred by the extra time required and financial burden of trying to reach twice as many voters.

3. Population forecasts mean that under-representation is likely to increase by the time of the next representation review.

Council local board population projections show growth rates for the five isthmus boards from 2018 to 2028 ranging from 16 to 26%. The three wards already in breach of the stipulated 10% range for representation (Albert Eden Roskill, Orakei and Maungakiekie-Tamaki) are all on the isthmus. Housing New Zealand’s largest redevelopment plan in Auckland envisages 10,000 extra houses in Mt. Roskill in the next ten years. There are also large housing projects in Owairaka and planned for the Unitec site.

4. There is a large divergence of socio-economic conditions within the ward. This is exacerbated by the addition of areas from the Waitemata and Gulf ward.

The divergence is well illustrated by the Property Report in the NZ Herald of 3 September compiled from QV.co.nz data. It shows median values in the northern and eastern parts of the ward as at 31 July of $1,861,150 for Epsom, $1,846,400 for Westmere, $1,488,550 for Pt. Chevalier, $1,435,450 for Mt. Eden and $1,141,350 for Kingsland. In the western and southern parts of the ward Hillsborough has the highest median value of $1,119,750 followed by Sandringham with $1,119,200, Mt. Albert with $1,114,600, Lynfield with $1,071,400, Three Kings with $1,019,500 and Mt. Roskill with $983,800. A division of the ward between North and East and South and West would greatly reduce the chance of having two councillors both of whom have little understanding of the needs of up to half the population of Albert Eden Roskill.

5. The southern and western parts of the present ward are the subject of major redevelopments which will require focused consultation with residents.

Major projects under way in these areas include housing projects in Roskill South, Owairaka and Unitec, light rail and commercial developments around May and Stoddard Roads. The councillor representing these areas will need strong local connections. Epsom and Westmere have quite different priorities.
6. There are major environmental issues which could be better dealt with separately.

The likely boundary between two wards would place the whole of the Oakley Creek catchment within the western and southern ward. Members of the local boards in this catchment already work together on major upgrades and would benefit from having a councillor familiar with the area. The northern parts of the present ward have a strong interest in the Waitemata Harbour while the southern parts most want to preserve the largest native bush area on the isthmus and continue to restore the Manukau Harbour.

7. The four wards neighbouring Albert Eden Roskill are all single member.

While I believe that single member wards would be best across the whole city, there is a stronger case for the isthmus plus Whau as these wards have had to absorb the full impact of the exceptional population increase in Waitemata. Having single member wards helps mitigate the impact of this in terms of workload and campaigning issues. The arguments used by the Local Government Commission to split Orakei and Maungakiekie-Tamaki into single member wards from the 2010 election apply equally to Albert Eden Roskill.

8. The boundaries of two wards are easy to draw.

I have checked the 2013 populations needed to provide two similarly sized wards within the boundaries now proposed for Albert Eden Roskill. This can be achieved by adding the Waterview, Springleigh, Owairaka and Sandringham Census areas and the Royal Oak area moved from Maungakiekie-Tamaki to Puketapapa (excluding the portion going to the Whau ward). The other ward would be made up of Westmere, the other areas moving out of the Waitemata and Gulf ward), Pt. Chevalier, Kingsland, Mt. Albert Central, St. Lukes and the Maungawhau subdivision.

9. There is likely to be strong support from the Governing Body.

I have had opportunities to speak directly to the Mayor and seven councillors, six of whom represent two member wards. They are almost unanimous in showing a preference for one member wards. I appreciate that there are different communities of interest in some other wards which I am not qualified to comment on.

I hope that Auckland Council will continue to strongly advocate for the removal of the 20 councillor limit which treats Auckland as a second class community despite it accounting for half New Zealand’s population growth. An interesting comparison is the figures for the Waikato Regional Council which for its representation review has 14 councillors for 465,000 people - an average of 33,000 or 40% of Auckland’s 82,860.

David Holm
19 September 2018.