

**MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**TO THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS**  
**OF THE COMMITTEE**

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE**

Cr R H M Johnston (Chairperson)

Cr R A Budd  
Cr A G Neill  
Cr W E Woods

Cr R M Kirk  
Cr J F Slee  
Cr T K Burke (ex officio)

A meeting of the Committee will be held on  
**Wednesday, 21 June 2006 at 1.30pm**

**VENUE:** Council Chamber  
First Floor  
Pegasus Building  
58 Kilmore Street  
CHRISTCHURCH

**BUSINESS:** As per Order Paper attached.

Dr Bryan Jenkins  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE TAKEN**  
**AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL**

58 Kilmore Street,  
PO Box 345,  
Christchurch,  
Telephone: (03) 365-3828,  
Fax: (03) 365-3194  
Website: [www.ecan.govt.nz](http://www.ecan.govt.nz)



## COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 DECISION-MAKING REQUIREMENTS

Except as below, a statement of compliance and a completed decision checklist is required for any agenda item on a council committee or the council recommending that a decision be made. This will be the responsibility of the person signing off the agenda item.

### The compliance statement and checklist will not be used for:

- Recommendations that information be received or that the Council make a decision.
- Decisions taken under the Resource Management Act 1991 or the Biosecurity Act 1993 in relation to resource consents, decisions required when following the procedures set out in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, other permissions, submissions on plans, or references to the Environment Court.
- Decisions taken to proceed with enforcement procedures under various primary or secondary legislation or regulations, including procedures under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Biosecurity Act 1993, the Local Government Act 2002, and Environment Canterbury Bylaws.
- Administrative and personnel decisions that are entirely internal to Environment Canterbury.
- Other decisions where the procedures to be followed are set out in Legislation.

### COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

The council committee (or the council) must formally certify that:

- (a) It is satisfied that it has sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being and the effects on community outcomes, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions.
- (b) It is satisfied that it knows enough about and has given adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.

### INFORMATION CHECKLIST

(a)	A Statement of the Proposed Decision
(b)	A Statement of the Objective of the Proposed Decision and the Issue or Problem being addressed
(c)	A list of all reasonably practicable options, (including doing nothing).
(d)	For each option in (c): An evaluation of the Benefits and Costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.
(e)	For each option in (c): A statement of the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted or achieved in an integrated and efficient manner.
(f)	For each option in (c): A statement of the Impact, if any, on Environment Canterbury's capacity to undertake its statutory responsibilities
(g)	If the Proposed Decision is a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, a statement of how Maori values have been taken into account
(h)	A Statement of significant inconsistencies, if any, with any Existing Policy, Plan or Legislation arising from the Proposed Decision.
(i)	A statement how the views and preferences of affected or interested persons have been given adequate consideration during the definition of the problem or issue, the objective, the assessment of options and the development of the proposed decision, including the particular contribution of Maori to the decision-making process.

#### Notes:

The significance of proposals and decisions determines how much time, money and effort is put into exploring and evaluating options and obtaining the views of affected and interested parties. The significance of proposals and decisions is determined through reference to criteria contained in the policy on significance.

The policy on significance together with Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the Council's requirements in relation to decisions. Some decisions can only be made through the Long-Term Council Community Plan, or after the Special Consultative Procedures set out in the Act have been used, (refer to the policy on significance and the Act).

All decisions of Environment Canterbury are subject to the decision-making requirements of section 76 of the Act unless inconsistent with specific requirements of other legislation.

**ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY**  
**REPRESENTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**ORDER PAPER**

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 4 MAY 2006
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

**MATTER FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

5. REPRESENTATION REVIEW

**MATTER FOR INFORMATION**

6. PROCESS TIMETABLE
7. NOTICES OF MOTION
8. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
9. QUESTIONS
10. NEXT MEETING
11. CLOSURE

**ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY**  
**REPRESENTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE**

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATION REVIEW  
COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY 4 MAY 2006  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, PEGASUS BUILDING,  
58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH FROM 2.00 P.M.

**CONTENTS**

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 13 SEPTEMBER 2005
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

**MATTERS FOR RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL**

5. REPRESENTATION REVIEW – COMMUNITY OF INTEREST
6. PROCESS TIMETABLE

**MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

7. CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL
8. NOTICES OF MOTION
9. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
10. QUESTIONS
11. NEXT MEETING

**PRESENT**

Crs R H M Johnston (Chairperson), R A Budd, T K Burke, R M Kirk, A G Neill, J F Slee, and W E Woods.

**MANAGEMENT AND STAFF PRESENT**

J C Pani (Manager Secretariat), and L M McDonald (Administration Officer)

P C Berry (Representation Review Consultant)

**1. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING                      13 September 2005**

**Resolved**

*That the minutes of the meeting held 13 September 2005, as circulated, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.*

Cr Burke/Cr Woods

### 3. MATTERS ARISING

Cr Burke advised that the Regional Affairs Committee of Local Government New Zealand has looked at the issue of regional communities of interest.

Notes from consultation meetings held with territorial authorities and stakeholders held on 28 October and 17 November 2005 had been circulated separately, for information, to the Committee. Cr Slee requested that her apology for the 17 November 2005 meeting be recorded. It was also requested that the affiliation for Mark Solomon be checked.

#### ***Resolved***

***That the notes from the 28 October and 17 November 2005 meetings with territorial authorities and stakeholders to discuss the representation review, as amended, be received.***

Cr Burke/Cr Budd

Cr Neill arrived at 2.08 p.m.

### 4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

Nil

### MATTER RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

### 5. COMMUNITY OF INTEREST

Cr Johnston welcomed Peter Berry to the meeting and invited him to present his report.

Mr Berry spoke to his report and highlighted the following points:

- The need to keep to the process timeline in order to meet legislative requirements. Council must resolve by 24 August 2006 an option to be advertised for public submission. He suggested a Council Workshop before the July Council meeting would be useful for the Council to consider the community of interest and other factors.
- The Regional Affairs Committee has considered the matter of the lack of guidelines for regional councils and identified regional council functions that might be used to identify regional communities of interest.
- In previous representation reviews communities of interest was given consideration but not at the level now required.
- The figures produced for the representation review for Ashburton District indicate that if population numbers were required to be moved in or out of Ashburton District to meet the +/- 10% requirement of the regional representation review, it may result in the urban Ashburton area being spilt in a similar way to Timaru and Rangiora as identified in the options previously considered.
- The list of regional functions in appendix one of his report does not rate the importance of each function in terms of community of interest.
- While proposed changes to the legislation may allow more than one option to be put forward for public consultation, such a change would not be introduced in time to affect the current review process. Therefore, unfortunately, only one option can be identified in the draft proposal for public consultation.

In response to a question from Cr Johnston, Mr Berry advised that any submissions to the representation review must be considered by the Council. Any subsequent appeals or counter objections would be then considered by the Local Government Commission. He reminded the Committee that any decision that varied from the +/- 10% population formula would also go the Local Government Commission for determination.

The Committee considered the report and reviewed appendix 1 that listed regional functions for each constituency. The following comments were made:

- Include coasts in list of functions.
- Groundwater is an issue for Christchurch and Waitaki
- Landscape is an identity feature for many people in Canterbury, for example the iconic landscapes of the high country, the Fairlie Basin and the Mackenzie Basin.
- Biodiversity to be added to the list of functions relevant to all constituencies.
- Add pest districts and irrigation to the Selwyn list and regional transport to Waitaki.

There was some support for applying a weighting to the functions listed in appendix 1, but others suggested that it was too early in the process to do so and more detail would be required before this can be done.

#### **Recommended**

***That the report "Representation Review Community of Interest" prepared by Peter Berry form the basis for the identification of the communities of interest for further development in the representation review process with the addition of the following to appendix 1:***

- ***Add coasts, landscape and biodiversity in the list of regional functions for all constituencies.***
- ***Christchurch – include groundwater, river catchments and pest districts (Banks Peninsula).***
- ***Selwyn – include pest districts and irrigation.***
- ***Waitaki – include groundwater and regional transport.***

Cr Budd/Cr Woods

## **6. PROCESS TIMETABLE**

Attached to the agenda was a proposed timetable to complete the Representation Review process and a revised copy of the full timetable showing legislative deadlines.

Peter Berry again stressed the need to keep to this timetable as extra time had been taken with pre-review consultation. He confirmed that the Council decision of the draft proposal for public consultation would require resolution at the 24 August meeting (not 30 August as shown on the draft timetable)

#### **Recommended**

***That the proposed timetable, as amended, to complete the Representation Review process be recommended to Council for adoption.***

Cr Budd/Cr Slee

## MATTER FOR COMMITTEE DECISION

### Election of Deputy Chair

Cr Johnston advised that he would be away from 12 May to 16 June and suggested the appointment of a Deputy Chair in case anything arose in his absence. He called for nominations for Deputy Chair.

### Resolved

***That Cr Bill Woods be appointed Deputy Chair of the Representation Review Committee.***

Cr Burke/Cr Budd

## MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

### 7. CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL

Attached to the agenda was information received from Christchurch City Council that included a report on Environment Canterbury's representation review that was presented to their Council meeting of 20 April 2006.

At that meeting the Christchurch City Council resolved to support Option 2, which provides for nine City Members. They also resolved:

1. To advise Environment Canterbury that the Christchurch City Council considers that whichever option is chosen, the City members should be elected at large across the city.
2. That City Council staff be requested to report back on the possible formation of a unitary authority.

### Resolved

***That the information provided by Christchurch City Council be received.***

Cr Budd/Cr Kirk

### 8. NOTICES OF MOTION

Nil

### 9. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

### 10. QUESTIONS

Nil

### 11. NEXT MEETING

21 June 2006 commencing at 1 p.m.

The meeting closed 4.28 p.m.

CONFIRMED

DATE \_\_\_\_\_ CHAIRPERSON \_\_\_\_\_

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO:</b> 5	<b>SUBJECT MATTER:</b> REPRESENTATION REVIEW
<b>REPORT:</b> Representation Committee Review	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 21 June 2006
<b>FILE REFERENCES:</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b> <b>PROJECT:</b> <b>OUTPUT:</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b> Louise McDonald, Administration Officer	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b>

## **PURPOSE**

Attached is a report from Consultant Peter Berry.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

*That the report be received*

*That the Committee considers whether to refer the report to a Council workshop on 6 July 2006 or makes a recommendation to the Council.*

## REPRESENTATION REVIEW

### 1. STEPS TAKEN SO FAR

- Maori Representation resolved. No separate Maori Constituency.
- Council confirmed first past the post voting system would remain for 2007 election.
- Pre-Review Consultation carried out.
- Regional Affairs/LGNZ guide for Region Councils' Representation Reviews issued.
- Canterbury region communities of interest considered by Council.

### 2. ACTIONS NOW REQUIRED

The following are details of actions now required for consideration and resolution leading up to the preparation of a Draft Proposal for public notification.

**Step 1 Identify regional communities of interest**

**Step 2 Determine the number of councillors necessary to provide effective representation of the region.**

The number of councillors must fall within the statutory limits of between 6 and 14. In determining the exact number the council should be mindful of the number of "regional communities of interest", the physical size of the region and the need to meet the workload requirements of the council. Workloads involves not only the operational demands of attending council and committee meetings but also the demands individual councillors will face in order to provide effective representation and engagement.

In terms of size Canterbury is the largest region and second in terms of population in the country. It has some of the major resource problems e.g. water allocation, clean air in major populated areas.

**Step 3 Determine constituency boundaries**

Constituency boundaries should be determined on a provisional basis according to the representation requirement which requires the population ratio for each member to be within +/- 10% of the average population per member. Best attempts should be made to reconcile representation with regional communities of interest.\*

\* *Please note that steps 2 and 3 are largely iterative. The number of councillors identified in step 2 may need to be revised in order to achieve the best fit between regional communities of interest and effective representation.*

#### **Step 4            Compare provisional boundaries with identified regional communities of interest**

In this step the council considers whether or not there are regional communities of interest which are significantly disadvantaged by the provisional constituency boundaries. Significantly disadvantaged should be interpreted as lacking "effective representation". In such cases the council can use the authority contained in S19V3(b) to seek a variation to the +/-10% formula.

In preparing a case for a variation to the formula in order to achieve effective representation the following principles should be applied.

##### **Active participation of communities**

- Effective representation required a strong link between elected representatives and their constituents so as to promote a healthy democracy, protect citizens' rights and ensure their views and opinions are heard. For this to be achieved, elected members must be able to respond to the interest and demands of their constituents. It suggests a level of familiarity between voters and representatives and proximity to voters that might be diminished by, for example, large distances. A relevant factor able to influence access to elected representatives may also be the quality and configuration of the transport network.

Consequently regional communities of interest which are large and sparsely populated might qualify for a variation to the +/-10% requirement on the basis that additional representation (which is the equivalent of reducing the population/member ratio) is necessary to promote democratic participation. This factor might apply in the case of geographically isolated regional communities of interest.

- **Diversity of representation**

The LGA 2002 places considerable emphasis on the ability of councils to reflect community diversity in their decision-making. For example S14(c) "*when making a decision a local authority should take account of the diversity of the community, and the community's interests within a district or region;..*" In considering whether or not a regional community of interest requires specific representation, councils may validly ask whether or not such representation is necessary to assist the council take into account community diversity when making decisions.

If the answer is positive then this might provide a justification for seeking an amendment to the +/-10% requirement.

Underpinning the case for an exception is the legislative purpose of local government, namely to "enable democratic local decision-making by, and on behalf of, local communities". This implies a level of care by the local authority to ensure that regional communities of interest, in the case of regional councils, have effective representation.

Where such a community is significantly disadvantaged by the application of the +/- population requirement a case for an exemption might be made, particularly where a community is geographically isolated, large and sparsely populated.

## **Step 5            See community views**

Any recommendation to seek an exemption from the +/-10% requirement in a specific case, along with the rationale for such an exemption, should be incorporated in the Council's public consultation document prepared as part of the representation review as outlined in the Local Government Commission's guidelines.

In introducing the new local government legislation in the House on the 19 December 2001, the minister of Local Government, Sandra Lee, stated that: "the bill is about empowering communities, not as some might imagine by the empowerment of councils to exert greater and greater power and authority over their electors, but rather by the empowerment of New Zealanders within their local communities to exercise even greater control over their elected representatives and councils and over the environments and communities in which they live."

### **3.        LEGAL ADVICE ON APPLICATION OF THE +/-10% RULE**

The Local Government Commission in April 2005 sought an opinion from Phillips Fox on issues arising from the application of the plus/minus 10% rule. The details in respect of regional councils, which are published as an appendix to the Local Government Commission Guidelines are:

#### **Questions Raised:**

- 2(a)    In relation to a regional council, might a distinct community of interest be more effectively represented as a single constituency in which the membership ratio exceeds the +/- 10% rule rather than being split amongst two or more constituencies to achieve compliance with that rule?
- 2(b)    And if so, would the representation of the balance of the region have to comply with the +/- 10% rule?
- 3(a)    In relation to territorial authorities, the potential tension between 'effective' representation required by section 19T and 'fair' representation required by section 19V, how is the Commission to approach a proposal which will not comply with both section 19T and section 19V(2) or (3)?
- 3(b)    In relation to a regional council, and the same potential tension, is the effect of the ostensibly greater flexibility in the 'effectiveness' provisions indicative that these prevail in importance over the 'fairness' provisions?

#### **Summary of comments and answers**

- 2(a)    We agree that the exception created by section 19V(3)(b) applies equally to the proposals which fall either side of the +/-10% rule. I think the provision is neutral on this point. It applies where the Commission concludes that the statutory objective of effective representation is simply not served by adherence to the rule in section 19V(2).
- 2(b)    As in 1 (above) if the Commission makes a decision that a specific community of interest is more effectively represented without complying with the +/- 10% rule, then compliance must be relaxed for the balance of the region,

particularly if continuing to require it would create 'downstream' impediments to effective representation.

- 3(a) I have some difficulty with the concept that the inevitable potential tension between section 19T and section 19V is to be resolved by giving one of them priority. Both provisions require the Commission to 'ensure' that certain principles are given effect to. Both fairness and effectiveness are principles that the Act is explicitly intended to implement. However the only guidance given by the provisions does tend to support the Commission's approach. That is because one provision (*effective representation*) requires the Commission to form a number of judgements which will almost always have some inherent trade offs and compromises; and the other (fair representation) is simply an empirically derived number. In other words, where your 'seemingly insurmountable tension' does arise, then it seems easier to reconsider the assessments made under section 19T than the limited exception available under section 19V(3).
- 3(b) In relation to regional councils, the resolution of the tension is, as you say, somewhat easier. Although the +/- 10% rule in section 19V(2) is still the starting point for implementing the more general direction given by section 19V(1), the effect of section 19V(3)(b) is that the rule can simply be discarded if the Commission does not think that it will deliver an effective representation outcome. Again, I would not categorise this as an issue of primacy as between effectiveness and fairness – what we appear to be left with in relation to regional councils is that the Commission has the ability to make broadly discretionary judgements in each category and then reconcile them as it thinks best. Bear in mind that while section 19V(2) is the preferred method of achieving fairness, the ability to override it in section 19V(3) should not be seen as detracting from the need for fair representation.

## **Discussion**

Some comment on the reasons for these conclusions may be helpful. Again, the questions overlap and plainly require a consistency of approach, so I start with two general points.

### **Overview**

As always, we should start by recording that section 4 LEA contains two immediately relevant provisions.

- (1) The principles that this Act are designed to implement are the following:
  - (a) Fair and effective representation for individuals and communities:
- (2) This section does not override any other provision in this Act or any enactment.

Section 4(1)(a) states simply, in my view, that fairness and effectiveness are equally important principles. But they are also principles which are intrinsically incapable of complete definition. To the extent that the Act goes on to specify what each of these principles requires in the context of representation, then these specifications must be

given effect to, but that of itself does not appear to alter their apparently equal importance in section 4.

Whilst the provisions dealing with 'effective representation' (sections 19T and 19U) precede the provisions dealing with 'fair representation' (section 19V) I do not think that this order implies that the assessment is necessary sequential – in other words that effectiveness must be determined before fairness. Both are simply aspects of the decision-making required by sections 19H and 19I. In my view, while representation must be considered from both aspects, the assessment of each will inform the other so that an overall assessment can be reached and given effect to.

### **Downstream effects and the language of the provisions**

In relation to questions 1 and 2(b) (and the relevant answers) the language in section 19V(3)(a) and (b) indicates that while the departure from the +/- 10% rule might have a single trigger point, it will have effect across the district or region as a whole. Thus paragraph (a) stipulates that where effective representation of a particular community of interest within an island/isolated community requires departure from section 19V(2) then 'wards and subdivisions of a community may be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply' etc.

Paragraph (b) is in similar terms

Although the language seems reasonably clear, the logic of the conclusion can be tested in the way you have suggested by seeing whether it is always, or even ever, possible to comply with the rule in the balance of the district or region. Plainly, there are cases where it might not. Nevertheless, it can be concluded that even where exceptions do arise under subsection (3), subsection (2) should still be regarded as the best way of achieving, to the extent possible, the requirement for fair representation.

The opinion could be summarised as follows:

- Where the effective representation of a community of interest requires departure from the +/- 10% rule (as in 19V (3) (b)), then this requirement effectively supersedes 19V (2). Further, they advise that "if the Commission makes a decision that a specific community of interest is more effectively represented without complying with the +/- 10% rule, then compliance must be relaxed for the balance of the region, particularly if continuing to require 'downstream' impediments to effective representation".
- In relation to the tensions inherent in the effective/fair representation debate, Section 19V(3)(b) enables the Commission to discard the +/- 10% rule for regional councils. In effect, the Commission "has the ability to make broadly discretionary judgements in each category and then reconcile them as it thinks best."
- While it is clear that regional councils will need to convince the Commission that communities of interest should take precedence over the population only formula, this legal opinion provides the Commission with the ability to make exemptions. Further, if constituency boundaries within regional councils are based on territorial authority districts, this strengthens the argument for retaining these boundaries as distinct communities of interest.

#### 4. PRE-REVIEW CONSULTATION

The pre-review consultation was carried out as follows:

- **Oamaru, 3 October 2005**

- Attendees: Mackenzie, Timaru, Waimate and Waitaki District Council representatives.
- Main points generally agreed were:
  1. Retain 14 Councillors for the Canterbury Regional Council's geographic area (the upper allowable number).
  2. Retain the present eight urban (Christchurch), six rural (wider Canterbury) representation relationship.
  3. Retain the present Waitaki Constituency as an entity on its own.
  - 4(a) Consider "ring fencing" Christchurch with the present 8 Councillors – 1:43,000 approx.  
(or with Banks Peninsula) 1:44,050 approx.
  - (b) Isolating Waitaki with present population - 1:12,300 approx.
  - (c) Splitting the remainder of Canterbury (average of) 1:29,200 approx.
  5. Defining Community of Interest so far as it relates to the various southern communities in their interface with the role and responsibilities of Environment Canterbury was seen as important.

The four participating District Councils undertook to define "Community of Interest" for their Districts and relay those perspectives to Environment Canterbury. Environment Canterbury was appreciative of that.
  6. Community of Interest – The four Councils saw very little value in an extensive (and expensive) pre-consultation process with the respective communities – would be difficult to obtain some valid viewpoints, with an exhaustive process of education necessary beforehand. Better for Territorial Authorities to express their view as major, and important, stakeholders. The Territorial Authorities would have a better understanding of local perceptions than anyone.
  7. Effective Representation – seen by all as fundamentally important –
    - (a) Ability for the Council representatives to adequately represent their constituencies – geography and distance of travel being the main constraints; and
    - (b) Ability for constituents to have access to their elected representative.
  8. Important for the Waitaki constituents to be represented by someone from Waitaki.

9. No great enthusiasm for a larger (2 member) constituency embracing the areas of the present Waitaki and South Canterbury Constituencies.

Principal reason – the concern that Waitaki may be represented by a person (or 2 people) from urban Timaru, due to population concentration.

10. No support at all for dividing major towns or centres in half, e.g., Timaru or Rangiora, to accommodate population re-distribution.
11. General support for the endeavours of the Regional Affairs Committee (RAC) to get agreement on a nation-wide basis on what defines “Community of Interest”.
12. Recognition of the need/desirability of unanimity of view region-wide before the final position of Environment Canterbury is conveyed to the Commission.
13. Support for telephone surveys and country hall meetings to be held next year – when we have a firm proposal to take out.

- **Christchurch, 28 October 2005**

- Attendees: Ashburton, Banks Peninsula, Hurunui, Selwyn, Waimakariri District Councils representatives and Christchurch City Council representatives.
- Feedback included:
  1. Population of Banks Peninsula community of interest lies with Christchurch, but regional council's land use functions would dictate a relationship with Selwyn.
  2. Dominance of population in Christchurch was a big issue. Effective representation was a big issue for regional councils. Kaiapoi and northern parts were already in Waimakariri for general elections. Isolation of Waitaki was an issue.
  3. Support for Lyttelton and the harbour basin being taken as one identity. Suggestions that the perimeter of the metropolitan boundary had many grey areas.
  4. Boundary lines are effectively lines on a map for electoral purposes and not used for management purposes.
  5. There are different representation because of different conditions and this logic could be used in presenting the Council's case to the Local Government Commission.
  6. Strong communities of interest existed, particularly within wards. Hurunui would be very concerned if the rural representation was diluted.

- **Christchurch, 17 November 2005**

- Representatives: Canterbury Manufacturers Association, North Canterbury Fish and Game, North Canterbury Federated Farmers, Mid-Canterbury Federated Farmers, South Canterbury Federated Farmers, Community and Public Health, Meridian Energy Ltd, South Island High Country Committee of Federated Farmers, University of Canterbury, Te Runanga o Waihao, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te

Runaka o Arowhenua, Te Runanga o Wairewa Inc, Te Hapu o Ngati Wheke, Council of Social Services in Christchurch, Yani Johanson (representing Tim Barnett MP), Combined Christchurch Residents Assn, Opawa Residents Assn, South New Brighton Residents Assn, Beckenham Residents Association, North Canterbury Branch of Royal and Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc.

- Feedback in addition to a number of clarifications south included:
  1. A conservative approach of complying with the population formula would be at the expense of communities of interest.
  2. Some lateral thinking was required and creation of boundaries in a spoke pattern from Christchurch would enable the population formula to be met.
  3. Support for the current eight urban/six rural split.
  4. Ashburton had a solid community of interest between two river boundaries. District Council boundaries should be followed as much as possible.
  5. Community of interest considerations should take preference over population formulas. Acknowledgement that the range of factors that go into describing a community of interest for a region was different from that for a district.
  6. Current representation is working well so why change it.

- **Christchurch City Council Seminar, 7 February 2006**

The Christchurch City Council resolved to support an option that provides for nine city members, and advise Environment Canterbury that the Christchurch City Council considers that whichever option is chosen, the city members should be elected at large across the city.

- **Canterbury Mayoral Forum**

The Canterbury Mayoral Forum has been kept up-to-date with the progress of Environment Canterbury's representation review as it has moved through the various stages.

## 5. POPULATION STATISTICS

The following are population statistics showing the estimated and projected population for the Canterbury Region.

	Estimated Resident Population			Projected Population			
	At 30 June			At 30 June			
	2001	2004	2005P	2006	2011	2016	%2006-2016
<b>North Canterbury</b>							
Kaikoura	3,580	3,630	3,610	3,600	3,600	3,600	0
Hurunui	10,150	10,650	10,850	10,500	10,900	11,200	6.7
Waimakariri	37,900	41,000	42,100	43,100	46,100	48,900	13.5
<b>Christchurch</b>	51,630	55,280	56,560	57,200	60,600	63,700	13.6
Christchurch	327,200	344,100	347,600	339,960	346,900	352,900	3.8
Banks Peninsula	8,040	8,310	8,430	8,200	8,400	8,500	3.7
	335,240	352,410	356,030	348,100	355,300	361,400	3.8
<b>Selwyn</b>	28,300	30,800	31,600	31,400	34,300	37,300	18.8
<b>Ashburton</b>	26,000	26,700	26,900	26,000	26,000	25,800	-0.8
<b>South Canterbury</b>	42,800	43,100	43,000	42,200	41,500	40,600	-3.8
<b>Waitaki</b>							
Mackenzie	3,790	3,750	3,730	3,800	3,800	3,700	-2.6
Waimate	7,220	7,100	7,020	6,900	6,500	6,200	-10.2
Waitaki (Pt)	1,720	1,460	1,460	1,800	1,500	1,300	-17.8
	12,730	12,310	12,210	12,500	11,800	11,200	-10.4
Canterbury Region	496,700	520,600	526,300	517,400	529,500	540,000	

P = Provisional

Statistics NZ has recently released the provisional results of the changes in census night population counts as follows.

<b>Territorial Authority</b>	<b>2001 Census Night</b>	<b>2006 Census Night</b>	<b>% Change 1996-2006</b>	<b>% Change 2001 – 2006</b>
Kaikoura	4,401	4,810	8.9	9.3
Hurunui	10,818	11,300	7.0	4.4
Waimakariri	36,645	42,200	13.7	15.2
	51,864	58,310		
Christchurch (1)	331,174	359,900	2.9	8.0
Selwyn	27,969	34,200	11.3	22.3
Ashburton	25,344	27,600	0.9	8.9
Timaru	42,315	43,000	-1.5	1.6
Mackenzie	5,184	5,390	-6.3	4.1
Waimate	7,128	7,120	-6.2	-0.1
Waitaki (pt) (2)				

(1) Includes Banks Peninsula

(2) Details not available

**Notes:**

(1) Source – Statistics NZ

(2) Figures have not been adjusted to “Usually Resident Population”.

## **6. APPENDICES**

Appendices are attached:

Appendix 1: States the current situation (status quo).

Appendix 2: Details the requirements of Step 3 of the Local Government Commission guidelines to determine constituency boundaries.

Appendix 3: Details the requirements of Step 4 of Local Government Commission guidelines to compare provisional boundaries with identified regional communities of interest.

## APPENDIX 1

### CURRENT SITUATION (STATUS QUO)

<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Ratio</b>	<b>%</b>
North Canterbury	2	55,300	1:27650	- 15.6
Christchurch	8	344,100	1:43010	+ 15.8
Selwyn/Banks Peninsula	1	39,110	1:39110	+5.2
Ashburton	1	26,700	1:26700	-28.1
South Canterbury	1	43,100	1:43100	+16.0
Waitaki	1	12,300	1:12300	-67.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>520,160</b>	<b>1:37150</b>	

#### Notes:

Selwyn/Banks Peninsula is the only constituency that meets the plus/minus 10% formula.

## APPENDIX 2

### STEP 3: DETERMINE CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES

This step determines constituency boundaries on a provisional basis according to the requirement which requires the population ratio for each member to be within the +/- 10% requirement.

#### DETERMINATION BASED ON 14 MEMBERS

<b>North Canterbury (2)</b>			
Kaikoura	3,630		
Hurunui	10,650		
Waimakariri	41,000		
Christchurch (pt)	18,280		
	<hr/>		
	73,560	1:36,780	-10%
<b>Christchurch (9)</b>			
Lyttelton Basin	5,470		
North Canterbury	-8,280		
	<hr/>		
	331,290	1:36,810	+0.9%
<b>Selwyn (1)</b>			
Akaroa/Wairewa	2,840		
	<hr/>		
	33,640	1:33,640	-10.0%
<b>Ashburton (1)</b>			
Temuka Ward	6,060		
Timaru Ward (pt)	8,410		
	<hr/>		
	41,170	1:41,170	+10.7%
<b>South Canterbury/Waitaki (1)</b>			
Mackenzie	3,750		
Waimate	7,100		
Waitaki (pt)	1,440		
Timaru Ward (pt)	21,390		
Geraldine Ward	4,660		
Pleasant Point Ward	2,560		
	<hr/>		
	40,900	1:40,900	+10.0%
Total	<b>(14)</b>	520,560	1:37,180

#### Notes:

##### 1. North Canterbury

- This determination provides for 18,280 for inclusion in the northern area of Christchurch

- It also avoids splitting urban Rangiora Ward between two constituencies and having to provide a “corridor” area in the Woodend/Ashley Ward leading from Rangiora to Kaiapoi.
- There are common issues between the southern end of the North Canterbury constituency and northern Christchurch relating to northern traffic access in and out of Christchurch

## **2. Christchurch**

- Christchurch area currently has four constituencies, but for the purposes of this exercise is being considered as one area. Eventually, Council will need to consider the number and constituency boundaries in the Christchurch area.
- The Lyttelton /Mount Herbert community area of the former Banks Peninsula district is included in Christchurch.

## **3. Selwyn**

- The Akaroa/Wairewa community area of the former Banks Peninsula district is included in Christchurch.

## **4. Ashburton**

- To meet the +/- 10% requirement the Temuka Ward and part of the mainly urban Timaru Ward of Timaru District is required to be included in Ashburton.
- Unfortunately, any computation used for Ashburton and Timaru Districts to meet the +/- 10% requirement cannot avoid splitting the Timaru Ward. The Timaru Ward of 29,800 represents 69% of the total Timaru District population.

## **5. Waitaki/South Canterbury**

- The present constituencies of Waitaki and South Canterbury are required to be one to meet the +/- 10% requirement.

This provisional determination of constituencies with 14 members meets the +/- 10% requirement, although Ashburton is slightly under-represented by 270 population (0.7%).

## DETERMINATION BASED ON 13 MEMBERS

<b>North Canterbury (2)</b>			
Kaikoura	3,630		
Hurunui	10,650		
Waimakariri	41,000		
Christchurch (pt)	16,800		
	<hr/>		
	72,180	1:36,090	-10.0%
<b>Christchurch (8)</b>			
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert	5,470		
North Canterbury	16,800-		
Selwyn	2,410-		
	<hr/>		
	330,360	1:41,300	+3.1%
<b>Selwyn (1)</b>			
Akaroa/Wairewa	2,840		
Christchurch	2,410		
	<hr/>		
	36,050	1:36,050	-10.0%
<b>Ashburton (1)</b>			
Temuka Ward	6,060		
Geraldine Ward	4,660		
	<hr/>		
	37,420	1:37,420	-6.6%
<b>South Canterbury/Waitaki (1)</b>			
Waitaki	12,300		
Pleasant Point Ward	2,560		
Timaru Ward (pt)	29,800		
	<hr/>		
	44,660	1:44,660	+11.5%
<b>Total (13)</b>	<b>520,590</b>	<b>1:40,050</b>	

### Notes

#### 1. North Canterbury

- A one member constituency would require the Kaiapoi Ward, part Rangiora Ward and a "corridor" portion of the Woodend/Ashley Ward from Rangiora to Kaiapoi to be included in a Christchurch constituency.
- The Rangiora Ward would be split.

#### 2. Christchurch

- Creation of a seven member constituency in Christchurch would require a distribution of about 36,000 outside Christchurch to meet the +/- 10% formula.

**3. Selwyn**

- Achievement of the +/- formula requires about 2410 to be taken from Christchurch.

**4. Ashburton**

- Temuka and Geraldine Wards in Timaru District would require inclusion in Ashburton.

**5. South Canterbury/Waitaki**

- A one-member constituency is created but is slightly under represented.
- Splitting the Timaru Ward is avoided.

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **STEP 4: COMPARISON OF PROVISIONAL BOUNDARIES WITH IDENTIFIED REGIONAL COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST.**

In this step the Council considers whether or not there are regional communities of interest which are significantly disadvantaged by the provisional constituency boundaries i.e. lacking "effective representation".

#### **North Canterbury**

There are two options for the North Canterbury Constituency:

- **One Member**

Requires 14,400 to be transferred into Christchurch North including the Kaiapoi Ward, part of the Rangiora Ward and part of the Woodend-Ashley Ward (corridor from Rangiora to Kaiapoi).

- **Two Member**

Requires the North Canterbury constituency to be extended into the Christchurch North area (22,370 population).

#### **Comment**

1. The present North Canterbury constituency is large, comprising 30% of the regions land area and extends from Kekerengu in the north to the Waimakariri River in the south (distance of 240kms).
2. North Canterbury in particular Waimakariri District, is an area of high population growth. The census night figures from 2001 to 2006 show an increase of 15.2% increase in Waimakariri District and Statistics NZ projections to 2016 show similar increases.
3. The concept of having to split the mainly urban ward of Rangiora to achieve a one member constituency has not been received with any positive reaction.
4. The large size of the constituency suggests any reduction in the present representation of two members would result in a less than desirable effective representation and engagement with the voters of the region.

#### **Christchurch**

1. With the amalgamation of Banks Peninsula into Christchurch City it is now prudent to include the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert community area of the former Banks Peninsula in Christchurch. There is a clear community of interest with this area and Christchurch.
2. The Akaroa/Wairewa community area with its rural character would more properly fit within Selwyn District.
3. It has been acknowledged for several years that Canterbury was a problem area, the major problem was the dominance of Christchurch in terms of population.

In 1992 when legislation reduced the maximum number of members for a regional council to fourteen, the Local Government Commissioner set a membership of thirteen (seven members for Christchurch and six rural).

The Commission said "it had to look at the relativity between Christchurch City and other constituencies. If population alone was the major criterion, the Christchurch constituency should have another member. Yet this would not create fair representation overall. To add one more member to the South Canterbury constituency (included Waitaki) further compromises the fairness between the constituency and the Christchurch constituency.

On balance the 13 member council maintains a reasonable level of fairness as between the Christchurch constituency on the one hand and the remaining constituencies on the other hand."

4. Christchurch, plus the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Community has a clear community of interest – Public passenger transport, clean air and the Regional Land Transport Strategy references to Port activities.

### **Selwyn**

1. Selwyn is an area of high population growth, 22.3% increase from the 2001 to 2006 census. Statistics NZ projected population figures predict similar growth.
2. Inclusion of the Akaroa/Wairewa community in Selwyn is recommended because of the rural aspect of this area. The current pest area incorporates both Selwyn and Akaroa/Wairewa community.

Also, Lake Ellesmere would be included in the same constituency. Currently, the lake is split between Christchurch City (formerly Banks Peninsula) and Selwyn District.

3. It has been suggested that the more rural parts of the Lyttelton/Mt Herbert community should also be included in Selwyn. The population involved is 2,330, but does include some more urban areas e.g. Diamond Harbour and Governors Bay.

The inclusion of the whole Lyttelton/Mt Herbert community in Christchurch provides a more clearly defined and identifiable boundary.

### **Ashburton**

1. Ashburton has a clear regional community of interest. Irrigation and ground water functions are a major issue in this area. The Rangitata Diversion Race is wholly situated in the district connecting the Rangitata and Rakaia Rivers.
2. Ashburton constituency boundaries fits between two major rivers – Rangitata and Rakaia.

### **South Canterbury**

1. South Canterbury is an area with both urban and rural aspects.

2. To meet the +/- 10% population rule the Timaru Ward requires splitting between Timaru and Ashburton Districts.
3. Timaru Ward has urban issues of public passenger transport and clean air. The pre-review consultation and subsequent comment suggests moves to split the Timaru Ward would be strongly opposed. It is highly desirable that the Timaru Ward remains within one constituency.

## **Waitaki**

1. Waitaki became a separate constituency in 2001.
2. In 1999 the Otago Regional Council and the Waitaki District Council promoted a draft proposal to move the boundary line between Otago and Canterbury Regions to include the whole of the Waitaki District in Otago Region. In the event the proposal was subsequently declined.

During the hearings and the appeal a number of submissions were received from the community to have Waitaki as a separate constituency to achieve more effective representation.

Canterbury Regional Council picked-up these comments and included the concept of a separate constituency in its representative review at that time, which was eventually adopted.

3. Waitaki with its small population does not meet the +/-% formula.
4. Waitaki has a clear community of interest relating to the Waitaki River Catchment, including the Mackenzie Basin. The Waitaki Water Allocation Plan to administer the allocation of the Waitaki River water has been put in place by Central Government.
5. Waitaki has one member but is the largest constituency in Canterbury Region 38% of the regions total area. Much of the area is isolated.
6. Waitaki is an area significantly disadvantaged by the provisional boundaries. The large and sparsely populated area suggests the provisions of the act to allow a variation to the +/- 10% requirement should apply.

7. The calculation to provide a one member Waitaki Constituency would result as follows:

<b>North Canterbury (2)</b>			
Kaikoura	3,630		
Hurunui	10,650		
Waimakariri	41,000		
Christchurch	22,370		
	<hr/>		
	77,650	1:38,830	0.7%
<b>Christchurch (8)</b>			
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert	344,100		
North Canterbury	5,470		
Selwyn	22,370-		
	5,460-		
	<hr/>		
	321,740	1:40,220	2.9%
<b>Selwyn (1)</b>			
Akaroa/Wairewa	30,800		
Christchurch	2,840		
	5,460		
	<hr/>		
	39,100	1:39,100	0%
<b>Ashburton (1)</b>			
	26,700	1:26,700	-31.3%
<b>South Canterbury (1)</b>			
	43,100	1:43,100	+10.2%
	<hr/>		
	508,290	1:39,100	
<b>Waitaki</b>			
	12,300	1:12,300	
Total (14)	520,600		

**Notes:**

**1. North Canterbury**

- Requires 22,370 into Christchurch.

**2. Christchurch**

- Includes Lyttelton/Mt Herbert community.

**3. Selwyn**

- Includes Akaroa/Wairewa and 5,460 into Christchurch.

#### **4. Ashburton**

- Does not meet the +/- 10% requirement but may be considered in terms of the Phillip Fox legal opinion that a decision that a specific community of interest is more effectively represented without complying with the +/- 10% rule, then compliance must be relaxed for the balance of the region, particularly if continuing to require “downstream” impediments to effective representation.

#### **5. South Canterbury**

- Is slightly under represented by 90 Population, but may be acceptable being so close to the +/- requirement.

## **OPTIONS**

This section details four options for the Committee's consideration.

### **Option A**

- This option provides for nine members in Christchurch and two in North Canterbury.
- It avoids splitting the Rangiora Ward between two constituencies but does not avoid splitting the Timaru Ward between Ashburton and Timaru.
- South Canterbury and Waitaki is one constituency with one member.

### **Option B**

- This option provides for ten members in Christchurch and two in North Canterbury.
- Rangiora Ward and Timaru Ward are split between two constituencies.
- South Canterbury and Waitaki is one constituency with one member.

### **Option C**

- This option provides for a 13 member Council.
- It avoids splitting the Rangiora and Timaru Wards.
- South Canterbury and Waitaki is one constituency with one member.

### **Option D**

- This option provides for separate South Canterbury and Waitaki Wards with one member each.
- The case for a separate Waitaki Ward is on the basis of the provision contained in Section 19V(3)(b) of the Local Electoral Act.
- The splitting of the Rangiora and Timaru Wards between two constituencies is avoided.
- Ashburton remains over-represented and this can only be solved by making adjustments between Ashburton, Selwyn and Christchurch.
- However, the Phillips Fox opinion obtained by the Local Government Commission provides the Commission to make an exemption to the +/- 10% requirement when tensions exist in compliance with the +/- 10% rule.

## Option A

### North Canterbury (2)

Kaikoura	3,630	
Hurunui	10,650	
Waimakariri	41,000	
Christchurch (Pt)	18,280	
	<hr/>	
	73,560	-10.0%

### Christchurch (9)

Christchurch	325,820	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Comm	5,470	
	<hr/>	
	331,290	+0.9%

### Selwyn (1)

Selwyn	30,800	
Akaroa/Wairewa	2,840	
	<hr/>	
	33,640	-10.0%

### Ashburton (1)

Ashburton	26,700	
Temuka Ward	6,060	
Timaru Ward (Pt)	8,410	
	<hr/>	
	41,170	+10.7%

### South Canterbury/Waitaki (1)

Mackenzie	3,750	
Waimate	7,100	
Waitaki	1,440	
Timaru Ward (Pt)	21,390	
Geraldine Ward	4,660	
Pleasant Point Ward	2,560	
	<hr/>	
	40,900	+10.0%

Total	(14)	520,560	
-------	------	---------	--

## Option B

### North Canterbury (1)

Kaikoura	3,630
Hurunui	10,650
Oxford-Eyre Ward	8,640
Woodend-Ashley Ward	8,410
Rangiora Ward (Pt)	5,860

37,190

0%

### Christchurch (10)

Christchurch	344,100
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Comm	5,470
Kaiapoi Ward	11,950
Rangiora Ward (Pt)	6,090

367,610

-1.2%

### Selwyn (1)

Selwyn	30,800
Akaroa/Wairewa Comm	2,840

33,640

-9.5%

### Ashburton (1)

Ashburton	26,700
Temuka Ward	6,060
Timaru Ward (Pt)	8,410

41,170

+10.7%

### South Canterbury/Waitaki (1)

Mackenzie	3,750
Waitaki	1,440
Timaru Ward (Pt)	21,390
Geraldine Ward	4,660
Pleasant Point Ward	2,560

40,900

-10.0%

Total (14) 520,600

## Option C

### North Canterbury (2)

Kaikoura	3,630	
Hurunui	10,650	
Waimakariri	41,000	
Christchurch (Pt)	16,800	
	<hr/>	
	72,180	-10.0%

### Christchurch (8)

Christchurch	324,890	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert Comm	5,470	
	<hr/>	
	330,360	+3.1%

### Selwyn (1)

Selwyn	30,800	
Akaroa/Wairewa Comm	2,840	
Christchurch	2,410	
	<hr/>	
	36,050	-10.0%

### Ashburton (1)

Ashburton	26,700	
Temuka Ward	6,060	
Geraldine Ward	4,660	
	<hr/>	
	37,420	+6.6%

### South Canterbury/Waitaki (1)

Waitaki	12,300	
Pleasant Point Ward	2,560	
Timaru Ward	29,800	
	<hr/>	
	44,660	+11.5%

Total (13)	520,590	1:40050
------------	---------	---------

## Option D

<b>North Canterbury (2)</b>		
Kaikoura	3,630	
Hurunui	10,650	
Waimakariri	41,000	
Christchurch	22,370	
	<hr/>	
	77,650	0%
 <b>Christchurch (8)</b>		
Christchurch	316,270	
Lyttelton/Mt Herbert	5,470	
	<hr/>	
	321,740	+2.9%
 <b>Selwyn (1)</b>		
Selwyn	30,800	
Akaroa/Wairewa	2,840	
Christchurch	5,460	
	<hr/>	
	39,100	0%
 <b>Ashburton (1)</b>		
	26,700	-31.7%
 <b>South Canterbury (1)</b>		
	43,100	+10.2%
	<hr/>	
(13)	508,290	1:39100
 <b>Waitaki (1)</b>		
	12,300	1:12,300
 <b>Total (14)</b>		
	<hr/>	
	520,600	

## **FUTURE STEPS**

1. The Committee must provide options or a preferred option for Council consideration. It is suggested a Council Workshop (open to the public) be held prior to the Council meeting on 27 July 2006.
2. That meeting must also resolve the number of constituencies it requires in Christchurch.

Attached are maps of:

- River Catchment Boundaries in Christchurch area.
- Christchurch Groundwater Recharge Zones.
- Existing ward boundaries of Christchurch.
- Christchurch City Council Area Plans

These maps may assist this process of determination.

3. The Council **MUST** resolve its draft proposal for public consideration no later than 25 August 2006. The proposal must provide detail of constituency boundaries in sufficient detail to be clearly identifiable.
4. Public notification of the draft proposal made no later than 13 September 2006.
5. Submissions close 13 October 2006.
6. Council considers submissions (13/19 November)
  - Council may amend or confirm its initial proposal.
  - Gives public notice.
7. Last day for lodging appeals and objections to the Council's revised proposals (20 December)
  - if no appeals give public notice.
  - if appeals or objections received refer to Local Government Commission.

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO: 6</b>	<b>SUBJECT MATTER: PROCESS TIMETABLE</b>
<b>REPORT:</b> Representation Committee      Review	<b>DATE OF MEETING:</b> 21 June 2006
<b>FILE REFERENCES:</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO:</b> <b>PROJECT:</b> <b>OUTPUT:</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b> Louise McDonald, Administration Officer	<b>ENDORSED BY:</b>

## **PURPOSE**

Attached for information is the process timetable for the representation review.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

*That the timetable be received and noted.*

## PROCESS/TIMETABLE

	Process	LEA Authority	Legislation Timetable	Council/ Committee Timetable
1.	Committee report to Council (Committee meeting 1 April 2005)	-		28 April 05
2.	Council consideration of Electoral System (FPP/STV)	27(1)	12 Sept 05	30 June 05
3.	Public Notice right to demand poll on electoral system	28(1)	19 Sept 05	7 July 05
4.	Council consideration of Maori representation	19Z	By 23 Nov 05	28 July 05
5.	If Council passes a resolution under 19Z – public notice for right to demand a poll	19ZA	By 28 Nov 05	6 August 05
6.	Council consideration of detailed options and pre-review communications strategy	-		25 August 05
7.	Consultation with community	-		Sept/Oct/Nov 05
8.	Identify preferred option			24 Aug 06
9.	Council determines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proposed number of constituencies</li> <li>- proposed name and boundaries of each constituency</li> <li>- Number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each constituency</li> </ul>	19I 19K 19T 19V 19ZH Sch 1A	By 31 Aug 06	24 Aug 06
10.	Public Notice of Initial Resolution	19M	By 8 Sept 06	Sept 06
11.	Submissions close not less than one month after public notice	19M	9 Oct 06	13 Oct 06
12.	After close of submission period. No submissions received. Give Public Notice.	19Y		Oct 06
13.	Submissions received – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consider all submissions</li> <li>- may amend the resolution</li> <li>- give public notice</li> </ul>	19N	By 19 Nov 06	13 –19 Nov 06
14.	Last day for lodging of appeals and objections to the Council's revised proposals	19O 19P	20 Dec 06	20 Dec 06
15.	No appeals or objections – give public notice.	19Y		
16.	Appeals or objectives received – refer to Local Government Commission. A regional council using a formula other than +/- 10% population is considered an appeal.	19Q	15 Jan 07	
17.	Local Government Commission issues a final determination.	19R 19S	11 April 07	
18.	Election day		13 Oct 07	