

**ORDINARY MEETING
OF
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA**

Time: 9:30am
Date: Tuesday, 12 October 2021
Venue: Virtual meeting

MEMBERSHIP

Mayor Foster (Chair)
Deputy Mayor Free (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Calvert
Councillor Condie
Councillor Day
Councillor Fitzsimons
Councillor Foon
Councillor Matthews
Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Pannett
Councillor Paul
Councillor Rush
Councillor Sparrow
Councillor Woolf
Councillor Young

Have your say!

You can make a short presentation to the Councillors at this meeting. Please let us know by noon the working day before the meeting. You can do this either by phoning 04-803-8334, emailing public.participation@wcc.govt.nz or writing to Democracy Services, Wellington City Council, PO Box 2199, Wellington, giving your name, phone number, and the issue you would like to talk about. All Council and committee meetings are livestreamed on our YouTube page. This includes any public participation at the meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
12 OCTOBER 2021

| Business | Page No. |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. Meeting Conduct | 5 |
| 1.1 Karakia | 5 |
| 1.2 Apologies | 5 |
| 1.3 Announcements by the Mayor | 5 |
| 1.4 Conflict of Interest Declarations | 5 |
| 1.5 Confirmation of Minutes | 5 |
| 1.6 Items not on the Agenda | 5 |
| 1.7 Public Participation | 6 |
| 2. General Business | 7 |
| 2.1 Representation Review Oral Hearings | 7 |

1. Meeting Conduct

1.1 Karakia

The Chairperson will open the meeting with a karakia.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Whakataka te hau ki te uru, | Cease oh winds of the west |
| Whakataka te hau ki te tonga. | and of the south |
| Kia mākinakina ki uta, | Let the bracing breezes flow, |
| Kia mātaratara ki tai. | over the land and the sea. |
| E hī ake ana te atākura. | Let the red-tipped dawn come |
| He tio, he huka, he hauhū. | with a sharpened edge, a touch of frost, |
| Tihei Mauri Ora! | a promise of a glorious day |

At the appropriate time, the following karakia will be read to close the meeting.

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Unuhia, unuhia, unuhia ki te uru tapu nui | Draw on, draw on |
| Kia wātea, kia māmā, te ngākau, te tinana, | Draw on the supreme sacredness |
| te wairua | To clear, to free the heart, the body |
| I te ara takatū | and the spirit of mankind |
| Koia rā e Rongo, whakairia ake ki runga | Oh Rongo, above (symbol of peace) |
| Kia wātea, kia wātea | Let this all be done in unity |
| Āe rā, kua wātea! | |

1.2 Apologies

The Chairperson invites notice from members of:

1. Leave of absence for future meetings of the Wellington City Council; or
2. Apologies, including apologies for lateness and early departure from the meeting, where leave of absence has not previously been granted.

1.3 Announcements by the Mayor

1.4 Conflict of Interest Declarations

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

1.5 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2021 will be put to the Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council for confirmation.

1.6 Items not on the Agenda

The Chairperson will give notice of items not on the agenda as follows:

Matters Requiring Urgent Attention as Determined by Resolution of the Wellington City Council

The Chairperson shall state to the meeting.

1. The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
2. The reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

The item may be allowed onto the agenda by resolution of the Wellington City Council.

Minor Matters relating to the General Business of the Wellington City Council

The Chairperson shall state to the meeting that the item will be discussed, but no resolution, decision, or recommendation may be made in respect of the item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting of the Wellington City Council for further discussion.

1.7 Public Participation

A maximum of 60 minutes is set aside for public participation at the commencement of any meeting of the Council or committee that is open to the public. Under Standing Order 31.2 a written, oral or electronic application to address the meeting setting forth the subject, is required to be lodged with the Chief Executive by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the meeting concerned, and subsequently approved by the Chairperson.

2. General Business

REPRESENTATION REVIEW ORAL HEARINGS

Kōrero taunaki

Summary of considerations

Purpose

1. This report asks Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council to hear the oral submissions of submitters on the Council's 2021 representation review initial proposal.

Strategic alignment with community wellbeing outcomes and priority areas

Aligns with the following strategies and priority areas:

- Sustainable, natural eco city
- People friendly, compact, safe and accessible capital city
- Innovative, inclusive and creative city
- Dynamic and sustainable economy
- Functioning, resilient and reliable three waters infrastructure
- Affordable, resilient and safe place to live
- Safe, resilient and reliable core transport infrastructure network
- Fit-for-purpose community, creative and cultural spaces
- Accelerating zero-carbon and waste-free transition
- Strong partnerships with mana whenua

Strategic alignment with priority objective areas from Long-term Plan 2021–2031

Relevant Previous decisions

These oral submissions relate to the representation review initial proposal which was agreed by Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council on 26 August 2021.

Financial considerations

- Nil Budgetary provision in Annual Plan / Long-term Plan Unbudgeted \$X

Risk

- Low Medium High Extreme

| | |
|------------|---|
| Author | Sean Johnson, Senior Democracy Advisor |
| Authoriser | Jennifer Parker, Democracy Services Manager |

Taunakitanga

Officers' Recommendations

Officers recommend the following motion

That the Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council:

1. Receive the information and thank the submitters.

Kōrerorero

Discussion

2. Wellington City Council consulted on the Representation Review 2021 initial proposal from 4 September 2021 to 4 October 2021.
3. Submitters were asked if they would like to make an oral submission to Council.
4. Oral submitters' submissions have been attached.

Ngā mahinga e whai ake nei


Next actions

5. Following these hearings, a report for a final proposal on the 2021 representation review is due to come to Te Kaunihera o Pōneke | Council on 28 October 2021.

Attachments

Attachment 1. Oral Submissions [↓](#) 

Page 9

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
|  | Respondent No: 21 | Responded At: Sep 26, 2021 17:02:49 pm |
| | Login: Max Shierlaw | Last Seen: Sep 25, 2021 22:46:35 pm |
| | Email: [REDACTED] | IP Address: [REDACTED] |

Q1. Do you support the proposal for Council representation? No

Q2. If yes, why do you support the proposal for Council representation?

not answered

Q3. If no, why do you not support the proposal for Council representation?

The Council should be elected at large given that the Maori ward is an at large election.

Q4. Do you support the proposal for community board representation? No

Q5. If yes, why do you support the proposal for community board representation?

not answered

Q6. If no, why do you not support the proposal for community board representation?

not answered

Q7. Do you have any additional comments?

The proposal has been selected because it suits Councillors who clearly see it as their best means of getting re-elected.

Q8. Do you have a file you would like to upload to support your submission? Upload it here.

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/8bf29cbf6f4c9fd261d6cb02c34c399f52ba5732/original/1632628837/6aa9792e1f26930954c5ad8ab07870e5_SUBMISSION_TO_THE_WELLINGTON_CITY_COUNCIL_REPRESENTATION_REVIEW.docx?1632628837

Q9. Please provide your full name: Max Shierlaw

Q10. Please provide your address:

not answered

Q11. Please provide your phone number if you wish to make an oral submission. this is so we can arrange a time with you.

[REDACTED]

Q12. Please provide your email address:

[REDACTED]

Q13. I am making this submission: as an individual, or

Q14. If you are making a submission on behalf of an organisation, please provide their name below: not answered

Q15. I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillor Yes

Q16. I am connected to Wellington because I prefer not to say

Q17. What gender do you identify with? Male

SUBMISSION TO THE WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATION REVIEW

RECOMMENDED SYSTEM:

The Council has failed to put forward the most logical representation option given its decision to establish a Maori ward. The Maori ward is an at large ward, so for consistency and fair and effective representation for the rest of the community, one general ward at elected at large should be implemented. The size of the Council should remain unchanged, so thirteen councillors should be elected at large in a general ward.

This would enable a voter on the general ward to be able to vote for all thirteen councillors rather than just two or three as they do at present. A vote would have a much bigger say in the makeup of the Council which would be welcomed by the electorate.

COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST:

While advocating a ward based electoral system, the Council does not appear to have turned its mind to the Local Government Commission's guidelines on Communities of Interest:

“Community of interest’ describes it as a three-dimensional concept:

- perceptual – a sense of belonging to a clearly defined area or locality
- functional – the ability to meet with reasonable economy the community's requirements for comprehensive physical and human services
- political – the ability of the elected body to represent the interests and reconcile the conflicts of all its members.”

Perception:

I submit that most people who live in Wellington identify themselves as living or belonging to Wellington. The capital city encompasses the belonging of most Wellingtonians. Many Wellingtonians do not work in the Ward in which they reside, a significant number travel to the CBD.

Clearly Wellington's ward system does not reflect a sense of belonging.

Functional:

Wellington's hub is the CBD. Much of the City's business activity is located there, as well as the Region's entertainment.

Facilities such as the Michael Fowler Centre, the Town Hall when it is renovated, the St James Theatre when it is renovated and the convention Centre currently under construction are facilities are the benefit of the entire City. The Council's economic strategy centres around the CBD so what the Council is doing there is of interest to all Wellingtonians, not just those in the Lambton ward.

Many secondary students live outside of the ward where they attend school. Wellington Boys & Girls Colleges attract students from all over the city and their enrolment zones cover more than one ward.

Likewise the two tertiary institutions. Both attract students from all over the City.

These examples illustrate that Wellington Council's ward system is not functional. The wards do not have the ability to meet the community's requirements for comprehensive physical and human services.

Political:


Much of the Local Government services in Wellington are integrated across the City and the region. Three Waters is an integrated service throughout the region. It is managed as a network. There are no conflicting interests of members in relation to Three Waters. It is very much in the City's interests that it is managed and overseen as a City wide network.

Likewise with roading, a connected network is very much in the City's interest and major roading projects usually have a city wide interest, such as the current consultation over Cobham Drive.

Climate change. By definition this must be addressed as a City wide issue. If the City is to meet its targets, resources must be applied throughout the city and the strategies and policies are designed to achieve this, an example being the 147km citywide cycleway network.

CONCLUSION:

A Representation Review is not a tick box exercise to derive a system that suits Councillors. Rather it is an impartial analysis of the best method to achieve fair and effective representation. The issue of whether the existing ward system reflects communities of interest has not been considered, and doesn't appear to have been analysed at all in recent years.

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
|  | Respondent No: 26 | Responded At: Oct 02, 2021 16:38:26 pm |
| | Login: Lawrence | Last Seen: Sep 26, 2021 22:01:16 pm |
| | Email: [REDACTED] | IP Address: [REDACTED] |

Q1. **Do you support the proposal for Council representation?** Yes

Q2. **If yes, why do you support the proposal for Council representation?**

It best meets the needs of our community, Broadmeadows, Khandallah and Kaiwharawhara.

Q3. **If no, why do you not support the proposal for Council representation?**

not answered

Q4. **Do you support the proposal for community board representation?** Yes

Q5. **If yes, why do you support the proposal for community board representation?**

We have no problem with the correct macrons being used.

Q6. **If no, why do you not support the proposal for community board representation?**

not answered

Q7. **Do you have any additional comments?**

Please see our attached submission.

Q8. **Do you have a file you would like to upload to support your submission? Upload it here.**

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/a4552cc2e013c6d6a21d07253fc017786a08f467/original/1633145800/48c160ee5b35a19cda122942c66ac56b_ORCA_Submission_on_Representation_Review_Final_2.10.2021.pdf?1633145800

Q9. **Please provide your full name:**

Lawrence Collingbourne

Q10. **Please provide your address:**

[REDACTED]

Q11. **Please provide your phone number if you wish to make an oral submission. this is so we can arrange a time with you.**

[REDACTED]

Q12. **Please provide your email address:**

[REDACTED]

Q13. **I am making this submission:**

on behalf of an organisation.

Q14. **If you are making a submission on behalf of an organisation, please provide their name below:**

Onslow residents Community Association

Q15. I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillor Yes

Q16. I am connected to Wellington because I live in Wellington
I am a Wellington City Council Ratepayer

Q17. What gender do you identify with? not answered



ON-SLOW RESIDENTS' COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Submission of the Onslow Resident's Community Association for the Representation Review 2021

The Onslow Residents Community Association represents the areas of Khandallah, Broadmeadows and Kaiwharawhara. Our purpose is to act as a conduit between the community and local authorities, represent the views and interests of our three communities, promote, develop and improve the public services and facilities for our community and foster a sense of community. We are a voice for our community.

Overview

The Onslow Residents Community Association is pleased to make a submission on the proposed changes to Representation as part of Wellington City Council's 2021 review. This is based upon the views of our Committee.

We support the recommended proposal for Representation.

We oppose the listed options as we do not want Councillors at Large, nor Khandallah, Broadmeadows and Kaiwharawhara to move into a Northern Ward, nor a new Lower North Ward that would include Khandallah, Broadmeadows and Kaiwharawhara.

We have no problem with using macrons in community board representation.

We also wish to make an oral submission.

We will now make some specific points.

Specific points we wish to make

We wish to make the following specific points about the representation review:

1. ***We believe that this mid-term review is no time to change the ward structure***, as it is only three years before the next review, and consultation is only happening because of the introduction of a Maori Ward. Let's keep it simple.
2. ***We do not want Councillors at Large and believe the debate is festering both wrong and dangerous opinions***. We have heard it reported that some are advocating for Councillors at Large because these councillors will represent the whole City and not just one ward of it. All ward councillors must affirm that they will represent the interests of the whole city, so this statement is wrong. This statement reinforces the incorrect belief that Councillors at Large are in some way superior to the other councillors, and that they can opt out of any issues they deem to be local ward issues, so it may simply prolong the dysfunctionality we have seen in this council. These councillors will still live in a ward, so they distort its representation on Council.


3. ***We believe that using larger wards, as in Option 2, reduces local representation.*** Electing four councillors by STV enables councillors with only 26% of first votes to be automatically elected and they could predominantly come from a larger suburb.
4. ***We want Khandallah, Broadmeadows and Kaiwharawhara to be affiliated with suburbs we relate to,*** and do not want to become part of the Northern Ward with the large metropolitan areas of Johnsonville and Tawa, as these suburbs have different characteristics and needs to us, and they will dominate the voting, while the Onslow-Western Ward is more closely related.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission. We will also be sharing this submission in ORCA's communications with its members. Please feel free to contact our association at [REDACTED] or by phone on [REDACTED] regarding this submission.

Yours sincerely

Lawrence Collingbourne, President on behalf of
Onslow Residents' Community Association

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
|  | Respondent No: 38 | Responded At: Oct 04, 2021 15:21:44 pm |
| | Login: Ray Chung | Last Seen: Oct 04, 2021 02:03:18 am |
| | Email: [REDACTED] | IP Address: [REDACTED] |

Q1. **Do you support the proposal for Council representation?** No

Q2. **If yes, why do you support the proposal for Council representation?**

not answered

Q3. **If no, why do you not support the proposal for Council representation?**

I support the Council's ward proposal but consider that all wards should have an equal +/-10% number of constituents and the proposed Maori ward has only 9,410 people on the Maori roll compared to 14,771 constituent median on all the other wards. The government changed the Local Electoral Act 2001 to exempt the Maori ward from these equality conditions which I consider is undemocratic. However, if the 9,410 figure is used as the base figure and all wards use this median, then that would restore the legitimacy.

Q4. **Do you support the proposal for community board representation?** Yes

Q5. **If yes, why do you support the proposal for community board representation?**

I believe the Makara area is sufficiently different to the nearest urban areas of Karori but the Tawa Community Board doesn't have any significant difference to the people in the Northern ward so deem it unnecessary to have this Community Board.

Q6. **If no, why do you not support the proposal for community board representation?**

not answered

Q7. **Do you have any additional comments?**

not answered

Q8. **Do you have a file you would like to upload to support your submission? Upload it here.**

https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/016ce75ab9d42c95231cb7102feb0ce330a6c108/original/1633313944/6aca6b339a29d78348660f745c39d828_Submission_on_Ward_Representation_v2.doc?1633313944

Q9. **Please provide your full name:** Rayward Chung

Q10. **Please provide your address:**

[REDACTED]

Q11. **Please provide your phone number if you wish to make an oral submission. this is so we can arrange a time with you.**

[REDACTED]

Q12. **Please provide your email address:**

[REDACTED]

1 October 2021

Gavin Beattie
Johnsonville
Wellington

**Submission on Wellington City Council's
initial representation proposal**

Introduction

I am making this submission as both a resident of Wellington City and also someone who has a particular interest in good representation review processes.

This interest arises from the fact that until recently I was an adviser to the Local Government Commission and was involved in five rounds of hearings of appeals and objections on council representation proposals. Prior to that I was in the Local Government Policy Team in the Department of Internal Affairs and I led the policy development for the Local Electoral Act including the new representation review provisions.

I am now keen to pass on the experience I have gained on the representation review process and to help ensure councils are aware of and understand the options open to them and also the connections between these options, when determining the best representation arrangements for their district/city.

Approach to Wellington City Council's representation review

The consultation document simply notes that the council resolved, on 26 August 2020, to keep the single transferable voting (STV) voting system for the 2022 elections. It also notes, correctly, that this decision is not part of the representation review process.

The required decisions and associated timelines set out in the Local Electoral Act reflect the connections between the various decisions and are designed to assist a council achieve the best representation arrangements for its district/city. These start with the two decisions to be made by councils before commencing the formal representation review process i.e. choice of electoral system (FPP or STV) and option of dedicated Māori representation.

While Wellington City Council resolved to introduce Māori wards and its initial representation proposal includes such a ward and a rationale for it, there is no evidence presented as to the reasoning for the adoption of STV and any role this decision may have played in identifying the council's initial representation proposal.

It is this factor I wish to address primarily. I also raise the issue of the important role community boards can play to assist achievement of effective representation and at the same time go some way to achieving a number of other desirable objectives.

Council's motivation for adopting STV

STV is first a preferential voting system in which voters rank candidates according to their preferences. Subject to the number of preferences a voter identifies, they will contribute to the election of at least one candidate. Given this, STV can be seen to be a fairer system in that votes will not be 'wasted' on unsuccessful candidates i.e. they will be transferred to voters' next preferences.

STV can also be a proportional representation system providing representation for communities of interest in approximate proportion to their size. But this will only occur in certain circumstances. It will occur in 'at large' elections or when wards are sufficiently large, generally considered to be at least 5-member wards. By way of contrast, you cannot achieve proportional representation in one- or two-member wards.

This raises the question as to whether the council resolved to retain STV simply as a fairer voting system, or with a view to actually achieving proportional representation for Wellington City's communities of interest? If it is the latter, the council should be considering larger general wards than are proposed in its initial representation proposal and even a fully 'at large' system (i.e. one general ward along with the proposed Māori ward).

Applying STV to Wellington City

In order to achieve effective representation under STV, it firstly needs to be understood that to be elected to the council, a candidate needs a certain share of the votes called the 'quota'. Applied in Wellington City for the election of 14 councillors from one general ward, the quota of votes to be elected would be just over one-fifteenth of the valid votes cast. Based on 2019 election statistics, the maximum possible quota would then have been 9,485 votes¹. This, however, is using the total number of electors on the roll, whereas only approximately half this number typically vote, meaning the quota to be elected is more likely to be around 4,742.

Potential of STV to achieve effective representation for Wellington City

Using a rounded quota of say 5,000 votes, a candidate in an 'at large' Wellington City election (i.e. one general ward) residing in any of the five current ward areas could easily be elected with a focused local campaign, as shown in the following table.

| Ward area | Number of electors on roll in 2019 | Assessed number of general electoral population electors² |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Takapū/Northern | 33,823 | 32,470 |
| Wharangi/Onslow-Western | 32,804 | 31,492 |
| Pukehīnau/Lambton | 28,823 | 27,670 |
| Paekawakawa/Southern | 24,475 | 23,496 |
| Motukairangi/Eastern | 28,266 | 27,135 |

But importantly, in addition to enabling local geographically-based candidates to be elected, an 'at large' election would also enable candidates representing other significant communities of interest spread across the whole city to be elected. Included here would be candidates representing, for example, particular interest groups such as young people, Māori (not on the Māori roll), other ethnicities, business and environmental interests.

It is not possible to break down currently enrolled Wellington City electors associated with such groups/interests. However, the following statistics are relevant:

¹ Calculated by taking the total number of electors in 2019 of 148,191, subtracting the number of electors currently on the Māori roll of 5,918, which equals 142,273, and divided by 15.

² Calculated by using the number of general electoral population (GEP) electors and then taking the proportion of GEP electors to the total electoral population (i.e. GEP plus the Māori electoral population) for the city as a whole (206,800/206,800 + 9,400 = 96%) and applying this in each ward area.

- approximately 10% of the city's population was between 20 and 29 years in 2018 (Statistics NZ census data) and this equates to about **20,300** young electors across the city
- approximately **7,140** Māori electors across the city would be eligible to vote in one general ward (i.e. Māori electors not on the Māori roll)³
- approximately **27,800** Asian electors and **7,700** Pasifika electors across the city would be eligible to vote in one general ward

It can be seen that an 'at large' election (one general ward) in Wellington City, with a reasonable understanding of how STV works and particularly the quota needed to be elected (say around 5,000), could result in enhanced representation for the city. This is in the form of effective representation for both local geographically-based communities of interest and communities of interest spread across the whole city. In other words, this can be seen as 'the best of both worlds' in terms of community representation.

I also note that STV literature suggests STV, used to its full potential, can have a positive impact on voter turnout. This is as a result of more (previously non-engaged) electors seeing, with the help of a little education, they are able to have a say in the election of a particular councillor i.e. their vote will not be 'wasted'. I am not aware of any research in New Zealand to support this and it would also be difficult to undertake this given the relatively small number of councils which have used STV since it was first available in 2004, and the even fewer councils that have used it with elections 'at large' or with large wards. However, to me a positive impact on voter turnout seems plausible when using STV to its full potential and worth considering by a council looking at all possible ways to increase voter turnout.

Further benefits of an 'at large' election

An 'at large' election for 14 councillors from one general ward (along with the one elected from a Māori ward) would have the following benefits compared to five general wards:

- allow general voters to vote for all general councillors giving them a sense of having a greater say in the running of the city
- provide voters with a greater choice of candidates
- provide residents with more choice when approaching councillors after the elections
- make it easier for councillors to act in the interests of the whole city in line with their oath of office
- free council from the constraints of the '+/-10% rule' and the requirement to seek Local Government Commission endorsement of any non-compliance with the rule.

Possible disadvantages of an 'at large' election

A perceived disadvantage of 'at large' elections may be seen as a need for candidates to campaign across the whole area which is seen as daunting and costly. I have shown above, however, that with an understanding of STV, this is not necessary for election. For the purposes of achieving the quota of votes to be elected, campaigning can be targeted either in local geographically defined areas, for example the current ward areas, or at particular communities of interest spread across the city.

³ Calculated by taking 75% of the total Māori population in Wellington City of 17,409 in 2018 (Statistics NZ website) as being over 18 years, equalling approximately 13,057, and then subtracting 5,918 being the number of people currently registered to vote in the Māori ward (Electoral Commission website).

Another disadvantage of an 'at large' election in Wellington City may be seen as a likely long list of candidates standing for the say 14-councillor positions. For the 2019 elections, the total number of candidates was 35. I note, for information, two councils, Dunedin City and Palmerston North City, which both use STV in 'at large' elections had 37 and 27 candidates respectively in 2019. It is also worth noting that it is not required for voters to rank all candidates under the STV voting system.

However, if for this reason, or any other, the council resolves not to adopt an 'at large' election for one general Wellington City ward, it could consider either two or three general wards and still achieve some of the benefits of proportional representation. I note, for example, the council did consider a possible option of three wards based on the parliamentary electorates.

The importance of communities of interest

In line with Local Government Commission recommended good practice, representation reviews should commence with the identification of communities of interest for the purpose of providing them with effective representation. As I have outlined above, communities of interest may be either local geographically-based communities or ones spread across the city. What is seen as an appropriate balance between both types of communities, and bearing in mind the nature of STV, should be what determines whether there are to be wards and, if so, the size of these wards.

The officers' report to the council meeting on 26 August acknowledges the need to identify communities of interest. In analysing various ward options, the report identifies options of moving whole suburbs between wards in order to comply with the '+/-10% rule'. While compliance might be achieved in some cases thereby avoiding the need for Local Government Commission endorsement, care needs to be taken that existing communities of interest are not split between wards as a result. On the other hand, evidence needs to be provided to support non-compliance with the '+/-10% rule' in order to avoid such splitting of communities of interest. It is not clear to me the extent to which the council is able to demonstrate the necessary demarcations of geographic communities of interest in the city.

As I have outlined above, this level of analysis can be avoided by the adoption of a fully 'at large' system which can work as a type of 'informal ward system' for local geographically-focused councillors while also providing for councillors representing communities of interest across the city. What this requires is simply a good understanding of the full potential of STV.

Finally, I note the officers' report acknowledges this argument to a certain extent in the analysis of a mixed 'at large'/wards system and the suggestion that council considers "those communities that are geographically distinct, and those that are spread across the city. Having some councillors elected by the entire city might be a better way of representing any communities which are spread across the city." The report goes on "having some councillors elected by the whole city could result in a different type of candidate running for Council."

Community boards: Additional local representation and empowerment

Clearly there are benefits in adoption of 'at large' elections (one general ward) for Wellington City. As noted, this should not be seen as at the expense of dedicated representation for local geographically-based communities of interest within the city. However, to reinforce this, community boards can further guarantee local representation as well as provide other important benefits.

While the council is proposing to retain the two current community boards, there appears to have been little, if any, consideration to possible benefits from establishing further community boards.

By being representative of their communities, community boards can assist the council to achieve the statutory principles (set out in section 14 of the Local Government Act) that it is required to act in accordance with, including:

- making itself aware of, and having regard to, the views of all of its communities
- when making a decision, taking account of the diversity of the community and the community's interests
- in taking a sustainable development approach, take into account the well-being of people and communities.

In a practical sense, community boards can assist councils achieve the objectives set out in their significance and engagement policy; with some councils using their boards to lead or co-lead council consultation in their communities.

Community boards can play an active place-making role and promote resilience in local communities, with resilience here being the apparently increasing need for the ability of communities to “survive, adapt and thrive in the face of stresses and shocks (natural and man-made)” in the area. These roles are made easier when the communities concerned are distinct and geographically identifiable for residents.

In relation to a local place-making role for community boards, this can be promoted by a council making delegations of decision-making in respect of the operation of local community facilities such as libraries, parks, swimming pools and community halls, and services such as local traffic control and parking (the ‘service delivery’ dimension of a community of interest). Such delegations have the dual benefits of empowering local communities and thereby encouraging community engagement, but also allowing the council to focus on strategic city-wide matters. At the same time, it is worth noting that any delegations of decision-making would be subject to council city-wide policies and council set budgets.

Community boards can also be used to play a key facilitating role as part of an active and locally focused civil defence and emergency management strategy aimed at promoting local resilience.

The experience of councils where community boards can be seen to be most effective, is that this depends on a combination of mutually understood protocols and expectations between the council and its community boards, and also appropriate substantive delegations.

Conclusion

With its decision to introduce a Māori ward, this representation review provides the council with an opportunity to take a fresh look at the best representation arrangements for Wellington City. The fresh look should involve reflecting on the potential of STV to provide effective representation for both local geographically-based communities of interest and for communities of interest spread across the whole city. To achieve this potential, I believe the council should seriously consider introducing fully ‘at large’ elections (one general ward and one Māori ward).

I believe the suggested fresh look should also involve reflecting on the ability of community boards to provide effective representation for communities across the city as well as promoting local community engagement and well-being. I don't believe it would be appropriate to introduce new boards across the city at this point in the review process, but I believe they warrant deeper consideration by the council in the future.

Wellington City Council Representation Review

Submission by Sam Somers

My submission here today is to oppose the Council Recommendation of sticking with the status quo plus Maori Ward in its recommendation and put my support behind alternative option, option 3 with amendment.

I support option 3 because it will split Wellington into 6 general wards and 1 maori ward, which would allow for future growth in population. I would like the option to be amended to scrapping councillors at large and replace all ward councillor numbers from 2 to 3, with the exception of Maori Ward which wouldn't meet the population quota for 3 councilors. This make up would be 18 General Ward Councilors, 1 Maori Ward Councilor and 1 Mayor. This would restore it to the same number of councilors that we had in 2001, when our population was 163,000 people or 8,579 people per councillor. The reason why I am not supporting councillors at large is because we have had past experience of these councilors being elected from a certain section of the city, and reducing local representation and with STV, this actually helps them get elected with a smaller margin of first preference votes. Also the first time in the 20th century we have a councilor elected south of the basin was in the 1980's when wards were introduced, whereas Prime Minister, Peter Fraser was elected to the Seat of Brooklyn in 1946.

Here is what quota looks like per ward based 3 councilors per general ward
Population Quota would be 11489 people per councillor, Maori ward would remain at 9420, but this could change at the next MEO in 2023

| Ward | Members | Population | Pop. Per Member |
|-------------|---------|------------|-----------------|
| Upper North | 3 | 36,000 | 12000 |
| Lower North | 3 | 32,900 | 10967 |
| West | 3 | 32,100 | 10700 |
| Central | 3 | 37,100 | 12367 |
| South | 3 | 34,100 | 11367 |
| East | 3 | 34,600 | 11533 |
| Total | 18 | 206800 | 11489 |

| | | | |
|-------|---|-------|-------|
| Maori | 1 | 9,420 | 9,420 |
|-------|---|-------|-------|

I would suggest consulting with local communities on the complete makeup of wards when drawing up the boundaries with this option as there might be some communities being split in half. One would be shifting Crofton Downs from West ward to Lower North ward, while shifting Wadestown from Lower North ward to either West ward or Central ward, for example.

This option would also help future proof our makeup for population growth for many election cycles to come in the future, as we have had Population Growth of 60,000 people by the 2017 census but a representation decrease since 2001 from 19 councilors to 14. This proposal restores the representation to 2001 levels.

The Maori Ward population number should be reviewed before the 2025 local body elections after the 2023 MOE, as numbers may change, increasing or decreasing the number of people on the Maori Roll, which may result in the need to expand the number of councilors for the Maori Ward

Concerns that might be outside the scope of the review but need to be mentioned.

- Our Voting system only allowing only 1 vote per ward, rather than 1 vote per elected position available, like FFP.
 - Potential solution would be to give voters X number 1's per position available in that ward, currently would be 2 number 1's for Paekawakawa Southern Ward but 3 number 1's Wharangi Onslow-Western Ward.
- Advocating to central government for when the MEO occurs for those Maori who can advocate for whether they want to be on the Maori Roll or General Roll for General Election and a separate option for Local Government Representation. There are many people who made their last decision at the MEO based on General Election only and the playing field has changed since 2018
 - Issues it might bring up, is general ward councilor candidates showing up as not living in the constituency when all it is, they are on the Maori Roll.
 - Voters may not be able to change which roll until 2023 but may want to have separate MEO options for Central and Local Government and I believe the council should advocate for this option to be available before the next MEO goes ahead.
- We need to have a desired quota number for councilors in the future when population grows, we adjust our numbers of councilors to suit. We have this with the general election being the south island population divided into 18, and that becomes the population electorate quota for the country. A similar system needs to be in place for Wellington City Council.
 - This would remove the controversial issue of increasing representation along with population growth

For the attention of:

**DEPUTY ELECTORAL OFFICER,
WELLINGTON CITY COUNCIL**

By hand

Following the Council's Public Notice dated September 4 2021 this is my submission on the Council's initial proposal for representation arrangements for the 2022 local elections.

I submit that the Council has failed to take proper account of the effects of its establishment of a Maori Ward.

Firstly, its proposed naming for its Non-Maori Wards has failed to take proper or fitting account of the departure from these Wards of voters on the Maori Electoral Roll.

Secondly, the Council's Public Notice has failed to alert the public to the extent of its proposed departure from the maximum variance allowed in respect of the members per the population of each ward. In this the Council has strayed from the stipulated legal maximum variance in one case by 54% (fifty-four percent) and in another by over 20% (twenty percent).

This is exorbitant, unacceptable and wrong.

NAMING OF NON-MAORI WARDS (PAKEHA WARDS)

I submit that it is absurd to use a rarely recognised Maori word in front of a readily recognised English-language word when naming the Council's newly proposed Pakeha Wards. In the Council's proposal it is absurd that, in the non-Maori Wards, the Maori words Takapā, Wharangi, Pukehānu, Motukairangi and Paekawakawa are used in addition to the names Northern Ward, Onslow-Western Ward, Lambton Ward, Eastern Ward and Southern Ward.

The height and breadth of this absurdity as well as its incongruity can be seen in the Council's failure to use any English-language word in the naming of the proposed Maori Ward.

EXORBITANT VARIANCE FROM THE REQUIRED 10%

The Council should consider a compliant option such as:

1/ an option based on the three parliamentary constituencies in the capital viz:

| Ward | Members | Population | Pop. Per Member | Variance |
|--------------------|---------|------------|-----------------|----------|
| Ōhāriu/Mana | 4 | 71,200 | 17,800 | 3.3% |
| Wellington Central | 4 | 70,200 | 17,550 | 1.8% |
| Rongotai | 4 | 63,400 | 16,350 | 5.1% |

Plus Te Whanganui-a-Tara Ward with one member representing a Maori population of 9,410.

In this option the aligning of local and central election boundaries would give the voter an easier and more consistent election experience and would be even more appropriate in New Zealand's Capital City than it is elsewhere in New Zealand. It should also be noted that voter turnout for central elections is higher than for local elections and that more people are familiar with their electorates than they are with their Wards.

or 2/ the third option put before the Council at its meeting on August 26 2021. In this option, in addition to the Maori ward, six Pakeha Wards each with two Councillors were proposed viz:

| Ward | Members | Population | Pop. Per Member | Variance |
|-------------|---------|------------|-----------------|----------|
| Upper North | 2 | 36,000 | 18,000 | 4.4% |
| Lower North | 2 | 32,900 | 16,450 | 4.5% |
| West | 2 | 32,100 | 16,050 | 6.9% |
| Central | 2 | 37,100 | 18,550 | 7.6% |
| South | 2 | 34,100 | 17,050 | 1.1% |
| East | 2 | 34,600 | 17,300 | 0.4% |

Plus Te Whanganui-a-Tara Ward with one member representing a Maori population of 9,410.

(Note that, if it is considered desirable to have Johnsonville and Newlands in the same Ward, then a four-member "Northern" Ward would be acceptable.)

Finally, I declare that I have no plans to stand as a candidate in any future election for the Council and have been completely unaffected by any overtures from any sitting Councillor or other person who might have sought to influence my submission with the intention of further influencing the forthcoming election.

My submission has been made because of the concerns I have mentioned about the naming of Wards and the unacceptable variances in the numbers of voters in the Wards proposed by the Council.

I ask to present my submission personally on behalf of the organisation "Caring Wellingtonians" noting that it is possible that some of my figures might need to be changed when further information from the Council has been received.

SIGNED



Michael Gibson
Karori
September 15 2021



Respondent No: 30
Login: Historic Places Wellington
Email: [REDACTED]

Responded At: Oct 03, 2021 17:24:44 pm
Last Seen: Oct 03, 2021 04:19:50 am
IP Address: [REDACTED]

- Q1. Do you support the proposal for Council representation? Yes
- Q2. If yes, why do you support the proposal for Council representation?
Support the Status quo for Ward representation
- Q3. If no, why do you not support the proposal for Council representation?
not answered
- Q4. Do you support the proposal for community board representation? Yes
- Q5. If yes, why do you support the proposal for community board representation?
Support the Status quo
- Q6. If no, why do you not support the proposal for community board representation?
not answered
- Q7. Do you have any additional comments?
not answered
- Q8. Do you have a file you would like to upload to support your submission? Upload it here. not answered
- Q9. Please provide your full name: Felicity Wong
- Q10. Please provide your address:
[REDACTED]
- Q11. Please provide your phone number if you wish to make an oral submission. this is so we can arrange a time with you. [REDACTED]
- Q12. Please provide your email address: [REDACTED]
- Q13. I am making this submission: as an individual, or
- Q14. If you are making a submission on behalf of an organisation, please provide their name below: not answered
- Q15. I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillor Yes

Q16. I am connected to Wellington because


I live in Wellington

I work in Wellington

I am a Wellington City Council Ratepayer

Q17. What gender do you identify with?

Female

| | | |
|---|--|---|
|  | Respondent No: 33 | Responded At: Oct 03, 2021 22:46:18 pm |
| | Login: Johnsonville Community Association Inc | Last Seen: Oct 03, 2021 09:33:11 am |
| | Email: [REDACTED] | IP Address: [REDACTED] |
| | | |

Q1. **Do you support the proposal for Council representation?** Yes

Q2. **If yes, why do you support the proposal for Council representation?**

The Johnsonville Community Association had a discussion on this issue at our monthly meeting. The consensus was that, because there was a review done 3 years ago and another one is proposed in 3 years time, that making major changes to the general wards was not required. If any changes are to be made, then this should be restricted to re-balancing the ward populations. The JCA does not support changes to the number of wards. The JCA especially does not support the introduction of Councillors at large and notes that JCA members were unanimous in opposing the idea of introducing of Councillors.

Q3. **If no, why do you not support the proposal for Council representation?**

not answered

Q4. **Do you support the proposal for community board representation?** Yes

Q5. **If yes, why do you support the proposal for community board representation?**

Because Community Boards provide those areas lucky enough to have one an extra avenue for WCC community engagement. The JCA also requests that the WCC support a Community Board for Johnsonville as we have been working towards this over the past three years.

Q6. **If no, why do you not support the proposal for community board representation?**

not answered

Q7. **Do you have any additional comments?**

The JCA especially does not support the introduction of Councillors at large and notes that JCA members were unanimous in opposing the idea of introducing of Councillors.

Q8. **Do you have a file you would like to upload to support your submission? Upload it here.** not answered


Q9. **Please provide your full name:** Tony Randle

Q10. **Please provide your address:**

[REDACTED]

Q11. **Please provide your phone number if you wish to make an oral submission. this is so we can arrange a time with you.** [REDACTED]

- Q12. Please provide your email address: [REDACTED]
- Q13. I am making this submission: on behalf of an organisation.
- Q14. If you are making a submission on behalf of an organisation, please provide their name below: The Johnsonville Community Association
- Q15. I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillor Yes
- Q16. I am connected to Wellington because
I live in Wellington
I work in Wellington
I am a Wellington City Council Ratepayer
- Q17. What gender do you identify with? I prefer not to say

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
|  | Respondent No: 13 | Responded At: Sep 17, 2021 13:42:20 pm |
| | Login: nickruane | Last Seen: Sep 16, 2021 21:17:35 pm |
| | Email: [REDACTED] | IP Address: [REDACTED] |

- Q1. Do you support the proposal for Council representation? No
-
- Q2. If yes, why do you support the proposal for Council representation?
not answered
-
- Q3. If no, why do you not support the proposal for Council representation?
I believe that the Representation Review misses out on an opportunity to achieve broader Democratic participation goals.
-
- Q4. Do you support the proposal for community board representation? Yes
-
- Q5. If yes, why do you support the proposal for community board representation?
not answered
-
- Q6. If no, why do you not support the proposal for community board representation?
not answered
-
- Q7. Do you have any additional comments?
not answered
-
- Q8. Do you have a file you would like to upload to support your submission? Upload it here. not answered
-
- Q9. Please provide your full name: Nick Ruane
-
- Q10. Please provide your address:
[REDACTED]
-
- Q11. Please provide your phone number if you wish to make an oral submission. this is so we can arrange a time with you. [REDACTED]
-
- Q12. Please provide your email address: [REDACTED]
-
- Q13. I am making this submission: as an individual, or
-
- Q14. If you are making a submission on behalf of an organisation, please provide their name below: not answered
-
- Q15. I would like to make an oral submission to the Councillor Yes
-

Q16. I am connected to Wellington because

I live in Wellington

I am a Wellington City Council Ratepayer

Q17. What gender do you identify with?

Male

Personal Submission of Nicholas Ruane on the Wellington City Council / Me Heke Ki Pōneke Representation Review.

I am making this submission in my personal capacity as a Wellington resident, disabled person, leader in the disability community and a person who is interested to ensure that the full rights of citizenship for disabled people are realised in Aotearoa New Zealand.

I wish to focus this submission specifically upon political rights and the political aspirations of disabled people to stand for and be elected to political office, specifically local government.

The Office for Disability Issues is particularly interested in local government as it sees local government as the engine room for the aspiration of Convention Rights for disabled people in New Zealand.

I want to draw Councillors attention to first, how the Council supports the Convention, and second which provision of the Convention is most relevant to this discussion.

If Councillors are of the mind that the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is not relevant to Local Government, I would draw your attention to the fact that in 2020 the Office for Disability Issues began a National Local Authority Survey on Accessibility.

This is a yearly health check on Accessibility, (Art 9 of the Convention). This clearly indicates that Central Government views Local Government as having obligations to discharge under the Convention.

The Wellington City Council Accessibility Action Plan 2019 properly endorses the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) as being important to clarify the rights of persons with disabilities and sets out the responsibilities to respect those rights.

Of particular relevance to this submission is Art.29 which states as follows:

States Parties shall guarantee to persons with disabilities political rights and the opportunity to enjoy them on an equal basis with others, and shall undertake:

a) To ensure that persons with disabilities can effectively and fully participate in political and public life on an equal basis with others, directly or through freely chosen representatives, including the right and opportunity for persons with disabilities to vote and be elected

I ask, how will WCC give effect to Art 29? It was not referenced at all in the consultation document, and there was no engagement with disabled people about how our political rights could be realised?

To my recollection there has only been one person who identified as a disabled person, Humphrey Hanley, who stood for Council. His bid was ultimately unsuccessful.

Turning specifically to the issue of elected representation here in Wellington.

What I am asking Councillors is, can this Representation Review achieve some important democratic and inclusion objectives.

As citizens of Wellington, every issue that comes to the Council table has a direct impact upon disabled people in Wellington, Housing, Transport, infrastructure, pipes, the Arts budget, City Safety,

The question I put to Councillors is this,

How is the lived experience of actual disabled people properly represented in discussions when there are not currently, or at any time in the past has there been a Councillor who identifies as disabled to reflect that experience?

What Disabled people are being asked to do, is to trust that non disabled people can represent us, our voice, experiences in the decisions that are made on our behalf.

This is not just, what this is is a form of thinking that says that as an abled bodied person I can make the decision for you, on behalf of the disabled person in their best interests.

This would never be asked of, or accepted from, any other group in our society today, and yet as Disabled people we are asked to be happy about this situation.

Councillor at Large option

I support Councillors thinking wider than the option which is currently supported.

I wish to be clear that I fully support the option that brings Tangata Whenua to the Council table, as is their right. That is not the point of my submission

Disabled people and Māori share a similar experience of being subject to oppression in this country, we both have inadequate access to the health system, Deaf New Zealanders have been denied access to their language, both disabled people and Māori have very poor employment outcomes and we both have been subjected to shocking abuse in institutional care.

The point of my submission is that this Representation Review could have achieved a larger democratic participation objective.

Disabled people are a specific identifiable population group representing 24% of the population.

The Councilor at Large model of representation should be used to give political voice for disabled people and also as an innovative method for Council to support New Zealand to meet its Convention obligations, which the Representative organisations of Disabled People and the Office for Disability Issues would be both supportive of.

A Councillor at Large Model would bring a new level of democratic participation to Council that is not there today, a voice currently not present.

I urge Councillors to reconsider what can be achieved through this process and think about whose voices are missing from the Council table today and what can be done to fix that.

Think about what a wider representation of elected members from our great city would bring to the quality of decision making that will ultimately deliver a better city for every Wellingtonian.

Ngā mihi nui,

Nick Ruane.

Brad Olsen JP MInstD
2016 Queen's Young Leader – New Zealand
2020 Young Wellingtonian of the Year

Wellington City Council

via email: RepReview2021@wcc.govt.nz

4 October 2021

Submission on the 2021 Representation Review for Wellington City Council

Introduction

1. Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the 2021 Representation Review for Wellington City Council. I make this submission in a strictly personal capacity, as a resident of Wellington City living in the Pukehinau/Lambton Ward.
2. I support a modified Option 2: Three general wards (aligned closely to General Election boundaries), one Māori ward, and a mayor – with no councillors elected at large.
3. My submission will cover the following two key points:
 - a. Importance of fair representation
 - b. Understandable and usable boundaries

Modified Option 2 supported

4. A modified Option 2 provides the best outcomes for effective and fair representation. This modified proposal would include:
 - a. The three wards outlined in the Option 2 proposal, (Ōhāriu/Mana, Wellington Central, and Rongotai, aligned closely to parliamentary electorate boundaries), with four councillors each
 - b. One Māori ward, with one councillor, covering the entire city (as proposed)
 - c. The mayor, elected at large
 - d. No councillors at large (different from Option 2)
5. This modified Option 2 would have 13 councillors plus the mayor – down one councillor from the status quo, and down four councillors from the proposal in Option 2.

Importance of fair representation

6. Having fair representation is important, as it allows people to, as equally as possible, determine their elected representatives and dictate the future of their city.
7. The council's initial proposal fails to meet the fair representation requirement under the Local Electoral Act, s 19V (2), which states (**emphasis added**):

*For the purposes of giving effect to subsection (1), the territorial authority or regional council and, where appropriate, the Commission must ensure that the population of each ward or constituency or subdivision, divided by the number of members to be elected by that ward or constituency or subdivision, produces a figure **no more than 10% greater or smaller** than the population of the district or region or local board area or community divided by the total number of elected members (other than members elected by the electors of a territorial authority as a whole, if any, and the mayor, if any).*

1 of 3

8. Council's proposal explicitly does not provide for fair representation, as noted on page 6 of the Representation Review 2021 Statement of Proposal.
9. The current proposal means that Motukairangi Eastern Ward electors have a greater influence on outcomes than Takapū Northern Ward and Paekawakawa Southern Ward electors.

| Ward (Proposal) | Population per member | Variance |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Takapū Northern Ward | 16,267 | 10.1%, 1,495 |
| Wharangi Onslow-Western Ward | 14,433 | -2.3%, -338 |
| Pukehīnau Lambton Ward | 14,700 | -0.5%, -71 |
| Motukairangi Eastern Ward | 12,500 | -15.4%, -2,271 |
| Paekawakawa Southern Ward | 16,550 | 12.0%, 1,779 |
| General ward total | 14,771 | |

10. Here, the population represented per-member ranges from 12,500 (2,271 people per member fewer than the Wellington average) to 16,550 (1,779 people per member more than the Wellington average).
11. Although there will always be variances, the fact that three of Wellington's five wards are outside the 10% tolerance means that nearly 120,000 Wellingtonians are voting in a legally unfair voting representation arrangement.
12. Option 2, which aligns to parliamentary electorate boundaries, set by the independent Representation Commission, would provide a much more equal representation for Wellington.

| Ward (Option 2) | Population per member | Variance |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Ōhāriu/Mana | 17,800 | 3.3%, 567 |
| Wellington Central | 17,550 | 1.8%, 317 |
| Rongotai | 16,350 | -5.1%, -883 |
| General ward total | 17,233 | |

13. Here, the population represented per-member ranges from 16,350 (883 people per member fewer than the Wellington average) to 17,800 (567 people per member more than the Wellington average).
14. Option 2 conforms to the fair representation requirements under s 19V (2) of the Local Electoral Act.
15. It is clear that a per-member range of -883 to +567 is more equal, and fairer, than a per-member range of -2,271 to +1,779 from the citywide average.
16. In short, Option 2 (modified) provides more equal representation in Wellington City than the proposal.

Understandable and usable boundaries

17. For representation to be effective, it must be understandable and usable.
18. The three-ward system proposed under Option 2 (modified) would provide the most understandable and usable representation.
19. The boundaries in Option 2 (modified) would work well for electors. They understand the parliamentary electorate boundaries well, with higher turnout for general elections, and with a greater focus on the supports their local MP might provide.
20. The current council ward boundaries are less well understood.
21. Wellington is a highly urbanised area. As such, communities of interest are harder to assess and establish, with larger zones of interest likely important to citizens, rather than their direct local community, given the substantial cross over of areas utilised and that citizens are linked to.
22. As a result, it seems natural and reasonable to use existing electoral communities of interest that are used for parliamentary elections.
23. Better alignment of electoral boundaries at a central and local government level could also foster a stronger relationship between local and central government entities and provide better outcomes and support to citizens.
24. Young people in Wellington move around a lot, with flat switches and similar a frequent occurrence. Larger ward boundaries would reduce the likelihood that electors move from one ward to another, which is confusing for electors. Alignment with parliamentary electorate boundaries would also better allow young people to understand and remain engaged with civic functions, with shared reinforcement of their local area during local and general elections.

Conclusion

25. There is an importance balance between having too few people elected to represents people's interest (allowing for more concentrated power) and having a larger and more cumbersome organisation of governance and decision making (with extended debate and inefficiency).
26. There does not seem to be a strong argument made that more decision makers are required in Wellington. The modified Option 2 provides a similar number of elected members (13) to the status quo (14), but also achieves fairer and more equal representation.
27. Option 2, as it stands, achieves fairer and more equal representation, but also enlarges the number of decision makers to 17, without an assessment of the costs or benefits of such a move.
28. As such, there is less evidence, and therefore less desire, to introduce at-large councillors. A modified Option 2 provides a similarly sized council, but with a much-enhanced fairness to local representation.