

10 December, 2009

The Chief Executive Officer  
Local Government Commission  
PO Box 5362  
WELLINGTON

Sent by email to: [info@lgc.govt.nz](mailto:info@lgc.govt.nz)

## NZCID submission on Auckland Governance Arrangements: Proposals for Wards, Local Boards and Boundaries for Auckland

The New Zealand Council for Infrastructure Development<sup>1</sup> appreciates the opportunity to make a submission on the proposals for wards and local boards proposed by the Local Government Commission.

### One Ward One Councillor

NZCID agrees with the submissions by others, that the basis for ward representation should be changed from a mix of one and two-councillor wards, as proposed by the Commission, to all wards having one councillor. We submit that, with the exception of the wards for the Hauraki Gulf which are specified in legislation, that ward and local board boundaries should be aligned. It is our view that this provides for much more balanced representation and allows better alignment with communities of interest. It provides a consistent and coherent basis that is simple for electors to understand and will support effective engagement between people, communities, local boards and the Auckland Council.

NZCID does not consider that the local board and ward boundaries as proposed by the Commission achieve the first three primary objectives stated by the Commission namely:

1. a new Auckland governance structure that is coherent, understandable, enduring and legally compliant
2. the structure will promote good governance and support effective engagement between people, communities, local boards and the Auckland Council
3. the structure will provide effective representation for Auckland's diverse communities

Nor does NZCID consider that the proposal is consistent with the Commissions stated criteria:

- compliance with the requirements of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009
- recognition of communities of interest in Auckland

---

<sup>1</sup> NZCID is a non profit organisation. Members comprise a diverse range of leading private and public organisations including infrastructure equity owners, financiers, constructors, service providers, public sector agencies, and major infrastructure users. Information on the Council, its members, policy and work can be found at [www.nzcid.org.nz](http://www.nzcid.org.nz). In developing its policy position on infrastructure issues, NZCID consults extensively with its member organisations, undertakes workshops and seminars on policy and undertakes independent research. This submission represents the views of NZCID as a collective whole, and may not necessarily represent the views of individual member organisations, some of whom will be making their own individual submissions.

- effective representation of those communities of interest
- effective governance of Auckland.

In support of this view we note the following inconsistencies:

1. Reference to the summary of Local Government Commission proposed wards which is reproduced below shows that eight of the twenty wards (40%) are not compliant with the requirements of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 requirement “that the population of each ward divided by the number of members to be elected by the ward produces a figure no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of Auckland divided by the total number of elected members (other than the mayor)”

Summary of Local Government Commission proposed wards:

Wards	Population	No. of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from average population per councillor	% deviation from average population per councillor*
Rodney	53,590	1	53,590	-17,219.5	-24.3
Hibiscus-Albany-East Coast Bays	120,400	2	60,200	-10,609.5	-15.0
North Shore	144,600	2	72,300	+1,490.5	+2.1
Waitakere	166,150	2	83,075	+12,265.5	+17.3
Whau (New Lynn-Avondale)	80,900	1	80,900	+10,090.5	+14.3
Mt Albert-Mt Roskill	144,000	2	72,000	+1,190.5	+1.7
Maungawhau-Hauraki Gulf (Auckland Central)	88,000	1	88,000	+17,190.5	+24.3
Orakei-Maungakiekie	161,400	2	80,700	+9,890.5	+14.0
Manukau	142,400	2	71,200	+390.5	+0.6
Papakura-Manurewa	129,400	2	64,700	-6,109.5	-8.6
Howick-Pakuranga-Botany	121,700	2	60,850	-9,959.5	-14.1
Franklin	63,650	1	63,650	-7,159.5	-10.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,416,190</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>70,809.5</b>		

\* '+' denotes under-representation and '-'denotes over-representation

2. Local board population size and scale are inconsistent
3. The large deviations in representation mean that the proposed representation is neither coherent, understandable, enduring nor legally compliant and results in significant unfair variances in voter equality
4. Consequently the structure will not promote good governance and support effective engagement between people, communities, local boards and the Auckland Council; and
5. That the structure will not provide effective representation for Auckland's diverse communities

We do not support the Commission's view that two member wards provide for better alignment of communities of interest. In fact, as many submitters will highlight, the Commission's proposal groups communities which have very little in common socially, culturally, geographically or historically (the proposed Orakei Maungakiekie ward being the most glaring example).

The argument that a two member ward councillor coming from multiple local board areas will act less parochially than a single member ward stands little scrutiny. On the contrary, one could argue that two

members coming from the same areas could lobby collectively in a parochial manner which could potentially be more problematic than single member representation. The fact that the ward representative is not a member of the Local Board provides sufficient separation of function in and of itself to enable councillors not to be fettered by local parochial interests - unless of course they think that such matters are justified, in which case it would be correct and proper that appropriate local representations be made. In the end, unless local councillors can enjoy broader support for local interests they will be a lone voice on a Council of twenty and the remaining 19 councillors will have to make a considered judgement on matters of regional significance.

## NZCID Proposal

Taking a similar approach to the Heart of the City submission, and given that the legislation has prescribed a twenty member council, NZCID proposes that the city be divided into 20 wards of approximately 71,000 population each. We have assumed the northern boundary stays where it is. The summary of wards and local boards is listed below and the detailed list of community areas is included in Appendix One.<sup>2</sup>

Ward	Population	Var
Rodney	71,170	1%
Albany-East Coast Bays	73,810	4%
Takapuna-Devonport	72,410	2%
Glenfield-Birkenhead	72,090	2%
Upper Harbour	74,000	5%
Henderson	76,850	9%
Waitakere-New Lynn	76,260	8%
Bay-Roskill	72,760	3%
Western Isthmus	71,370	1%
Eden-Epsom	70,220	-1%
City & Gulf	68,270	-4%
Remuera-Kohimaramara	73,960	4%
Maungakiekie-Tamaki	71,840	2%
Mangere-Otahuhu	68,400	-3%
Howick-Pakuranga	69,340	-2%
Botany-Flatbush	69,340	-2%
Otara-Papatoetoe	66,190	-6%
Manukau-Manurewa	68,280	-4%
Papakura	66,300	-6%
Franklin	62,680	-11%
Total	1,415,540	

<sup>2</sup> The definition of local boundaries is used to illustrate that it is possible to achieve broad alignment of communities of interest in a one councilor ward model. Final definition of boundaries will require further refinement taking on board the input from the communities themselves. This has not been possible in the time available to prepare submissions.

The plan provides for twenty wards, one councillor per ward, and twenty two local boards which, with the exception of the Gulf Island local boards, are all of consistent size and representation. We believe this provides better representation of communities at both the Local Board and Council levels. All proposed wards are within the +/- 10% representation guidelines (except Franklin).

Alignment of council elector wards with local board areas simplifies council structures and election processes. Electors will simply vote for one mayor, one councillor from their ward area to sit on the Council and the relevant number of local board members. There would be consistency of representation at the local level through local boards and the regional level through the locally elected Auckland councillor. Most importantly, wards of equivalent size ensure fair and balanced representation across the region.

NZCID submits that the ward and local board boundaries should be amended as described above.

Yours faithfully



Stephen Selwood  
Chief Executive