



LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

Determination

of representation arrangements to apply for
the election of the Wellington City Council
to be held on 13 October 2007

Background

1. The Wellington City Council (the Council) elected at the 2004 local elections comprises the mayor and 14 councillors elected as follows:

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per councillor
Northern	42,400	3	14,133	+911.57	+6.89
Onslow-Western	37,000	3	12,333	-888.43	-6.72
Lambton	45,200	3	15,067	+1,845.57	+13.96
Eastern	34,700	3	11,567	-1,654.43	-12.51
Southern	25,800	2	12,900	-321.43	-2.43
TOTALS	185,100	14	13,221.43		

*These figures are rounded 2005 population estimates provided by the Government Statistician

2. Currently there are two community boards in Wellington City. The Tawa Community Board covers part of the Northern Ward and the Makara-Ohariu Community Board covers parts of the Onslow-Western and Northern Wards. The Tawa Community Board comprises six elected members and two appointed members. The Makara-Ohariu Community Board comprises six elected members.
3. It is noted that the Wellington City Council uses the STV electoral system.
4. On 28 June 2006 the Council resolved, under sections 19H and 19J of the Local Electoral Act 2001 (the Act), its initial proposed representation arrangements to apply for the 2007 local elections. These were publicly notified on 8 July 2006.
5. The Council's initial proposal was as follows:
 - (a) the Council comprise 14 councillors (and the mayor) elected from five wards as follows:

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per councillor
Northern	42,400	3	14,133	+911.57	+6.89
Onslow-Western	40,250	3	13,417	+195.57	+1.48
Lambton	40,350	3	13,450	+228.57	+1.73
Eastern	37,180	3	12,393	-828.43	-6.27
Southern	24,920	2	12,460	-761.43	-5.76
TOTALS	185,100	14	13,221.43		

*These figures are rounded 2005 population estimates provided by the Government Statistician

- (b) the existing Makara-Ohariu Community Board be extended to include the rural suburbs of Takapu Valley (excluding the suburban centre in Takapu Valley) and Horokiwi (excluding Hutt Road), the altered community be renamed the Wellington Rural Community, and the board consist of seven elected members; and
- (c) the existing Tawa Community Board be abolished.
6. In resolving its initial proposal, the Council noted that the existing ward boundaries do not satisfy the fairness provisions of the Act but that these will be achieved with the following three boundary adjustments:
- transfer of Roseneath from the Lambton Ward to the Eastern Ward;
 - transfer of Wadestown from the Lambton Ward to the Onslow-Western Ward; and
 - transfer of Southgate from the Southern Ward to the Eastern Ward.
7. In notifying its proposal on community boards, the Council noted that:
- in respect of the Makara-Ohariu Community Board:
 - 73% of the people who took part in pre-review consultation supported the retention of the board on the basis that the community was a “special” case and needed local advocacy;
 - the board currently provides the Council with expert advice (based on first-hand knowledge) on a range of rural issues that would not be available if the board did not exist;
 - because of its size (65% of the city’s total area), its unique characteristics and environmental importance to the city, the Council agrees that the rural community needs a level of representation within the Council’s governance structure;
 - the rural areas of Takapu Valley and Horokiwi lack rural representation and it is therefore proposed to extend the existing Makara-Ohariu Community to include these rural suburbs; and
 - the advantage of this proposal is that almost all rural land in Wellington City would then be under the jurisdiction of one community board, to be named the Wellington Rural Community Board;
 - in respect of the Tawa Community Board:

- the Council had carried out a review of community boards to determine whether they were necessary to provide fair and effective representation for individuals and communities, and as a result of this review the Council had decided that the establishment of more community boards across the city was not necessary to achieve these requirements and was therefore not supported;
 - this view was supported by 73% of those people who took part in pre-review consultation; and
 - while there was strong support for the retention of the Makara-Ohariu Community Board (because of its specialised and unique role), the majority view of the Council was that if no more boards were to be established in the city, the retention of the Tawa Community Board could not be supported on fairness grounds (i.e. the electors of the Tawa Community receive an additional level of representation other urban residents do not receive).
8. The Council received 598 submissions on its initial proposal as follows:
- 14 covering a range of issues including at large elections (under the STV electoral system), a mixed system of representation, and the number of councillors;
 - 18 opposed to proposed ward boundaries as follows:
 - Roseneath: 11;
 - Wadestown: one;
 - Southgate: two;
 - five proposed alternative boundary options;
 - 556 on the proposal to abolish the Tawa Community Board as follows:
 - 539 opposed with a petition signed by 700+ people;
 - 17 in support;
 - 29 on the proposal to extend Makara-Ohariu Community Board as follows:
 - 14 supported the status quo;
 - seven supported abolition of Makara-Ohariu Community Board;
 - eight supported the Council's proposal.
9. Following consideration of submissions, the Council, on 27 September 2006, confirmed its initial proposal as its final proposal in relation to the basis of election and the number of councillors (i.e. 14 councillors plus the mayor) elected from five wards.
10. The Council, however, resolved to amend its initial proposal relating to community representation as follows:
- the proposal to abolish the Tawa Community Board be rescinded so that it is retained with its existing boundaries and current numbers of both elected and appointed members; and
 - the proposal to extend the Makara-Ohariu Community to include the rural suburbs of Takapu Valley and Horokiwi and for the altered community to be renamed the Wellington Rural Community, be rescinded.

11. Eight appeals/objections were received against the Council's proposal. The main concerns of the appellants/objectors related to:
- the proposed transfer of the Roseneath area from the Lambton Ward to the Eastern Ward, and the transfer of Southgate from the Southern Ward to the Eastern Ward;
 - the general approach to the review and identification of wards;
 - the retention of the Tawa Community Board; and
 - the decision not to provide for rural representation by way of a rural community board or rural community sub-committee.

Hearing

12. The Commission met with the Council, appellants/objectors and representatives of the two community boards who accepted an invitation to appear in support of the Council's proposal, at a hearing held in the Wellington City Council Committee Room on 5 March 2007. The Council was represented by the Mayor Kerry Prendergast, the Council's Chief Executive Garry Poole and the Electoral Officer Ross Bly. The appellants/objectors who appeared at the hearing were: Warwick Taylor of the Wellington Residents' Coalition Southern Branch; Bill Fair; Victor Davie; Alec Waugh, President of the Roseneath Residents' Association; Bernie Harris; Barry Blackhurst from the Glenside Progressive Association; and Stan Andis.

Matters raised in appeals, objections and at the hearing

13. The main arguments presented in relation to the proposed transfer of Roseneath from the Lambton Ward to the Eastern Ward were:
- there is a depth of feeling against the proposed transfer and Roseneath being treated as a "political appendage" with its transfer between wards simply to comply with a legislative formula;
 - 81% of respondents to a Council questionnaire favoured the transfer of Roseneath into the Lambton Ward when this occurred in 2000;
 - the transfer was well received by residents and there has been no community move to attempt to reverse the decision;
 - the prevailing community of interest, socially and geographically, is with the inner city and central business district covered by the Lambton Ward; and
 - the Roseneath Residents' Association has developed a good working relationship with the Oriental Bay Residents' Association, working in partnership on issues of common concern, and both Associations oppose the transfer of Roseneath out of the Lambton Ward.
14. The main arguments presented in relation to the proposed transfer of Southgate from the Southern Ward to the Eastern Ward were:
- inspection of a topographical map clearly shows Southgate as part of an "Island Bay bowl" with the streets running down to Island Bay;
 - Southgate has the same postcode as Island Bay and other areas in the Southern Ward;

- residents in the area do not support the proposed transfer;
 - the transfer is not actually required at this stage for compliance with the +/-10% rule, and is simply based on a speculative future possibility; and
 - other options would be to juggle the total number of councillors.
15. The following points were made in respect of the review generally and the identification of wards:
- the Council should have treated the review as a greenfields exercise and as a way to address the big issues facing the city identified in the Council's long-term council community plan;
 - the Council, however, simply went back to the status quo;
 - suburbs are not an appropriate basis for identifying wards;
 - fewer and larger wards are desirable to achieve the full benefits of the STV electoral system;
 - a three- or four-ward option could be achieved, moving the Onslow area into the Northern Ward and combining the other wards;
 - three- to six-member wards would be more effective;
 - there appeared to be a reluctance by the Council to consider increasing the number of councillors; and
 - the 'three plus three plus three plus three plus two' member structure is unbalanced between the wards.
16. The main arguments presented in relation to retention of the Tawa Community Board were:
- Tawa is a distinct community of interest physically and socially;
 - there is a history of a 'sense of town' and of self-governance which is reflected in Tawa having been a separate borough prior to 1989;
 - Tawa has suffered an erosion in representation since 1989;
 - the board is a good model of local democratic decision-making in action;
 - the board provides effective representation and advocacy;
 - the board has developed good working relationships with local groups and organisations such as police, fire, local schools and churches;
 - the board is supported by the community with eight candidates at recent elections, and five candidates for a recent byelection;
 - board meetings are relatively well attended by local residents;
 - the board is not a financial burden, with annual administration costs of \$27,000 compared to the rates take from the area of \$8.5 million; and
 - Tawa receives an unfair level of representation compared to other areas of the city.
17. The main arguments presented in relation to the Makara-Ohariu Community Board were:
- the rural community board initially proposed by the Council would have covered a large and disjointed area;

- the proposed board would have meant a significant redefinition of the community of interest compared to the community of interest of the Makara-Ohariu Community;
 - the Makara-Ohariu Community has no particular affinity with the enlarged area;
 - the Makara-Ohariu Community Board has a good working relationship with the Council which is not always confined to rural issues;
 - representation for the rural areas of the city as initially proposed by the Council, in the form of a rural community board, would have been useful;
 - a 'rural issues advisory board or committee' was worth considering further; and
 - individual areas will continue to seek appropriate representation of their interests.
18. Some appellants/objectors raised procedural issues relating to the Council's approach to the review such as the appropriate population figures to use. These are not matters over which the Commission has jurisdiction. In any event the Commission will make its own determination using what it believes, under the legislation, to be the appropriate approach.

Matters for Determination

19. The statutory provisions in respect of objections are contained in sections 19R, 19H and 19J of the Act.

19R. Commission to determine appeals and objections

- (1) *The Commission must—*
- (a) *Consider the resolutions, submissions, appeals, objections, and information forwarded to it under section 19Q; and*
 - (b) *Subject to sections 19T and 19V in the case of a territorial authority, and to sections 19U and 19V in the case of a regional council, determine,—*
 - (i) *In the case of a territorial authority that has made a resolution under section 19H, the matters specified in that section:*
 - (ii) *In the case of a regional council that has made a resolution under section 19I, the matters specified in that section:*
 - (iii) *In the case of a territorial authority that has made a resolution under section 19J, the matters specified in that section.*
- (2) *For the purposes of making a determination under subsection (1)(b), the Commission—*
- (a) *May make any enquiries that it considers appropriate; and*
 - (b) *May hold, but is not obliged to hold, meetings with the territorial authority or regional council or any persons who have lodged an appeal or objection and have indicated a desire to be heard by the Commission in relation to that appeal or objection.*
- (3) *The Commission must, before 11 April in the year of a triennial general election, complete the duties it is required to carry out under subsection (1).*

19H. Review of representation arrangements for elections of territorial authorities

- (1) A territorial authority must determine by resolution, and in accordance with this Part,—
- (a) Whether the members of the territorial authority (other than the mayor) are proposed to be elected—
 - (i) By the electors of the district as a whole; or
 - (ii) By the electors of 2 or more wards; or
 - (iii) In some cases by the electors of the district as a whole and in the other cases by the electors of each ward of the district; and
 - (b) In any case to which paragraph (a)(i) applies, the proposed number of members to be elected by the electors of the district as a whole; and
 - (c) In any case to which paragraph (a)(iii) applies,—
 - (i) The proposed number of members to be elected by the electors of the district as a whole; and
 - (ii) The proposed number of members to be elected by the wards of the district; and
 - (d) In any case to which paragraph (a)(ii) or paragraph (a)(iii) applies,—
 - (i) The proposed name and the proposed boundaries of each ward; and
 - (ii) The number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each ward.
- (2) The determination required by subsection (1) must be made by a territorial authority —
- (a) On the first occasion, either in 2003 or in 2006; and
 - (b) Subsequently, at least once in every period of 6 years after the first determination.
- (3) This section must be read in conjunction with section 19ZH and Schedule 1A.

19J. Review of community boards

- (1) A territorial authority must, on every occasion on which it passes a resolution under section 19H, determine by that resolution, and in accordance with this Part, not only the matters referred to in that section but also whether, in light of the principle set out in section 4(1)(a) (which relates to fair and effective representation for individuals and communities) —
- (a) There should be communities and community boards; and
 - (b) If so resolved, the nature of any community and the structure of any community board.
- (2) The resolution referred to in subsection (1) must, in particular, determine—
- (a) Whether 1 or more communities should be constituted:
 - (b) Whether any community should be abolished or united with another community:
 - (c) Whether the boundaries of a community should be altered:
 - (d) Whether a community should be subdivided for electoral purposes or whether it should continue to be subdivided for electoral purposes, as the case may require:
 - (e) Whether the boundaries of any subdivision should be altered:
 - (f) The number of members of any community board:

- (g) *The number of members of a community board who should be elected and the number of members of a community board who should be appointed:*
 - (h) *Whether the members of a community board who are proposed to be elected are to be elected—*
 - (i) *By the electors of the community as a whole; or*
 - (ii) *By the electors of 2 or more subdivisions; or*
 - (iii) *If the community comprises 2 or more whole wards, by the electors of each ward:*
 - (i) *in any case to which paragraph (h)(ii) applies, -*
 - (i) *The proposed name and the proposed boundaries of each subdivision; and*
 - (ii) *The number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each subdivision.*
- (3) *Nothing in this section limits the provisions of section 19F.*

Consideration by the Commission

Effective and fair representation

20. A review of representation arrangements under the Act is to ensure that:
- the method adopted for the election of members (i.e. at large, wards, or a combination of both) will provide effective representation of communities of interest within the district (section 19T); and
 - in determining the number of members to be elected by each ward, electors of that ward will receive fair representation (section 19V).
21. For the purpose of achieving fair representation, section 19V(2) requires that the population of each ward divided by the number of members to be elected by that ward produces a figure no more than 10% greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of elected members. The Act does not define ‘effective representation’ or ‘communities of interest’.
22. The steps in the process for achieving effective and fair representation are not statutorily prescribed. The Commission believes that the following approach to determining representation arrangements will achieve a robust outcome that is in accordance with the statutory criteria:
- (a) identify the city’s communities of interest;
 - (b) determine the best means of providing effective representation of the communities of interest; and
 - (c) determine fair representation of electors for the city.

Wellington City

23. The Council commenced its review by undertaking pre-review public consultation on representation arrangement options. In its discussion document, it identified options of at large and a mix of at large and wards. The ward system, however, still attracted strong community support. The response rate to the pre-review consultation was comparatively low (190 submissions received). We believe, however, there is sufficient indication from both the pre-review and statutory consultation exercises of support for a

ward system as the best means to provide effective representation for communities of interest. The city has used the ward system since 1986.

24. One appellant did question whether the Council's use of suburbs was the most appropriate basis for identifying wards. We are satisfied, in the absence of evidence of a more appropriate method and of widespread dissatisfaction with this approach, that the use of suburbs is an appropriate mechanism. We note also that the Council undertook an extensive review of suburb boundaries in 2003 that included public consultation.
25. The Council subsequently identified the current five wards as appropriate groupings of communities of interest. We note in its pre-review consultation, that the Council did identify a three-ward option as a modification of the five-ward model, with Onslow the only area changing wards (from the Western to the Northern Ward) in order to comply with the +/-10% rule. Under this option the five current wards would be combined as follows: Northern, Western-Lambton, and Eastern-Southern.
26. We are satisfied that the current ward structure does reflect an appropriate grouping of communities of interest in the city. We note the appeals supporting a three-ward structure largely on the basis of achieving maximum potential from the STV electoral system as a system of proportional representation. We also note that the electoral system is not a statutory criterion in the consideration of the basis of election and that it is a matter for the Council to consider at its discretion.
27. Given these findings, we then proceeded on the basis of consideration of the five-ward structure as a means of providing effective representation of communities of interest and fair representation of electors. We note that the only appeals/objections in relation to the proposed ward boundaries relate to the Roseneath and Southgate areas.
28. In respect of the Roseneath area, we acknowledge the points made by the Residents' Association in support of Roseneath remaining in the Lambton Ward. The only provision for an exception to the fair representation +/-10% rule, however, is in the case of isolated communities and clearly this does not apply in the case of Wellington City nor did anyone attempt to argue this. On this basis, the Council identified Roseneath as the "only logical community of interest to shift" in order for the Lambton Ward to comply with the +/-10% rule. Having inspected the area, we agree with the Council. As the Council pointed out, moving Roseneath to the Eastern Ward makes the boundaries of this ward consistent with the Rongotai Parliamentary Electorate. We also note that, while part of Roseneath does look west toward the central city area and may well feel an affinity with the Lambton Ward, other parts clearly look east and the boundary between Roseneath and Hataitai, located in the Eastern Ward, is not a distinct demarcation. We find, as a result, that Roseneath will transfer from the Lambton Ward to the Eastern Ward.
29. The Council also identified Wadestown as an area that could be moved from the Lambton Ward to the Onslow-Western Ward. This was with a view to providing a fairer balance of representation across the wards at least into the immediate future, given the present disproportionate rate of population growth in the Lambton Ward. The Council's initial proposal attracted only one submission on this issue. We agree with the Council that the transfer of Wadestown is an appropriate step and determine accordingly.

30. In relation to the proposal to transfer Southgate from the Southern Ward to the Eastern Ward we were persuaded by the clarity of the appeal against this proposal and that Southgate is geographically part of the “Island Bay basin” and should remain in the Southern Ward. We determine accordingly.
31. We heard no other appeals or representations in respect of ward boundaries and accordingly confirm, in all other respects, the Council’s ward proposals.
32. One appellant proposed an increase in the number of councillors to 15, allowing three councillors to be elected by the Southern Ward. This could not be achieved within the fair representation +/-10% rule. We heard no other representations on this issue, or on the total number of councillors generally, and we agree with the Council that there be a total of 14 councillors.
33. We are advised that some minor meshblock alterations are required to ensure that these do not divide particular properties. These do not affect the achievement of effective or fair representation in respect of wards and will become part of this determination.
34. We believe that the above decisions will provide effective representation for the communities of interest of Wellington City. They also comply with the requirement for fair representation of electors. The relationship between these decisions on ward boundaries, the number of councillors per ward, and the requirements of section 19V(2) is illustrated in the following table:

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per councillor
Northern	42,400	3	14,133	+911.57	+6.89
Onslow-Western	40,250	3	13,417	+195.57	+1.48
Lambton	40,350	3	13,450	+228.57	+1.73
Eastern	36,300	3	12,100	-1,121.43	-8.48
Southern	25,800	2	12,900	-321.43	-2.43
TOTALS	185,100	14	13,221.43		

*These figures are rounded 2005 population estimates provided by the Government Statistician

Communities and community boards

35. Section 19W of the Act sets out criteria for community board reviews. These include requirements for effective representation of communities of interest within the community and fair representation of electors.
36. We note that the Council undertook a review of representation arrangements prior to the 2004 local elections and on this basis was not required by the Act to undertake a further review until prior to the 2010 local elections. The Council, however, resolved in 2003 to review the issue of community boards on a city-wide basis prior to the 2007 local elections and confirmed this decision in April 2006. As such a review could not be undertaken in isolation, a further full representation review was required to be undertaken.
37. The Council’s pre-review consultation document asked respondents whether the establishment of community boards across the city would provide fairer and more effective representation for individuals and communities in Wellington City. A total of 138 respondents (72%) said ‘no’.

38. In notifying its initial proposal to abolish the Tawa Community Board, the Council referred to the outcome of the pre-review consultation. It advised that it had decided that the establishment of more community boards across the city was not necessary to achieve the requirements for effective and fair representation. It noted that, while there was strong support for the retention of the Makara-Ohariu Community Board (because of its specialised and unique role), the majority view of the Council was that if no more boards were to be established in the city, the retention of the Tawa Community Board could not be supported on fairness grounds (i.e. the electors of the Tawa Community receive an additional level of representation other urban residents don't receive).
39. The Council received 556 submissions (out of a total of 598) in response to its initial proposal to abolish the Tawa Community Board. Of the 556 submissions:
- 539 opposed the proposal including a petition signed by over 700 people; and
 - 17 supported the board's abolition.
40. Following consideration of the submissions, the Council changed its initial proposal and proposed the retention of the Tawa Community Board. In notifying its decision the Council advised that:
- a significant number of individuals and organisations from the Tawa Community strongly opposed the abolition of the board;
 - residents clearly showed they value the efforts of the board;
 - residents provided a number of reasons why Tawa's community of interest is distinct and different and why the board should be retained to ensure the effective representation of the community's interests and fair representation of its electors; and
 - submitters stated, and the Council agreed, that the fact other communities did not appear to want community boards was no reason why Tawa should have its board taken away.
41. Given the level of community support for the retention of the Tawa Community Board and the arguments made by representatives of the board at the hearing, as recorded earlier, we agree with the Council's proposal to retain the board and determine accordingly.
42. We are advised that some minor meshblock alterations are required to ensure an appropriate alignment of the Tawa Community with individual meshblocks. These do not affect the achievement of effective or fair representation in any respect and will become part of this determination.
43. In respect of the Makara-Ohariu Community Board, the Council, in notifying its final proposal advised that:
- submitters strongly supported retention of the board in its current form;
 - in the view of submitters the current board represents a distinct community of interest;

- including the rural suburbs of Takapu Valley and Horokiwi, and possibly Glenside, changes the board's role from representing a geographically contiguous community of interest, to representing rural issues across the city in general;
 - this creates an artificial body that does not really cover a definable community; and
 - retention of the Makara-Ohariu Community Board results in the Council still receiving expert advice (based on first-hand knowledge) on a range of issues faced by a community that takes in 59% of the city's total area and has unique characteristics and environmental importance to the city.
44. Again, given the level of community support for the retention of the Makara-Ohariu Community Board and the arguments made by representatives of the board at the hearing, as recorded earlier, we agree with the Council's proposal to retain this board and determine accordingly.
45. We are advised that further minor meshblock alterations are required to ensure an appropriate alignment of the Makara-Ohariu Community with individual meshblocks. These do not affect the achievement of effective or fair representation in any respect and will become part of this determination.
46. In respect of both boards, we heard no arguments to change current membership arrangements (i.e. the number of elected and appointed members) and, accordingly, we determine that current arrangements will be retained.

Commission's Determination

47. Under section 19R of the Local Electoral Act 2001, the Commission determines that for the general election of the Wellington City Council to be held on 13 October 2007, the following representation arrangements shall apply –
- (1) Wellington City as delineated on SO Plan 35959 deposited with Land Information New Zealand, shall be divided into five wards;
 - (2) Those five wards shall be -
 - (a) the Northern Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan No. 37883 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (b) the Onslow-Western Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan No. 335633 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (c) the Lambton Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan No. 37886 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (d) the Eastern Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan No. 37887 deposited with Land Information New Zealand; and
 - (e) the Southern Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan No. 37888 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (3) The Council shall comprise the mayor and 14 councillors elected as follows -
 - (a) three councillors elected by the electors of the Northern Ward;

- (b) three councillors elected by the electors of the Onslow-Western Ward;
 - (c) three councillors elected by the electors of the Lambton Ward;
 - (d) three councillors elected by the electors of the Eastern Ward; and
 - (e) two councillors elected by the electors of the Southern Ward;
- (4) There shall be two communities as follows:
- (a) the Tawa Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 37411 deposited with Land Information New Zealand; and
 - (b) the Makara-Ohariu Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 36004 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
- (5) The membership of the community board for each community shall be comprised as follows:
- (a) the Tawa Community Board: six elected members and two members of the Council representing the Northern Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council; and
 - (b) the Makara-Ohariu Community Board: six elected members.

48. As required by sections 19T(b) and 19W(c) of the Local Electoral Act 2001, the boundaries of the above wards and communities coincide with the boundaries of current statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for Parliamentary electoral purposes.

FOR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

Gwen Bull (Commissioner)

Wynne Raymond (Commissioner)

10 April 2007