
Supplementary agenda for a meeting of the Waikato District Council to be held Audio Visually on **MONDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2021** commencing at **9.30am**.

Information and recommendations are included in the reports to assist the Council in the decision making process and may not constitute Council's decision or policy until considered.

****Please note the original agenda noted the below two items would be circulated under separate cover on this supplementary agenda due to timing of the meetings they were emanated from and the next scheduled ordinary meeting of Council is in November 2021.****

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.2 Minutes of the Representation Review Hearings & Deliberations held on 9 & 10 September and 14 & 16 September 2021

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS

6.4 Audit & Risk Committee

Committee Recommendations to Council – Thursday, 16 September 2021

Gj Ion
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Minutes of an extraordinary meeting for the Waikato District Council Hearings and Deliberations on the 2021 Representation Review – Initial Proposal via Audio Visual Conference on **THURSDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2021** commencing at **9.00am**; **FRIDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2021** commencing at **9.00am** and **TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2021** commencing at **9.00am**. Re-opened on **THURSDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 2021** commencing at **1.00pm**.

Present:

His Worship the Mayor, Mr AM Sanson (Chairperson)

Cr AD Bech
Cr JA Church
Cr CA Eyre
Cr JM Gibb
Cr SL Henderson
Cr SD Lynch
Cr RC McGuire
Cr EM Patterson
Cr JD Sedgwick
Cr NMD Smith
Cr LR Thomson
Cr CT Woolerton

Attending:

Mr D Ofsoske (Independent Election Services)

Mr GJ Ion (Chief Executive)
Mr TG Whittaker (Chief Operating Officer)
Mr A Marais (Business Intelligence Team Leader)
Mrs GJ Kanawa (Democracy Team Leader)
Mr M Horsfield (Democracy Advisor)
Ms B Clarke (Junior Corporate Planner)

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr McNally was absent without an apology.

CONFIRMATION OF STATUS OF AGENDA ITEMS

Resolved: (Crs Sedgwick/Thomson)

THAT the agenda for the meeting of the Waikato District Council Hearings (for Thursday, 9 September and Friday, 10 September and Deliberations (for Tuesday, 14 September and Thursday, 16 September be confirmed and all items therein be considered in open meeting.

CARRIED

WDC2109/01

DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were declared as follows:

Cr McGuire – Submission # 2042 – Jill McGuire

Cr Woolerton – Submission # 1889 – Middle Ridge Farms Ltd

Cr Sedgwick – Submission # 1941 – Te Kauwhata Community Committee

REPORTS

Hearings report for submissions on the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal
Agenda Item 4.1

The report was received [*WDC2109/01 refers*]. The Democracy Team Leader provided an overview of the report and process for the hearings and deliberations meeting. The following discussion was held:

- Council can reconsider the initial proposal but must give reasons and must be based on submissions.
- Any submissions received on the voting system (First past the post) and the establishment of the Maaori wards was out of scope for this review.

Resolved: (Crs Smith/Thomson)

THAT the Waikato District Council:

- a) *receives the 227 submissions on the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal, excluding Submission #133 which is invalid (refer below WDC2109/03)*
- b) accepts the 12 late submissions on the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal;**
- c) pursuant to provisions set out in sections 19H and 19J of the Local Electoral Act 2001, considers submissions received on the Waikato District Council 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal;**
- d) recommends that following the hearing of the verbal submissions on Thursday, 9 September 2021 and Friday, 10 September 2021; Council considers all submissions and provides feedback at their deliberations meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 14 September 2021 and Thursday, 16 September 2021 on guidance to staff on any proposed changes (if any) to become the Waikato District Council 2021 Representation Review Final Proposal; and**
- e) at its meeting on Tuesday, 28 September 2021 approves its 2021 Representation Review Final Proposal for public objection/appeal, this period being notified on Friday, 1 October 2021 and closing Wednesday, 3 November 2021 in accordance with section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001.**

CARRIED

WDC2109/02

Cr Smith raised a point of order at the end of the days hearings, under Standing Order 25.2(d) misrepresentation – misrepresentation of any statement made by a member or by an officer or council employee, which was done when the Democracy Team Leader advised that a submission (#133) was invalid, which was misleading as the submission actually had noted neutral on most points.

Cr Smith requested the original motion be amended and Council accept the submission as valid. The Democracy Team Leader advised that if the mover and seconder of the motion were happy to remove that portion of the resolution it could be done during the meeting whilst it was still open.

Resolved: (Crs Smith/Thomson)

THAT the Waikato District Council:

- a) receives the 227 submissions on the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal, excluding Submission #133 which is invalid.*

The mover and seconder agreed to alter the resolution a) to read:

That the Waikato District Council:

- a) receives the 228 submissions on the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal;**

CARRIED

WDC2109/03

Hearings – Verbal Submissions

The following submissions were presented, and submitters responded to questions:

Leanne Webb for Pukerewa Marae (Submission ID 2067, Page 72)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Huakina Development Trust (Submission ID 1999, Page 150)

Maria noted the following matters:

- Concern raised regarding under representation in the northern area of the district.
- There should be a north/south split for the Te Takiwaa Maaori ward, to ensure fair representation for both north and south.
- Should be Maaori councillors in each general ward also (noted outside of scope)

Waitama Thompson (Submission ID 1953, Page 179)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Chris Rayner (Submission ID 2070, Page 63)

Mr Rayner sent his apologies as he was no longer able to attend the hearings.

Bill Rosoman – Glen Afton Pukemiro Community Society (Submission ID 1919, Page 223)

Bill noted the following matters:

- Community of interest in Huntly – if part of Whaingaroa no access to grants (noted that this was incorrect as the rural fund still available to those outside community board areas)
- Community committee works with representation from local Huntly councillor
- Would prefer to be in Central general ward as linkages with Huntly not Whaingaroa

Gabrielle Parsons – Raglan Community Board (Submission ID 2065, Page 75)

Gabrielle noted the following matters:

- Request to expand the community board boundaries as Te Mata and Te Uku are communities of interest
- Whilst there are issues with the meshblocks, many properties in the proposed extension areas are lifestyle blocks with residents going to school/playing sport in Raglan
- Less of clear split between urban and rural, therefore no reason not to expand to these rural areas
- Board does not agree with the principle of being urban focussed only and their boundaries already include some rural areas
- Spoke to a number of people in the rural areas as to whether they wished to be a part of the community board area at local sports parks (it was noted minimal submissions from the general ward on extension of the community board area)
- Clear from discussions in community that they supportive of boundary extension (noted again that Council would have preferred submissions noting this rather than rely on informal discussions)
- Te Akau community committee – Te Akau landing is a strong community of interest, however a person did attend the drop-in session and advised community mixed on being part of the community board area.
- Waitetuna does not show interest in being part of the community board area.
- Board would include a rural voice as well as opportunity to be involved – blur between farming and lifestyle blocks. Not a very clear split – Raglan naturally work showed communities appreciated the board connecting with them.

The meeting was adjourned at 10.04am and reconvened at 10.21am.

**John Jackson – Te Akau Waingaro Community Complex Inc
(Submission ID 1911, Page 654)**

John noted the following matters:

- Chair volunteer fire service and active farmer for 30 years
- Representation review document – pg 3 identifying communities of interest and effective represented and fairly represented, yet not demonstrated in actual proposal
- Community of interest – remote rural very little amenities from Council, an hour away from urban centre and physical boundaries have been split
- Community feels disenfranchised with split down the middle of the road
- More support in rural areas from Council would be preferred, with the proposal to restrict community boards to urban centres rubs “salt into the wound”
- Rural communities deserve equal opportunity to form a community board
- Support general rate funded and therefore rural areas deserve better opportunities to representation
- Meshblocks are unfair tool – need to concentrate on the community of interest aspect of representation
- Form body that would help support councillor to ensure fair representation and return on our rates
- Ability to influence diluted by removing rural portion of Onewhero-Tuakau community board

John Lawson (Submission ID 1967, Page 172)

John noted the following matters:

- A number of submissions have suggested the Te Akau/Whaaingaroa boundary should be changed – please look at trying to turn around
- Done in a rush – relook at this perhaps to equal out population to get more community coherence (noted that this process started in September last year – so not rushed)
- Glen Massey does not have interest with Whaaingaroa ward
- Rearrange seating in chamber to fit one extra in numbers (it was noted that adding one extra councillor would actually be in the Te Takiwaa Maaori ward)
- Fitting the ward boundary would be better for the community board, there are links with natural catchment area for the board.
- Should be a community board for each ward – separate entities could work better
- Big ask for councillor to cover large areas that are proposed

The meeting was adjourned at 11.00am and reconvened at 11.20am.

John Simmons (Submission ID 1900, Page No. 240)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Melissa (Submission ID 1856, Page No. 252)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Dee Bond (Submission ID 2081, Page No. 43)

Dee noted the following matters:

- Generally under represented in the north
- Proposal to reduce representation average now 6,385 under new system, utilising old population statistics (noted legislation requires Council to use statistics to 30 June 2020)
- 13 councillors not enough – 5,000 should be the number we aim for – continuing to dilute our representation
- Revisit ward structure
- Community Boards – popular form of local representation in early engagement, under proposed new wards five community boards and three sit within Central general ward – far higher proportion of voice than any other community board area
- Four wards with no community boards at all – council has preference for community committees – missed opportunity in district representation
- Should have more community boards or consider and inform community of where the community committees are and how they feed into the representation of the council.
- Support splitting Onewhero-Tuakau community board, but really important to recognise rural areas with community boards is preference as legal ground for being in existence
- Council preference community committees rather than community boards, but level of distrust that they don't have any "legal standing"
- Te Takiwaa Maaori ward under represented, could easily accommodate another councillor
- Tamahere-Newcastle ward needs to be split to give better representation around its communities
- Reference to community committees is minimal in initial proposal, what a missed opportunity not including them in formal document as many would have made submissions. Broader conversation with community committees not evident in proposal
- Support 12 to 13 general ward councillors and 3 Maaori ward councillors

Gary McGuire & Tuakau Districts Development Association (Submission ID 2072, Page No. 60)

Gary noted the following matters:

- Very little in way of infrastructure spend for increased rates – representation on council is disproportionate for number of residents
- Increase number of councillors for the north
- Support splitting the Onewhero-Tuakau community board and separate ward for Tuakau, but need to establish a community board over the river for the rural area
- Support current councillors, but they are spread too thin and too narrow
- Tuakau specific focus to take north into future and recognise growth
- Rural and urban do not mix
- Aka Aka into new Tuakau ward, or else they are disenfranchised, unfair on them
- Keep Waikato river and water shed as the boundary
- Plus or minus so far over threshold now and population growth so fast – coming in from outside and proportion to representation for population greatly changing.

The meeting was adjourned 11.49am and reconvened at 12.00pm.

Jonathan Lovatt (Submission ID 2036, Page No. 118)

Jonathan noted the following matters:

- Currently a community board member and spent over 20 years involved with Onewhero community
- Overview of ward and councillors – personal opinion short sighted due to entire region having significant growth – should be future proofed
- Enhance representation in northern region of the district
- Local community rely on Tuakau – why are we being split off from community board
- We are too far away from council – time for a north west community board with rural/lifestyle aspect and supportive of community board on either side of the river
- Believe you have enough people interested in being on community board in the rural area, as long as you communicate with the community they will be involved

Marae Tukere - Waikato Tainui (Submission ID 1946, Page No. 118)

Marae noted the following matters:

- Provided overview of who they represent and acknowledged partnership under Joint Management Agreement
- Waikato Tainui does not support boundaries across the rohe which cut across whakapapa/hapu boundaries, however have noted that people discussed this at the hui at college and requested what the north/south split would look like
- Disappointed in lack of consultation with Waikato Tainui throughout the process (noted that process and discussions started with Joint Management Committee in October 2020 and representatives also attended hui at college)
- Communities of interest – definition unclear – supporting information didn't provide connections to boundaries in their view
- Effective representation – acknowledge adoption of Maori wards but true partnership would be reflected by half Maori councillors
- General ward councillors have defined areas, but Maori councillors have large area of entire district
- Concerned Council did not provide alternative and should have (noted that it was up to Maori to advise of any split of the district to wards)
- Believe Maangai Maori positions should be included into the Council committee structure permanently

Rosemarie Costar (Submission ID 1900, Page No. 240)

Tabled Item 4.1A: Verbal submission notes (emailed to Council)

Rosemarie noted the following matters:

- Glen Murray split in half – same has been done in TeAkau, ignores community of interest – outskirts of community better split than down a road
- Know from experience the struggle to travel across large wards to represent effectively
- Split Waerenga-Hukunui and leave south-eastern area with Tamahere
- Review in 2018 proposed to remove the Onewhero portion of the community board – here we are again having to repeat objections at the same time as the busiest time of the farming year
- 117 objections and 5 supporting – is that voice not clear enough
- Lengthy discussions regarding proposed split – so many unanswered questions – if Onewhero remains part of existing board it is at Tuakau detriment?
- Continue targeted rates so we fund an urban board, noting it may be time review targeted rate to ensure all community boards treated equally – they have to provide value for money
- Support approach for rural board – but have no issue with current system

The meeting was adjourned at 12.35pm and reconvened at 1.10pm.

Vern Reeve (Submission ID 2028, Page No. 127)

Vern noted the following matters:

- Support splitting of Tuakau ward and community board
- Only one name can be put in as submitter – look at website form for future consultation processes
- Support urban voice being split from rural voice
- Either community board or committee supported for rural area
- 450 sections coming on stream shortly in Tuakau – approximately another 1,000 people which would occupy these properties – should be in statistics now (noted legislatively we must use statistics from 30 June 2020)
- Rural community has organised itself well to enable them to have strengthened voice in urban area – was disappointed when told by rural members of the board that he should not have attended the drop-in session at Pukekawa Hall
- Name is important – so if you remain the same the name should change to have Tuakau-Onewhero
- Understand that Aka aka should stay in Tuakau but unsure an additional councillor is required

Liam McGrath - Mercer Community Committee (Submission ID 2024, Page No. 130)

Tabled Item 4.1B: Presentation by Mercer Community Committee

Liam noted the following matters:

- Ward boundaries – revised further to consider communities of interest – Aka Aka needs to go back to Tuakau general ward
- Northern and southern points of Waerenga-Hukunui and T_N wards and E-w wards
- Keep three councillors by river boundary split
- Acknowledge and commend Maaori Wards establishment but encourage north and south split
- Outdated statistics utilised – most up to date numbers needs to be placed in updated table (noted that confusion on tables requested, i.e. current structure based on 2017 statistics – proposed structure based on 30 June 2020 statistics)

**Leah Fry - Port Waikato Residents and Ratepayers Group
(Submission ID 1962, Page No. 136)**

Leah noted the following matters:

- Do not really support the proposal as Tuakau important part of community
- If it isn't broken then don't try and fix
- Neutral on number of councillors
- Natural borders make logical borders – remove northern side of river from proposed Port Waikato general ward
- Community board a legal entity, whereas community committee doesn't have those rights – makes us feel more vulnerable
- Proposal has very strong focus on urban – no accountability towards the rural
- Support another review in three years to consider growth

**John Burns - Onewhero Residents and Ratepayers Group
(Submission ID 2016, Page No. 136)**

John Burns noted the following matters:

- Do not support draft proposal
- Three proposed wards at 106% and above so already possible extended over the 110%
- Physically huge wards – two rural and split in two to alleviate
- Aka Aka/Otaua need to go back to Tuakau
- Boundaries in south will split Glen Murray and Te Akau communities
- Community board – Raglan has large rural areas so what is the difference
- Physically large ward for both Port Waikato and Whaaingarua
- Selective community engagement
- Extra \$25/year not a big issue in the scheme of what people would get in regard to representation
- Support increase in number of councillors, but have not done detailed analysis of the affects

John Burns (Submission ID 1947, Page No. 182)

John noted the following matters:

- Aka Aka not community of interest to southern side of river
- Te Akau split by road needs to be moved
- Onewhero and Tuakau are interconnected communities
- We utilise Tuakau for majority of services
- Access to funding a strong emphasis, therefore we need a community board on this side of the river (noted that residents outside community board areas could apply for funding via Council rural fund)
- Strong argument for Tuakau to have its own board but rural area needs to be represented by a board also
- Committees can be powerful but boards are legislated – more representation required and must be listened - cannot be ignored

John Leslie Anderson (Submission ID 1926, Page No. 204)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Russell Davis (Submission ID 1897, Page No. 243)

Russell noted the following matters:

- Port Waikato ward is fine, understand whilst Aka Aka not directly connected it is still a rural/coastal community
- The existing board did little to help us so am comfortable with board on this side of the river, may be appetite for rural western board which we would be happy to be part of
- Community committee will not work for us – issue of trust, we need a board which legally links the community to council
- Blueprints ahead of our appear to be secret
- Relationship with community partnerships team is good other council relationships are not – high frustration level in community with dealing with council

Helen Clotworthy - Pokeno Community Committee (Submission ID 3002, Page No. 780)

Helen noted the following matters:

- Have another review in three years – or get ourselves on front foot for representation
- We are already there now at 106% but growth in one year is over that threshold and will be higher than 110% by the next election (noted legislative requirement to use statistics from June 2020 and growth not just in Pokeno – affects the whole district)
- We are on the back foot in Pokeno and constantly in catch up mode with infrastructure
- Rampant growth – our existing councillors represent us well

The meeting adjourned at 2.50pm until Friday, 10 September at 9.00am

The meeting was reconvened at 9.03am on **FRIDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2021.**

Present:

His Worship the Mayor, Mr AM Sanson (Chairperson)

Cr AD Bech

Cr JA Church

Cr CA Eyre

Cr JM Gibb

Cr SL Henderson

Cr SD Lynch

Cr RC McGuire

Cr FM McNally

Cr EM Patterson

Cr JD Sedgwick

Cr NMD Smith

Cr LR Thomson

Cr CT Woolerton

Attending:

Mr D Ofsoske (Independent Election Services)

Mr GJ Ion (Chief Executive)

Mr TG Whittaker (Chief Operating Officer)

Mr A Marais (Business Intelligence Team Leader)

Mrs GJ Kanawa (Democracy Team Leader)

Mr M Horsfield (Democracy Advisor)

Ms B Clarke (Junior Corporate Planner)

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

All members were present.

Cr Smith conveyed an apology to a staff member for naming them with the point of order, when it was in fact another member that made the statement.

Neil Young – Tuakau Hotel (Submission ID 2086, Page No. 14)

Neil advised he no longer wished to speak to his submission.

Kate Reese (Submission ID 2083, Page No. 32)

Kate noted the following matters:

- President of Wairamarama community committee
- Long standing element of mistrust and neglect in the rural community
- Lack of information and quality of communication during submission period poor
- Disappointed community board was not considered as an option for the rural areas
- If we can't have own rural board please stick with status quo

Richard Haynes (Submission ID 1903, Page No. 237)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Ross McLean (Submission ID 2076, Page No. 50)

Ross noted the following matters:

- Keep Mercer together
- We have no common interest with north-east side
- Impending takeovers for the future (Local Government Reform)
- Progress is not going forward but keeping history to show where you have come from
- Put us into community board boundary
- Not enough representation in the north

Andrew Caldwell (Submission ID 1970, Page No. 166)

Andrew noted the following matters:

- New boundaries split us in half
- Boundary goes through paper road in the middle of his farm
- Strong rural community, that are not happy with being moved out of Cr Eyre's ward
- State Highway 22 in bad state, so what are we getting for the rates we pay now
- Towns are well represented, but rural only have one councillor dealing with lots of issues

Edgar Henson (Submission ID 1969, Page No. 169)

Edgar noted the following matters:

- Urban not sharing load – only urban areas receiving democracy
- Community boards should be in all wards
- Port Waikato general ward would mean councillor would need to work 36 hours a day to fully represent
- Far north changed their model – reduce number of councillors and increase community boards
- Should be ashamed of yourselves as it appears farming is under attack – one change after another thrown at it
- You don't want anything to do with us, yet we are producing wealth for the community
- Thank you for supporting Ohinewai-Sleepyhead development as we need to keep growing
- Unrealistic and undemocratic proposal

Hilary Walker & Bruce Cameron – Federated Farmers NZ (FFNZ) (Submission ID 2085, Circulated separately)

Hilary & Bruce noted the following matters:

- FFNZ represent Farmers across the district
- Support ward system but want boundaries to fit communities of interest
- Community boards – lack of consultation with rural community on the change to the boards
- Lack of meaningful information re rural boards, community committees – not valid option without knowing difference between boards and committees
- Establish a new rural community board alongside urban one
- Page 21 – specific consultation took place but FFNZ were not involved
- Not trying to have a louder voice – goal to have rural representation for our perspectives and knowledge
- Lake Whangapei not a community of interest to Waerenga-Hukunui

Bruce Cameron (Submission ID 2090, Page 17)

Bruce noted the following matters:

- Been in community for 50 years and previous OTCB Chair
- Pg 3 – seriously wonder if feedback considered
- Proposal has split Te Akau and Glen Murray in half
- Te Akau don't see themselves in Whaingaroa ward – not a community of interest
- Aka Aka nothing to do with southern area of the river
- Focussed purely on meshblocks
- Community boards are popular form of representation
- Establish rural community board
- No legislation that states community boards should be in urban areas only even though you don't wish to cross ward boundaries
- Both sectors need each other
- Support Tuakau having board but only if rural board established.
- Trust issues regarding community committee as they have no legal standing with council

Bruce Cameron – Glen Murray Community Association (Submission ID 2088, Page 25)

Bruce noted the following matters:

- Reiterate Andrew Caldwell statement – no consultation done
- Most points covered in previous personal submission

The meeting adjourned at 10.45am and reconvened at 11.00am.

Graeme Clelland & Adrian Pyne - Tauwhare Community Committee (Submission ID 1971, Page 163)

Graeme & Adrian noted the following matters:

- Join Eureka with Tamahere and split Newcastle portion away
- Many of Tauwhare area people utilise Hamilton
- Balance out the rations
- SH26 to Eureka is northern boundary
- Existing structure would be very large ward with possibility of councillors being elected from one urban area

Peter Thomson (Submission ID 2037, Page 115)

Peter noted the following matters:

- Would be better aligned with Pokeno
- Design of new road isn't commonly used so need to look at boundary SH2
- Think about the corridors

Kitty Burton – Matangi Community Committee (Submission ID 1996, Page 153)

Kitty noted the following matters:

- Become part of horseshoe – identification community of interest in Hamilton – but not really – own area and Eureka
- You are dissipating representation
- One councillor per ward
- Newcastle archaic name for a place – throw it out

John Cunningham – Te Kauwhata Community Committee (Submission ID 1941, Page 200)

John noted the following matters:

- Return trip of 150k for entire ward and we are urban not rural
- Worried about size of ward and where representation would come from
- Has enough been taken into consideration of the communities of interest
- Divide in half – each with one councillor (subdivision)
- Area a big stretch with two councillors possibly coming from southern end of ward
- Te Kauwhata high growth area – need good representation
- Local for local people
- Times and growth moving quickly – also see this for Te Kauwhata – six years too far away in our area but in some areas would be fine (it was noted that a representation review if undertaken has to cover the entire district)

**Sue Edmonds – Community Planning Committee for Eureka
(Submission ID 1923, Page 217)**

Sue noted the following matters:

- Don't like what you are doing
- What happened to idea of southern region?
- Started in 2004 – put together one community plan for southern region
- Why do we suddenly look rural – mainly lifestyle blocks
- Not feeling like we are part of Waikato district, don't want to be in the Waerenga-Hukunui ward
- Tamahere-Newcastle general ward should be split at Holland Road and include Eureka

Jenny Kelly (Submission ID 1917, Page 230)

Jenny noted the following matters:

- Didn't feel the Initial proposal even followed the guidelines for a representation review, i.e. many communities of interest split.
- One councillor per 6,500 residents seems reasonable enough
- Disappointing that there were errors in the statement of proposal and they were not corrected immediately, nor were they available for inspection at libraries when requested
- Parameters and mix of focus groups wasn't clearly explained
- Waerenga-Hukunui general ward only had two councillors to service expansive ward
- Candidates could not be aware of local issues if voted in from lower area of ward

Bryce Shuker (Submission ID 1918, Page 227)

Bryce noted the following matters:

- What is logic of having two members in one ward
- Try and make less wards with multi council wards - but submitters have pushed back saying they want single ward representation
- Don't want to be split as an area – community of interest is not with Te Kauwhata, need to stay in north

**Bryce Shuker – North East Waikato Community Group
(Submission ID 1877, Page 249)**

Bryce noted the following matters:

- Area very much community and with new ward system you are splitting us in half
- Clubs and groups and schools in area being split in half
- (09) phone numbers not involved with (07) in the past

The meeting was adjourned at 12.18pm and reconvened at 1.00pm.

David Whyte – Huntly Community Board (Submission ID 2061, Page 79)

Tabled Item 4.1C Presentation by Huntly Community Board Chair

David noted the following matters:

- Appalled that Huntly has been put in with Ngaruawahia when none of the pre consultation showed linkages or communities of interest
- Divide central general ward into two – break from Taupiri down and Huntly up
- Is there a third principle that is of concern that we don't know about
- Disappointed we were not told about meshblock issue (noted that the Mayor had explained this at the community board meeting)

Alan & Bronwyn Kosoof (Submission ID 2073, Page 57)

Alan & Bronwyn noted the following matters:

- All people living in individual wards receiving fair representations
- Biggest urban areas need proper representation, therefore 6.2% of district need 3 councillors in their ward
- Doesn't make sense that we lose Maaori residents to Maaori ward yet they still live in our area
- No representation at local level
- No of councillors should be significantly increased, workload huge and enforced on councils
- Preferred solution 2 Maaori ward councillors in addition to 13 general ward councillors (noted explained that any addition to general ward councillors would also include addition to Maaori ward to ensure fairness of representation)
- Central general ward would then have at least 3 councillors
- Maaori ward be split in two one ward central district – and rest of district
- Option 3 Huntly and Ohinewai north split from Taupiri and Ngaruawahia
- Firm advocates of individual communities having representation at the table
- Wrestle control back from beauraucrats to elected members who don't have the can't do attitude
- Model we have isn't correct

Amelia Moana (Submission ID 2046, Page 109)

Amelia withdrew from making a verbal submission.

Tony Perkins (Submission ID 1891, Page 246)

Tony noted the following matters:

- Huntly and Ngaruawahia not communities of interest, both being on river is not relevant
- By adopting Maaori wards without consultation and consideration – poor quality decision making – Maaori not involved in process (noted this was incorrect as consultation had been undertaken with partners, i.e. Waikato-Tainui)
- Engagement in local politics issue poor
- Local Government Commission determination – plus and minus 10% as key interest not hard and fast we don't have to comply with it
- Horotiu not happy with being put in horseshoe or removed from Ngaruawahia community board area

Marion Adams (Submission ID 2008, Page 144)

No response received to phone calls or emails and submitter did not attend.

Sue Robertson - Tamahere Community Committee (TCC) (Submission ID 1924, Page 207)

Sue noted the following matters:

- Only commented on effects on our ward – not keen on three councillor wide Tamahere-Newcastle general ward
- Would support joining with Matangi and Eureka as a ward, but not canvassed in our submission or community
- Good relationships with staff and elected representatives – important to keep growing and fear that three councillors won't be elected from specific areas in the larger ward
- Representation the key – put us in area with those surrounding but break them up into east/west
- Experiencing great change – if we didn't have relationship we wouldn't be in such a good place
- TCC happy to stay as a community committee, but will canvas targeted rate in future for discretionary funding for community projects/events
- Tauwhare/Eureka better than whole horseshoe
- In touch with community – single versus multi ward – if it ain't broke why change it

Leo Koppens (Submission ID 2057, Page 94)

Leo noted the following matters:

- Most of us can't see what is wrong with current system – we would have preferred if council told us why changing
- Concern with low participation in local councils
- Engagement an issue as it is putting three wards together won't help with this
- Election campaigns will be interesting – no mention of community committees disappointing
- All councillors at large but total disconnect with communities
- Greater Hamilton Council – hope this doesn't happen

Charles Fletcher (Submission ID 1914, Page 234)

Charles noted the following matters:

- 70% opposed to initial proposal, no choice but to scrap this proposal and urge you to do so
- The “horseshoe” is ridiculous, happy with the status quo
- Two Maaori seats fine potentially issue in future going forward
- Current model not broken so why try and fix it

Caroline Conroy – Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board (Submission ID 2074, Page 53)

Caroline noted the following matters:

- Don't know if proposal gave sufficient regard to support for community boards
- Disappointing no further mandate for inclusions
- Boards mandated under Local Government Act
- Board should be implemented south of river – rural area
- Ward structure – divides communities in half and doesn't recognise communities of interest
- Split north/south for Te Takiwaa Maaori ward to ensure fair representation

Additional information requested from Council for deliberations:

1. Retain/protect rural voice
2. Recognise urbanised forms in our towns and villages -and respecting that the fastest growing areas are in and around these nodes
3. Where practical, multi member wards should be constructed
4. 11 general ward councillors and 2 Maaori ward councillors
5. Recognise Auckland and Hamilton boundaries and these centres as significant communities of interest for adjoining communities\
6. Concern regarding district-wide Maaori ward being too big to handle – look at north/south split
7. Important to reconsider sticking with communities of interests and not splitting communities due to mesh block issues
8. Support for rural community board, within existing area that was split from Onewhero-Tuakau community board
9. Possible extension to Raglan community board
10. Clear messaging to split Newcastle-Tamahere and Central general ward, noting this would have impact on other boundaries and wards

The Chief Executive noted going back to the status quo is not actually what a majority of submitters – in specific cases it should be the same from submissions, but not necessarily across the board.

The meeting adjourned at 3.32pm until Tuesday, 14 September at 9.00am

The meeting was reconvened at 9.02am on **TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2021.**

Present:

His Worship the Mayor, Mr AM Sanson (Chairperson)

Cr AD Bech

Cr JA Church

Cr CA Eyre

Cr JM Gibb

Cr SL Henderson

Cr SD Lynch

Cr RC McGuire

Cr FM McNally

Cr EM Patterson

Cr JD Sedgwick

Cr NMD Smith

Cr LR Thomson

Cr CT Woolerton

Attending:

Mr D Ofsoske (Independent Electoral Services)

Mr GJ Ion (Chief Executive)

Mr TG Whittaker (Chief Operating Officer)

Mr A Marais (Business Intelligence Team Leader)

Mrs GJ Kanawa (Democracy Team Leader)

Mr M Horsfield (Democracy Advisor)

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

All members were present.

Deliberations – 2021 Representation Review – Initial Proposal
Agenda Item 4.2

The Mayor advised that he would put the recommendations in part, and only receive the report at this time and go through the issues to be considered in the following order:

- a) Number of councillors
- b) Te Takiwaa Maaori ward – consideration of north/south split
- c) General ward options
- d) Community board issues

Resolved: (Crs Sedgwick/Thomson)

THAT the Waikato District Council:

- a) **receives the deliberations report for submissions on the 2021 Representation Review Initial Proposal.**

CARRIED

WDC2109/04

The following balance of the motion was put at the end of the day:

Resolved: (Crs Bech/McGuire)

- b) **considers the additional information provided by staff within the deliberations report on the issues raised within the submissions and determine whether they wish to change the Initial Proposal based on the feedback within submissions;**
- c) **provides staff with any proposed changes to the Initial Proposal, along with reasons, to enable them to finalise these changes for adoption by Council of the Final Proposal on Tuesday, 28 September 2021; and**
- d) **at its meeting on Tuesday, 28 September 2021 approves its 2021 Representation Review Final Proposal for public objection/appeal, this period being notified on Friday, 1 October 2021 and closing Wednesday, 3 November 2021 in accordance with section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001.**

CARRIED

WDC2109/23

a) Number of councillors

The following discussion was held:

- Only a few submission criticising either way, i.e. some believed it should be higher, others believed lower
- Majority of submissions were either satisfied with the overall number of councillors proposed

Resolved: (Crs Bech/McGuire)

That the Waikato District Council confirm the number of 13 councillors, consisting of 11 general ward councillors, 2 Maaori ward councillors (elected by wards) and one mayor (elected at large).

CARRIED

WDC2109/05

Reason: Effective and fair representation able to be achieved with the initial proposal numbers

b) Te Takiwaa Maaori ward – consideration of north/south split

The following discussion was held:

- Splitting the district-wide ward proposal needs to be checked to ensure hapuu aren't split. Consultation is important
- Concerned of taking comments outside of hearings and only take in what was said and submitted for hearings.
- Must take in account the Waikato-Tainui submission, noting they provided a map of north/south split as part of their submission and whilst not happy if hapuu split they do understand concerns of Maaori regarding possibility of both councillors coming from central area
- First term of Maaori Wards will come with a lot of learnings for the next representation review – perhaps wait till then to change
- Reiterated that most submitters that provided feedback on this issue supported a north/south split to provide fair representation for both north and south of district

Resolved: (Crs Smith/Sedgwick)

That the Waikato District Council requests staff provide a proposed north/south split map of the Te Takiwaa Maaori ward, noting that consultation be undertaken in the next week with the marae fora to ensure communities are not divided from their marae and where possible overall hapuu.

CARRIED

WDC2109/06

Crs Gibb and Patterson requested their votes against the above motion be recorded.

c) General ward options

Four maps for general ward options were provided in the deliberations report following initial direction from Council and hearing of submissions. The following discussion was held:

- Discussion held regarding the position of Mercer on the different map options, whether it is split or placed in a predominately rural or urban ward
- Concern raised that there were no proposals to group the Ngaruawahia and Newcastle wards together, and they do not have shared communities of interest
- It was noted that the pre-consultation material demonstrated they were grouped as communities of interest
- Both support and opposition to single councillor wards in submissions and need to consider feedback from Commission in previous review also, whilst still keeping communities of interest together
- There were pros and cons in all maps due to difficulties with mesh blocks, noting that communities of interest should be given more merit than mesh blocks, which may result in plus or minus issues for some wards
- “Lion” map ruled out due to splitting of Mercer township and wards already close to 10% threshold
- “Swift” map ruled out due to Glen Murray and Te Akau communities still being split by mesh block
- “Jaguar” and “Tiger” maps best options, with the downfall being the Western rural ward in both was below 90%
- Request for more detailed maps on the preferred option for consideration during the final proposal.
- It was agreed that “Jaguar” map was the preferred option for the final proposal

Moved: Crs Thomson/Church

That the “Jaguar” map (Option 2a) be modelled in further detail as the preferred option for the final proposal.

The following amendment was moved: Crs Smith/Woolerton

That Newcastle and Ngaruawahia be separated into single councillor wards.

The amendment was put by show of hands and LOST by 4 votes to 10. The following original motion became the substantive motion:

Moved: Crs Thomson/Church

That the “Jaguar” map (Option 2a) be modelled in further detail as the preferred option for the final proposal.

CARRIED

WDC2109/07

Cr Smith requested his vote against the above substantive motion be recorded.

Reason: Significant number of submissions received in opposition to the Tamahere-Newcastle ward as proposed

Submissions supporting retention/increase for rural areas

Keep northern rural separate to northern urban, noting this results in a large geographic ward but sits within the +/-10% range

Pre-consultation material evidenced a number of communities of interest linkages which were not contained within initial proposal – feedback received during submission process to give more weight to the communities identified in that process

The meeting was adjourned at 10.40am and reconvened at 11.00am.

d) Community board issues

The report outlined a number of issues for consideration when looking at community boards. In particular:

- i) requests from Huntly and Raglan community boards for alterations to their boundaries
- ii) requests from submissions to either retain the Onewhero-Tuakau community board as it is or establish a rural community board for the southern side of the river
- iii) request from Huntly community board to change it's name to Raahui Pookeka community board
- iv) confirmation of numbers for community boards and their appointments

Resolved: (Crs Gibb/Patterson)

That following consideration of submissions the Ngaruawahia community board retain the Horotiu portion of the area that was removed for the initial proposal and keeps the extended area into River Terraces.

CARRIED

WDC2109/08

Reason: Submission received that did not want Horotiu split from Ngaruawahia community board

Resolved: (Crs Gibb/Patterson)

That the Taupiri community board boundaries remain as proposed in the initial proposal.

CARRIED

WDC2109/09

Reason: No submissions had been received to alter the boundaries further.

Resolved: (Crs McInally/Lynch)

That staff investigate the impact of inclusion of the areas toward Okowhau Road and extension of the Te Ohaki Road boundary, for the Huntly Community Board in the final proposal, noting that due to large mesh blocks in the area this may not be possible.

CARRIED

WDC2109/10

Reason: The community board did not take into account the large mesh blocks they requested for inclusion in their area, which had a significant impact on rural areas who have not submitted any support for their inclusion in the area

Resolved: (Crs Church/Eyre)

That noting with the change to establish the Tuakau-Pokeno general ward, the proposed Tuakau community board area be altered to reflect the township boundaries it will be representing and confirmed at the Council meeting on 28 September when the final proposal will be adopted.

CARRIED

WDC2109/11

Reason: The Tuakau community board set out in the initial proposal received support from submitters to retain an urban focus

Resolved: (Crs Church/Eyre)

That a new Rural and Port Waikato community board be established, within the existing targeted rate area south of the river to represent the rural/coastal communities within these boundaries.

CARRIED

WDC2109/12

Reason: Number of submissions received for a rural voice and community board preferred by submitters over community committee

Keeping area same as previous board area on the southern side of the river means no further ratepayers impacted by targeted rate, for which we have not consulted on

Resolved: (Crs Thomson/Gibb)

That the Raglan community board boundaries be extended by two mesh blocks in the south to incorporate Te Mata and one mesh block on the existing north east boundary to incorporate Okete.

CARRIED

WDC2109/13

Reason: Submissions received in support for extension to Te Mata and Okete communities.

Only board submissions received to incorporate the other three mesh blocks requested and includes Waitetuna Valley and Te Uku

No submissions received from affected ratepayers within Waitetuna Valley and Te Uku

Community boards boundaries (like wards) must adhere to mesh blocks and with large mesh blocks they often end up consuming other communities that do not identify with the town/board

Resolved: (Crs McNally/Lynch)

That the name for the Huntly community board remain unchanged in the final proposal.

CARRIED

WDC2109/14

Reason: Raahui-Pookeka has not been recognised formally as the name for Huntly at this stage

More research needs to be done by the board in consultation with the wider community

Discomfort with making uninformed decision without mana whenua input and guidance

c) General ward options:

It was noted that with significant boundary changes to general wards, Council needed to reconsider new general ward names for the final proposal. The following was resolved:

Resolved: (Crs McGuire/Bech)

That the general ward in the south-eastern sector of the district, represented by two councillors, be known as the Tamahere-Whitikahu general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/15

Resolved: (Crs Sedgwick/Woolerton)

That the general ward in the eastern sector of the district, represented by one general ward councillor, be known as the Waerenga-Hukunui general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/16

Resolved: (Crs Sedgwick/Church)

That the northern rural general ward, represented by one general ward councillor, be known as the Awaroa-Maramarua general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/17

Resolved: (Crs Church/Henderson)

That the general ward covering the townships of Tuakau and Pokeno, represented by two general ward councillors, be known as the Tuakau-Pokeno general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/18

Resolved: (Cr Eyre/His Worship the Mayor)

That the general ward in the western rural sector of the district, represented by one general ward councillor, be known as the Western Districts general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/19

Resolved: (Crs Thomson/Bech)

That the general ward covering the south-western sector of the district, represented by one general ward councillor, be known as the Whaingaroa general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/20

Resolved: (Crs Gibb/Patterson)

That the general ward from Whatawhata to Ngaruawahia, represented by two general ward councillors, be known as the Newcastle-Ngaruawahia general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/21

Resolved: (Crs Lynch/McInally)

That the general ward covering the township of Huntly and surrounds, represented by one general ward councillor, be known as the Huntly general ward.

CARRIED

WDC2109/22

In closing the Mayor thanked staff, both past and present, that have been involved in this Representation Review which commenced a year ago. He believed it to be one of the most robust processes we have done to date, with significant weight being given to both pre-consultation feedback and submissions.

The Mayor also thanked Cr Bech who had led this process from a political perspective and worked alongside staff to enable us to get to this point.

Cr Eyre noted that whilst the zoom hearings have been difficult to manage and a lot of work for staff, she noted that a number of people have expressed they have enjoyed the ability to watch the live webcast hearings and deliberations and would encourage utilising this for future meetings.

Cr Bech reiterated the commitment from the team behind the scenes who were involved in preparing report, maps, scheduling meetings and analysis of both pre-consultation material and post submission analysis.

There being no further business the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 12.35pm. However, following the closing of the meeting a Councillor raised that the issue regarding community board numbers and possible subdivisions had not been covered off in the deliberations.

Councillors were advised that the meeting would be reopened on the reserve day of **THURSDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 2021** commencing at 1.00pm.

The meeting was re-opened at 1.00pm on **THURSDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 2021.**

Present:

His Worship the Mayor, Mr AM Sanson (Chairperson)
Cr AD Bech
Cr JA Church
Cr CA Eyre
Cr JM Gibb
Cr SL Henderson
Cr SD Lynch
Cr RC McGuire
Cr FM McNally
Cr EM Patterson
Cr JD Sedgwick
Cr LR Thomson
Cr CT Woolerton

Attending:

Mr D Ofsoske (Independent Electoral Services)

Mr GJ Ion (Chief Executive)
Mr TG Whittaker (Chief Operating Officer)
Mr A Marais (Business Intelligence Team Leader)
Mrs GJ Kanawa (Democracy Team Leader)
Mr M Horsfield (Democracy Advisor)

APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Smith was absent without apology.

DELIBERATIONS (CONTINUED)

Deliberations – 2021 Representation Review – Initial Proposal
Agenda Item 4.2

The Mayor advised Council there were only two issues left to consider:

i) **Possible subdivisions for community boards**

The Mayor advised that after further reflection to ensure that a rural voice is heard that the new Rural & Port Waikato community board and the Raglan community board should have subdivisions to obtain a balance of voices from across their board areas.

Discussion had been held with Cr Eyre and Caroline Conroy (Chairperson of the Onewhero-Tuakau Community Board). They were both in agreement that this would ensure representation from across their area.

Resolved: (Crs Thomson/Church)

That staff provide options for subdivisions of the Rural & Port Waikato community board and Raglan community board for inclusion in the final proposal.

CARRIED

WDC2109/24

Reason: Fair and balanced representation across community board areas which have portions of a large town/village as well as smaller rural communities, i.e. as per submissions heard “retain/support rural voice”

ii) Numbers of elected members on each community board

Due to changes for both general wards and community board boundaries – consideration needs to be given to the number of elected members for boards as well as the number/type of appointed members to each board.

Further discussion had been held with the Taupiri community board chair regarding the submissions received criticising that they were being removed from community board areas and had a larger population base than Taupiri.

The Mayor provided population statistics for each community board area and what that broke down to on the current basis of the initial proposal. Having taking this and the feedback from the community board chairs the previous day the following was resolved.

Resolved: (Crs Patterson/McGuire)

That the final proposal consist of the following membership for community boards:

- a) **Huntly community board – Six elected members and two appointed members, being the Huntly general ward councillor and the Te Takiwaa (North) Maaori ward councillor;**
- b) **Ngaruawahia community board – Six elected members and two appointed members, being one of the Newcastle-Ngaruawahia general ward councillors and the Te Takiwaa (South) Maaori ward councillor;**
- c) **Raglan community board – Six elected members split over two subdivisions of rural and urban (four urban and two rural elected members) and two appointed members, being the Whaaingaroa general ward and the Te Takiwaa (South) Maaori ward councillor;**
- d) **Rural & Port Waikato community board – Four elected members, split over two subdivisions of north and south (two from each subdivision) and two appointed members, being the Western Districts general ward councillor and the Te Takiwaa (North) Maaori ward councillor;**

Open Meeting

To	Waikato District Council
From	Gavin Ion Chief Executive
Date	15 September 2021
Prepared by	Gaylene Kanawa Democracy Team Leader
Chief Executive Approved	Y
Reference #	GOV1301
Report Title	Audit & Risk Committee Recommendations

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's approval of the recommendations from the Audit & Risk Committee meeting of Thursday, 16 September 2021, as set out below.

The Audit & Risk Committee Agenda from its meeting of Thursday, 16 September 2021 can be found on the Council website:

<https://www.waikatodistrict.govt.nz/your-council/council-committees-boards/council-committees/audit-and-risk-committee>

2. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE

Proposed Revision of the Audit & Risk Committee Terms of Reference (A&R2109/10)

THAT the Waikato District Council adopt the revised Audit & Risk Committee Terms of Reference.

3. ATTACHMENTS

Nil