

# Western Bay of Plenty District Council

**Minutes of Meeting No. C19 of Council  
held on 3 September 2018 in the Council Chamber, Barkes Corner, Tauranga  
commencing at 9.30am**

## **Present**

His Worship the Mayor G J Webber (Chairperson), Councillors G Dally, M Dean, M Lally, P Mackay, K Marsh, D Marshall, M Murray-Benge, J Palmer, J Scrimgeour, D Thwaites and M Williams

## **In Attendance**

M Taris (Chief Executive Officer), E Holtsbaum (Group Manager Technology, Customer and Community Services), B Whitton (Customer Relationships Manager), P Hennessey (Strategic Advisor), C Lim (Community Team Leader), D Ofoske (Election Services), F Sweeney (Governance Management Advisor), C McKerras (Executive Assistant Technology, Community and Customer Services) and M Parnell (Governance Advisor)

## **Community Boards**

M Grainger (Chairperson, Omokoroa Community Board)

## **Others**

Six and as listed in the minutes as submitters to the process.

The Mayor opened the meeting and welcomed all submitters present.

## **Public Forum**

### **C19.1 Introduction to the Initial Proposal for the Representation Review 2019-2022**

The Group Manager Technology, Community and Customer Services provided an overview of the Initial Proposal for the Representation Review 2019-2022 process. She advised of the process so far and what Council could expect after this meeting. She also advised what was available to

Councillors on their electronic library and to some changes in the hearings schedule for the day.

## C19.2 **Hearing of Submissions to the Initial Proposal for the Representation Review 2019-2022**

The Committee considered the verbal submissions from the following submitters:

### C19.2.1 **Submission 173: Te Puke Community Board**

Peter Miller, Chairperson of the Te Puke Community Board, spoke to the Te Puke Community Board submission in opposition to the proposal and made the following points:

- They supported five wards instead of three.
- He noted that Waihi Beach did not have representation around the current Council table.
- They did not support the disestablishment of Community Boards and felt the Te Puke community had been well served by successive Te Puke Community Boards.

In response to questions, Mr Miller advised as follows:

- They supported more Western Bay of Plenty District Council residents having the opportunity to be represented by Community Boards.
- He did not have a view about Councillors being left off the Community Board but would not like to see more than three Councillors appointed to Community Boards.

### C19.2.2 **Submission 422: Michael Paul Maassen**

Michael Maassen introduced himself as a member of the Paengaroa Community. He did not live in an area represented by Community Boards but did not support the disestablishment of Community Boards.

In response to questions, Mr Maassen explained as follows:

- He supported the re-establishment of the Maketu Ward in the Western Bay of Plenty District Council.

### C19.2.3 **Submission 178: George Simon Van Dyke**

George Van Dyke spoke on behalf of himself and of Norm Mayo who both supported the status quo. Mr Mayo's submission challenged the Councillors to listen to the community about that they wanted for their district.

Mr Van Dyke spoke to his own submission and made the following points:

- He did not find the Representation Review process helpful or user friendly.

- He felt that in his opinion that Community Board members were not included enough in meetings of Council and its Committees.
- He spoke to his previous experience as a Community Board member and the positive work he had been able to do.
- He did not believe that the Reserves and Facilities Management bylaw review had been managed well by the current Councillors and advised that at the hearing meeting on 6 August 2018 he had been unable to hear the submitters clearly.

#### C19.2.4 **Submission 174: Waihi Community Board**

Allan Sole, Chairperson of the Waihi Beach Community Board spoke on behalf of the Waihi Beach Community Board and advised that they supported the status quo regarding the Community Boards. He made the following points:

- While they supported the democratic system, they were very aware that Waihi Beach was being less and less fairly represented after losing their dedicated ward, a dedicated Councillor and now possibly their Community Board.
- They believed that the Community Boards should remain and should be delegated more responsibility and held accountable.
- He felt Community Board members were more available to their community than Councillors could be.
- He felt that the Community Committee process would allow factions in the community to take control of meetings inappropriately.
- Community Boards had and did work well in other Councils and could work well in the Western Bay of Plenty District Council.
- The residents not served by the current Community Board model were, in his opinion, doing okay and did not seem to have submitted to this process to indicate otherwise.

In response to questions, Mr Sole explained as follows:

- He supported five wards in the Western Bay of Plenty District Council.
- He supported more proportionate representation for the community.

#### C19.2.5 **Submission 34: Patricia Margaret Coates**

Trish Coates spoke to her submission and a tabled document and advised that she opposed the disestablishment of Community Boards:

- She felt that Waihi Beach had more in common with Waihi rather than Katikati and did not feel Waihi Beach was fairly represented in this Council.
- The Community Board dealt with issues specific to Waihi Beach that she did not believe a Ward or Community Committee would do as effectively.
- She shared concerns that Councillors were not listening to the community and cited an article from the Waihi Leader on 30 August 2018 about a KiwiCamp planned in Waihi Beach that she did not believe that the community had been consulted regarding.

**C19.2.6 Submission 487: Whakamarama Community Incorporated**

Colin Hewens spoke on behalf of the Whakamarama Community Incorporated in support of the proposal. He advised there were 600 households that were not represented by the current Community Board status quo. He hoped that Whakamarama would be more fairly represented with the proposed representation and requested that Whakamarama Community Incorporated be considered in the appointing of community representatives.

In response to questions, Mr Hewens:

- He supported compromise in this matter as long as everyone was fairly represented in the district.
- Has no issue with being included in a Community Committee with Omokoroa.

10.30am The meeting adjourned for morning tea.

10.45am The meeting reconvened.

**C19.2.7 Submission 50: Sam Dunlop**

Sam Dunlop spoke to his submission and a tabled document largely in support of the proposal. He believed that a reduction in elected members would be beneficial and the Council representation on Community Committees would mitigate factions taking over meetings.

**C19.2.8 Submission 17: Maureen Binns**

Maureen Binns spoke to her submission and a tabled document in opposition to the proposal. She encouraged elected members to seek to mend the current system rather than disestablishing Community Boards.

In response to questions, Ms Binns explained as follows:

- She recognised the different needs of urban and rural communities and felt it was unfair to ask elected members to represent both fairly.
- She supported more of the community being represented by Community Boards.

**C19.2.9 Submission 177: Baden Leo Jury**

Baden Jury spoke to his submission and made the following points:

- He was concerned about the work load for the current Katikati-Waihi Beach ward elected members.
- He did not believe meetings were adequately advertised to the community.
- He did not agree with members being appointed to Community Committees as he felt this gave the Council too much power.

- He had concerns about Council projects that had gone over time and over budget and felt that the Council was not spending enough on quality infrastructure and reducing debt.
- The existing Community Board system could be improved rather than disestablished.

In response to questions, Mr Jury advised the following:

- He confirmed he had not been to a meeting of the Katikati Community Board recently.
- Clarified that it was his understanding that Councillors did not attend Community Board meetings and was informed he was incorrect.
- Would support Community Committees if members were elected rather than appointed.
- He felt that advertisements in local papers and notices on notice boards would be effective ways to advertise meetings in the community.

#### C19.2.10

#### **Submission 474: Jenny Hobbs**

Jenny Hobbs spoke to her submission and made the following points:

- She felt that so few people engaged with the community board election system that it was not a particularly democratic process.
- Council needed to be responsive to the changing needs of the community and doing the same thing did not necessarily facilitate that.
- Rapid change and high population growth had created a splinting in the Katikati Community. Leadership was required to bring shared vision for all communities including Katikati.
- Did not believe that the appointment process would not be an undemocratic process but rather a targeted identification of people who would work well with others for the betterment of the community.
- Community Committees would give greater equity of representation to the Western Bay of Plenty District Council and supported equitable representation.
- Felt that appointed members would have more mana than elected members.

In response to questions, Ms Hobbs explained the following:

- Did not believe that the diversity of the Western Bay of Plenty District was accurately represented by the current Council and Community Boards and Community Committees would give an opportunity to rectify this.
- Feedback she had received was that the Community Board was not necessarily relevant to the Katikati community.
- Confirmed that her submission was her own and not a shared view by the Katikati Community Board.
- Agreed that Waihi Beach and Katikati were different communities but also recognised that there were different Communities of Interest in Katikati that were very diverse. She believed that Katikati and Waihi Beach were able to support each other in the same ward.

- Was not confident that people would put their names forward for elections and felt the election process put people off.

#### C19.2.11 **Submission 350: Maketu Community Board**

Shane Beech from the Maketu Community Board spoke to the Maketu Community Board submission in opposition to the disestablishment of Community Boards. He made the following points:

- They felt that the Community Boards worked well in the community.
- Appointing members allowed too much power for Council.
- The Have Your Say event at Maketu was very well attended and the community had made their views on the proposal clear.

In response to questions, Mr Beech advised as follows:

- Community Boards needed more delegated authority and were happy to include communities like Paengaroa who were not represented by a Community Board in the status quo.
- Had not had any feedback that community members that they resented the addition to their rates for their local community board.

#### C19.2.12 **Submission 356: Beth Bowden**

Beth Bowden spoke to her submission in opposition to the proposal and made the following points:

- In her view an election process was better than an appointed process.
- The proposal seemed to focus its positives and negatives specifically from a process perspective.
- Was concerned that Council had not considered how to remove an appointee from a Community Committee should they become disruptive.

In response to questions, Ms Bowden explained the following:

- She believed in local body voting but did realise that this was limited by the quality of those who stood for elected positions and low voting turn out.
- She agreed that limiting the time of appointment for an appointed member could be a way to manage disruptive appointees.
- Most of the people she knew who worked on boards did so in the spirit of service and remuneration was not a factor for them.

#### C19.2.13 **Submission 482: Marilyn Roberts**

Marilyn Roberts spoke to her submission in opposition to the proposal and made the following points:

- Regarding the proposed boundary change, she did not believe someone from the current Kaimai Ward would appreciate being represented from someone from Waihi Beach.

- She felt that the Waihi Beach Community Board was a well functioning board who were inclusive of their minority groups within their community.
- There had been duplication of events and initiatives from the Council and Community Boards, which had confused the community.
- Questioned the role of the appointed Councillors to Community Boards if a Community Board was struggling.
- Believed the advantages of the proposed system could be applied to the current Community Board system.
- Felt appointing members as opposed to electing members was undemocratic.
- Felt that Community Board members were more in touch with their communities than Councillors.

In response to questions, Ms Roberts advised the following:

- Regarding the areas of the Western Bay of Plenty District Council that were not currently represented by Community boards that it was Council's responsibility to provide representation to the areas that were not currently adequately represented.

C19.2.14

#### **Submission 477: Karen Summerhays**

Karen Summerhays spoke to her submission and tabled document and explained her background in Local Government. She made the following points:

- Noted an imbalance in resources and representation in the district.
- She questioned the need to appoint members of communities of interest when they could contribute to the status quo.
- She believed that the Community Boards would work better if they were delegated more authority.
- Community Plans are not being utilised by all communities to their full potential.

In response to questions, Ms Summerhays explained the following:

- She felt having Councillors at large showed a commitment to district wide decision making.
- She felt that the current financial delegations to Community Boards were not adequate.
- She recognised that it was difficult in the current model to represent to all equitably and advocated for more resourcing for Community Boards to be able to achieve this.
- She supported geographical representation and that communities of interest be referred to for further information.

12.23pm  
1.00pm

The meeting adjourned for lunch.  
The meeting reconvened.

**C19.2.15 Submission 10: Susan Campbell**

Susan Campbell spoke to her submission in opposition of the disestablishment of Community Boards. She made the following points:

- She noted how much more New Zealand Councillors consulted with their residents than had been her experience in America.
- She questioned that the community was consulted well enough with in this matter.
- She did not feel that the needs of Maketu would be better represented by the proposed, broader model than the status quo.

**C19.2.16 Submission 11: David Campbell**

David Campbell spoke to his submission in opposition of the disestablishment of Community Boards. He pointed out what he felt were inadequacies in the consultation process as follows:

- He felt the advert in the Te Puke Times for the consultation meeting did not give adequate notification to the meeting.
- Did not believe that the public meetings gave an appropriate opportunity for people to share their thoughts. The meeting rooms were not large enough to host a substantial meeting.
- He felt that the consultation booklet was not designed to encourage community input but to sell an idea.
- The only way that people felt they could talk to this process was to make an official submission and come to this meeting.
- The hard copy submission document did not have the postal or physical address for Council for submission of the document.
- He felt the online system was flawed: It required participants to pre-register themselves, participants were required to leave the website between registration and submission and participants could make multiple submissions.
- He noted that 207 people responded to the more simple system set up in Maketu and that he believed 96% of those responses were in opposition to the process.

In response to a question, Mr Campbell advised that he believed the Maketu Community clearly wanted to be able to elect their representation.

**C19.2.17 Submission 291: Donald Fraser**

Donald Fraser introduced himself as the Chairperson of the Waihi Beach Ratepayers Association. He spoke to his submission and a tabled document and explained the following about the Waihi Beach Ratepayers Association:

- They had 160 people on their database and 90-100 people came along regularly to meetings.
- They wanted to serve the Waihi Beach community, create cohesion among the current community groups in Waihi Beach and had



resolved to work positively with the Western Bay of Plenty District Council whatever the outcome of this process.

In response to questions, Mr Fraser explained the following:

- The Waihi Beach Ratepayers Association did not seek to support or oppose the proposal but to indicate their desire to work positively with Council.
- Personally, Mr Fraser had attended meetings of the Waihi Beach Community Board and was unsure as to how effective they were.

**C19.2.18 Submission 189: Ian Barnes**

Ian Barnes spoke to his submission in opposition to the disestablishment of the community boards. He felt that disestablishing them was not an option and should not be considered.

**C19.2.19 Submission 355: Christina Floyd-Humphreys**

Christina Floyd-Humphreys spoke to her submission opposed to disestablishing community boards. She believed that the Community Boards should be improved on as opposed to disestablishing them. She also felt that the Community Boards needed to have more delegated authority.

In response to a question, Ms Floyd-Humphreys advised that restructuring the current Community Boards could mean more people would be represented by them.

**C19.2.20 Submission 442: Susan Matthews**

Sue Matthews spoke to a tabled powerpoint presentation regarding her submission in support of the proposed change.

In response to questions, Ms Matthews explained the following:

- She supported the process of advertising for members for a Community Committee and explained her positive experience of engaging in similar processes.
- The Paengaroa Community group did not find they had any less representation from the Western Bay of Plenty District Council because they were not represented by a Community Board.
- She felt Community Boards were expensive and outdated.
- She participated fully in the Maketu Community Board when she was an elected member.
- Thought that the Community Committee structure could facilitate the same level of community as the Community Boards.

**C19.2.21 Submission 434: Anthony Thompson**

Anthony Thompson spoke to his submission in opposition to the disestablishment of Community Boards. He felt the elected nature of Community Boards made them more creditable and meant a higher level of participation.

In response to a question, Mr Thompson confirmed he supported an elected body rather than an appointed one.

**C19.2.22 Submission 419: Karyl Gunn-Thomas**

Karyl Gunn-Thomas spoke to her submission and a tabled document in support of Ward Boards rather than Community Committees:

- Did not believe that Community Boards had been given a fair chance.
- She supported elected Ward boards.

In response to questions, Ms Gunn-Thomas explained as follows:

- In her proposal she suggested subdivisions would be used to more fairly represent diverse areas within the same ward.
- When asked about how she expected people from different backgrounds on the same board to come to agreement on issues, she advised she did not see there being any difference to the current system.

**C19.2.23 Submission 311: Jo Gravit**

Jo Gravit spoke to her submission and tabled documents and made the following points:

- She could not support the Community Committees without more information regarding them.
- Did not support appointment of members but did see that it was likely the best way to get diversity and a change of culture within the current system.
- Could not make sense of the online submission process.
- She was concerned that only around 30% of people vote for local body elections.
- She believed that eight elected members plus a Mayor was a better number for the Western Bay of Plenty District Council.
- Felt that the Western Bay of Plenty District Council did not have an urban rural divide and that any elected members from these different backgrounds should be able to work together because the urban and rural areas in the Western Bay were interdependent on one another.

**C19.2.24 Submission 495: Stephen Bailey**

Stephen Bailey spoke to his submission and made the following points:

- He was concerned about the lack of representation for those who did not have Community Boards.

- Had received feedback about the submission form not being adequate.

In response to questions, Mr Bailey advised as followed:

- He questioned the quality and quantity of people standing for Community Boards.
- He acknowledged the work of the Community Boards in the communities that he lived and worked in.
- Federated Farmers was a members based organisation but did not necessarily speak for the whole rural community.

#### C19.2.25 **Submission 297: Brian Comrie**

Brian Comrie was unable to attend the hearing but asked that the following concerns were listed to Council:

- Retain Community Boards
- Need a Councillor for the beach
- More notification for our absentee ratepayers
- How does Council advise our absentee ratepayers of these consultations?
- Want to elect
- To have Community Committees is not democratic.

#### C19.2.26 **Submission 160: Kelvin O'Hara**

Kelvin O'Hara spoke to his submission in opposition to the proposal. He made the following points:

- He congratulated Council on thinking outside of the box in term of the proposal but believed it needed further work.
- He felt Council was opening itself up for unnecessary criticism by appointing members to Community Committees.
- Council needed to think ahead and make good decisions moving forward.
- He felt Council needed to broaden its base of relationships with the community. He advised that in his experience there is no depth to relationships between this Council and its communities. He also encouraged greater involvement from Councillors on Community Boards.
- He felt it was best to get the proposal correct now than moving ahead and trying to fix up any issues.

#### C19.2.27 **Submission 498: Anne Henry**

Anne Henry spoke to her submission in opposition to the disestablishment of Community Boards. She made the following points:

- She felt the proposed changes were not conducive to democracy.
- She enjoyed the opportunity to be able to attend Community Board meetings and speak in public forum.
- She suggested Community Committees would work if members were elected or appointed by ballot.

- She encouraged more delegated authority being given to Community Boards.

In response to questions, Ms Henry explained the following:

- She would support more community boards being established to make sure all communities are equitably represented.
- She understood that elections and by-elections carried a cost to the district.

#### C19.2.28 **Submission 171: Margaret Colmore**

Margaret Colmore spoke to her submission and a tabled document in opposition to appointed members on Community Committees.

In response to questions, Ms Colmore advised:

- She supported the elected representation of an Oropi Community Board.
- She would support Community Committees if the members were elected and not appointed.

#### C19.3 **Receiving Submissions to the Initial Proposal for the Representation Review 2019-2022**

Following the hearing of all submissions to the Initial Proposal for the Representation Review 2019-2022 the Council considered the following recommendation:

**Resolved:** Mayor Webber / Murray-Benge

*THAT all written and verbal submissions to the Initial Proposal for the Representation Review 2019-2022 be received and submitters thanked for their submissions.*

The meeting adjourned at 3.21pm.

## **Western Bay of Plenty District Council**

**Minutes of Meeting No. C19 of Council  
held on 20 September 2018 in the Council Chamber, Barkes Corner, Tauranga  
commencing at 1.00pm**

### **Present**

His Worship the Mayor G J Webber (Chairperson), Councillors G Dally, M Dean, M Lally, P Mackay, K Marsh, D Marshall, M Murray-Benge, J Palmer, J Scrimgeour and D Thwaites

### **In Attendance**

M Taris (Chief Executive Officer), G Allis (Deputy Chief Executive), E Holtsbaum (Group Manager Technology, Customer and Community Services), F Begley (Community Relationships Manager), B Whitton (Customer Relationships Manager), D Ofsoske (Elections Officer), G Payne (Strategic Advisor), M Bougen (GIS Technician), C Lim (Community Team Leader), M Barns (Community Engagement and Development Coordinator), R Woodward (Communications Advisor), F Sweeney (Governance Management Advisor) and M Parnell (Governance Advisor)

### **Community Boards**

J Hobbs (Chairperson, Katikati Community Board), M Grainger (Chairperson, Omokoroa Community Board), S Beech (Chairperson, Maketu Community Board), A Sole (Chairperson, Waihi Beach Community Board), J Dugmore (Member, Te Puke Community Board), G Cantlon (Member, Maketu Community Board), W McFadyen (Member, Maketu Community Board) and N Mayo (Member, Katikati Community Board)

### **As Required**

### **Others**

Three members of the public and one member of the media.

### **Leave of Absence**

It was noted that Councillor Williams was on leave of absence.

#### C19.4 **Representation Review 2018 - Final Proposal**

The Committee considered a report from the Group Manager Technology, Customer and Community Services report dated 17 September 2018 as circulated separately with the agenda.

The Group Manager Technology, Community and Customer Services introduced the report and gave information about how the process would move forward after the final deliberations had taken place. She also explained the issues that would be discussed during the meeting.

##### C19.4.1 **Topic REP18 1: Number of Councillors and Wards**

The Committee considered the issues and options paper as circulated separately with the agenda. A replacement copy of this issues and options paper was tabled.

The Group Manager Technology, Community and Customer Services provided a summary of the issues and options paper and of the submissions received regarding this particular issue.

**Resolved:** Murray-Benge / Marsh

<b>Decision</b>
<i>THAT the Status Quo is maintained - retain 11 councillors elected from the existing three wards, plus the Mayor elected district-wide.</i>

<b>Reasons for Decision</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Achieves fair representation and meets the '+/- 10% rule'.</i></li> <li>• <i>Will not require consideration of boundary adjustments which have not been publicly consulted on.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provides the population with reasonable access to its elected members and vice versa.</i></li> <li>• <i>Allows elected members to effectively represent the views of their electoral area.</i></li> <li>• <i>Allows elected members to attend public meetings throughout their area and provides reasonable opportunity for face-to-face meetings.</i></li> <li>• <i>Fairer representation than at large options.</i></li> </ul>

##### C19.4.2 **Topic REP18 3: Ward Boundary Adjustments - Proposed Minor Ward Boundary Adjustment Between Katikati-Waihi Beach and Kaimai Wards**

The Committee considered the issues and options paper as circulated separately with the agenda.

The Group Manager Technology, Community and Customer Services gave a summary of the issues and options paper and a precis of the submissions received regarding this issue.

**Resolved:** Thwaites / Marshall

**Decision**

*THAT Council makes a minor boundary adjustment from the eastern side of the Morton Road Peninsula between the Katikati-Waihi Beach and Kaimai wards by generally following the centre of the Waipapa River until it reaches just south of the Esdaile Road/Wainui South Road intersection. It then follows the centre of Wainui South Road for a short distance before continuing up the centre of Tim Road to its end, and before reconnecting with the remainder of the existing ward boundary.*

*AND THAT*

- (a) the Western Bay of Plenty District Council be divided into three wards, these being:*
- (i) Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward being the existing ward comprising the area delineated on LGC Plan 022-2013-W-2 deposited with the Local Government Commission with the addition of a small north-western portion of the current Kaimai Ward (westward of the Waipapa River), the boundaries and more detailed description of which are shown on Map 1 – Initial Proposal – Proposed Boundary Change;*
  - (ii) Kaimai Ward being the existing ward comprising the area delineated on LGC Plan 022-2013-W-3 deposited with the Local Government Commission with the exclusion of a small north-western portion (westward of the Waipapa River), the boundaries of which are shown on Map 1 – Initial Proposal – Proposed Boundary Change; and*
  - (iii) Maketu–Te Puke Ward being the existing ward comprising the area delineated on LGC Plan 022-2013-W-4 deposited with the Local Government Commission, the boundaries of which are shown on Map 1 – Initial Proposal – Proposed Boundary Change.*

**Reasons for Decision**

- The people in the affected area would become part of the ward in which they share common links with educational, shopping, social and other needs.*
- The numbers of people affected would not influence the fair representation rule of '+/- 10% rule'.*
- Reflects the information gathered from the community in the pre consultation process where people identified their own communities of interest.*

C19.4.3      **Topic REP18 4: Local Representation - Initial Proposal Disestablish Community Boards/Establish Community Committees**

The Committee considered the issues and options paper as circulated separately with the agenda.

The Group Manager Technology, Community and Customer Services gave a summary of the submissions received for this issues and options paper and of the submissions received regarding this option. She referred to the initial proposal document and reminded Councillors what their initial proposal was designed to achieve.

Staff confirmed in response to a question that Ward Councillor Committees would be made up solely of the Ward Councillors.

**Resolved:** Marsh / Mackay

<b>Decision</b>
<p><i>THAT the Waihi Beach, Maketu and Te Puke Community Boards be retained in their current boundaries.</i></p> <p><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>THAT the Katikati Community Board be retained in the adjusted boundary.</i></p> <p><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>THAT the Omokoroa Community Board be disestablished.</i></p> <p><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>THAT a Ward Councillor Committee consisting of all Ward Councillors be established for each of the following areas:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whole of Kaimai Ward</i></li> <li>• <i>Eastern end of the Maketu-Te Puke Ward i.e. all the areas not included in the Te Puke and Maketu Community Boards</i></li> <li>• <i>Matakana Island and Rangiwea Island of the Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward i.e. all the areas not included in the Waihi Beach and Katikati Community Boards</i></li> </ul> <p><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>THAT the purpose of the Ward Councillor Committees will be to provide representation and liaison for all the communities of interest as identified through the review process not currently represented by Community Boards.</i></p>



<p><b>Reasons for Decision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Satisfied the views expressed by those who submitted to and were heard regarding the initial proposal of the Representation Review process.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provided direct contact for Kaimai Ward, the eastern end of the Maketu-Te Puke ward and Matakana Island and Rangiwaea Island residents with their Ward Councillors.</i></li> <li>• <i>Easily able to be changed if Councillor Ward Committees did not work well.</i></li> <li>• <i>Was the closest compromise to the initial proposal once the views of the public had been made.</i></li> <li>• <i>Enabled different communities (i.e. urban and rural) within the same ward to work through their own community of interest issues.</i></li> <li>• <i>Opportunity to try a different model while retaining Community Boards in areas that supported them.</i></li> <li>• <i>Retains the Waihi Beach, Maketu, Te Puke and Katikati (subject to boundary adjustment) Community Boards</i></li> <li>• <i>Would create opportunity for representation in rural/other communities which do not currently have community boards</i></li> <li>• <i>Only partially addresses concerns regarding equitable representation and democratic process - only elected ward councillors would represent the district</i></li> <li>• <i>Potential lack of duplication of communication and engagement processes in the Kaimai ward only.</i></li> <li>• <i>More representation offered than the status quo.</i></li> </ul>
--



**Resolved:** Mayor Webber / Marsh

1. *THAT the Group Manager Technology, Customer and Community Services report dated 17 September 2018 and titled Representation Review 2018 Final Proposal be received.*
2. *THAT the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of high significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.*
3. *That following consideration of submissions received (written and oral), and taking into account the results of earlier informal consultation undertaken prior to resolving its initial proposal, Council, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, resolves to amend the initial proposal with the final proposal for the review of representation arrangements for the 2019 and 2022 triennial elections being:*

*THAT regarding the number of Councillors and Wards the Status Quo is maintained - retain 11 councillors elected from the existing three wards, plus the Mayor elected district-wide.*

*For the following reasons:*

- *Achieves fair representation and meets the '+/- 10% rule'.*

- *Will not require consideration of boundary adjustments which have not been publicly consulted on.*
- *Provides the population with reasonable access to its elected members and vice versa.*
- *Allows elected members to effectively represent the views of their electoral area.*
- *Allows elected members to attend public meetings throughout their area and provides reasonable opportunity for face-to-face meetings.*
- *Fairer representation than at large options.*

*THAT regarding the proposed boundary change Council makes a minor boundary adjustment from the eastern side of the Morton Road Peninsula between the Katikati-Waihi Beach and Kaimai wards by generally following the centre of the Waipapa River until it reaches just south of the Esdaile Road/Wainui South Road intersection. It then follows the centre of Wainui South Road for a short distance before continuing up the centre of Tim Road to its end, and before reconnecting with the remainder of the existing ward boundary.*

*AND THAT*

*(a) the Western Bay of Plenty District Council be divided into three wards, these being:*

- (i) Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward being the existing ward comprising the area delineated on LGC Plan 022-2013-W-2 deposited with the Local Government Commission with the addition of a small north-western portion of the current Kaimai Ward (westward of the Waipapa River), the boundaries and more detailed description of which are shown on Map 1 – Initial Proposal – Proposed Boundary Change;*
- (ii) Kaimai Ward being the existing ward comprising the area delineated on LGC Plan 022-2013-W-3 deposited with the Local Government Commission with the exclusion of a small north-western portion (westward of the Waipapa River), the boundaries of which are shown on Map 1 – Initial Proposal – Proposed Boundary Change; and*
- (iii) Maketu–Te Puke Ward being the existing ward comprising the area delineated on LGC Plan 022-2013-W-4 deposited with the Local Government Commission, the boundaries of which are shown on Map 1 – Initial Proposal – Proposed Boundary Change.*

*For the following reasons:*

- *The people in the affected area would become part of the ward in which they share common links with educational, shopping, social and other needs.*
- *The numbers of people affected would not influence the fair representation rule of '+/- 10% rule'.*
- *Reflects the information gathered from the community in the pre consultation process where people identified their own communities of interest.*

*THAT regarding the Initial Proposal Disestablish Community Boards/Establish Community Committees the Waihi Beach, Maketu and Te Puke Community Boards be retained in their current boundaries.*

*AND*

*THAT the Katikati Community Board be retained in the adjusted boundary.*

*AND*

*THAT the Omokoroa Community Board be disestablished.*

*AND*

*THAT a Ward Councillor Committee consisting of all Ward Councillors be established for each of the following areas:*

- *Whole of Kaimai Ward*
- *Eastern end of the Maketu-Te Puke Ward i.e. all the areas not included in the Te Puke and Maketu Community Boards*
- *Matakana Island and Rangiwaea Island of the Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward i.e. all the areas not included in the Waihi Beach and Katikati Community Boards*

*AND*

*THAT the purpose of the Ward Councillor Committees will be to provide representation and liaison for all the communities of interest as identified through the review process not currently represented by Community Boards.*

*For the following reasons:*

- *Satisfied the views expressed by those who submitted to and were heard regarding the initial proposal of the Representation Review process.*
- *Provided direct contact for Kaimai Ward, the eastern end of the Maketu-Te Puke ward and Matakana Island and Rangiwaea Island residents with their Ward Councillors.*
- *Easily able to be changed if Councillor Ward Committees did not work well.*
- *Was the closest compromise to the initial proposal once the*

*views of the public had been made.*

- *Enabled different communities (i.e. urban and rural) within the same ward to work through their own community of interest issues.*
- *Opportunity to try a different model while retaining Community Boards in areas that supported them.*
- *Retains the Waihi Beach, Maketu, Te Puke and Katikati (subject to boundary adjustment) Community Boards*
- *Would create opportunity for representation in rural/other communities which do not currently have community boards*
- *Only partially addresses concerns regarding equitable representation and democratic process - only elected ward councillors would represent the district*
- *Potential lack of duplication of communication and engagement processes in the Kaimai ward only.*
- *More representation offered than the status quo.*

The meeting concluded at 1.39pm.

Confirmed as a true and correct record

---

G J Webber, JP

**Mayor**

---

Date

C19