



TE KAUNIHERA O TE AWA KAIRANGI | HUTT CITY COUNCIL

Meeting to be held in the Council Chambers,
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on
Monday 26 August 2024 commencing at 11.30am.

SUPPLEMENTARY ORDER PAPER

PUBLIC BUSINESS

4. INITIAL REPRESENTATION PROPOSAL - HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS: UPDATED APPENDICES

Report No. HCC2024/4/89 by the Head of Strategy and Policy

2

Kate Glanville
SENIOR DEMOCRACY ADVISOR

22 August 2024

Report no: HCC2024/4/89

Initial Representation Proposal - Hearing of Submissions: Updated Appendices

1. To provide an updated copy of the hearing schedule and submissions associated with each speaker (in order of speaker).
2. The updated hearing schedule is attached as Appendix 1 to the report. The only change is to the page number reference.
3. The updated submissions associated with each speaker (in order of speaker) is attached as Appendix 2 to the report. The following has been updated:
 - a. Page 3 of the Eastbourne Community Board's submission has been added. This was omitted in the original submission pack; and
 - b. Four submissions have been updated to reflect the original format of their submission. No content was missing from the original submission pack.
4. All submissions received on the Initial Representation proposal can be viewed here: [Representation Review submission pack](#)

Appendices

No.	Title	Page
1↓	Appendix 1: Hearing Schedule	3
2↓	Appendix 2: Representation Review Hearings Submission Pack	4

Author: Richard Hardie
 Head of Strategy and Policy

Approved By: Jarred Griffiths
 Director Strategy and Engagement

Hearings Schedule Monday 26 August 2024						
#	Time	Name	Organisation	In Person or ZOOM	Presentation	Page #
	11:30 am	Mayor Campbell Barry to open the hearings				
	11:35 am	Council's Policy Lead and Policy Advisor to introduce the report				
1	11:40 am	Belinda Moss (Chair)	Eastbourne Community Board	In Person	N	4
2	11:50 am	Mike Fisher (Chair)	Petone Community Board	In Person	Y	8
3	12:00 pm	Mike Fisher	Individual	In Person	Y	11
4	12:05 pm	Bruce Spedding	Individual	In Person	Y	12
5	12:10 pm	Richard Arlidge	Individual	ZOOM	N	46
6	12:15 pm	Robert Ashe	Individual	In Person	N	47
7	12:20 pm	Barbara Sullivan	Individual	In Person	N	48
8	12:25 pm	Stephen Grenside	Lowry Bay Residents Association	ZOOM	N	49
9	12:30 pm	Emily Keddell	Individual	In Person	N	53
10	12:35 pm	Malcolm Sime	Individual	In Person	N	54
11	12:40 pm	Karl Weeks-Dickson	Individual	In Person	N	55
12	12:45 pm	Nicolle O'Neill	Individual	ZOOM	N	57
13	12:50 pm	Graham Wilson	Individual	In Person	N	58
14	12:55 pm	Frank Vickers	Individual	In Person	N	59
15	1:00 pm	Sally-ann Moffat	Petone Community House	In Person	N	60
16	1:05 pm	Joy Baird	Individual	In Person	N	64
17	1:10 pm	Sally Selwood	Individual	In Person	N	66
18	1:15 pm	Jeremy Winter	Individual	In Person	Y	67
19	1:20 pm	Gary Quirke	Individual	In Person	N	74
20	1:25 pm	Derek Wilshere	Individual	In Person	Y	80
	1:30 pm	LUNCH BREAK (45 minutes)				
21	2:15 pm	Haiying Shi	Individual	In Person	Y	82
22	2:20 pm	David L. F. Smith	Individual	In Person	N	83
23	2:25 pm	Karen Arraj-Fisher	Individual	In Person	N	84
24	2:30 pm	Karen (Kaz) Yung	Individual	In Person	N	85
25	2:35 pm	Pauline Innes	Individual	In Person	N	87
26	2:40 pm	Wal Louden	Individual	In Person	N	88
27	2:45 pm	Elizabeth Palmer	Individual	In Person	N	89
28	2:50 pm	Sandra Greig	Individual	In Person	N	98
29	2:55 pm	Michael Draper	Individual	In Person	N	99
30	3:00 pm	Pete Matcham	Grey Power	In Person	N	101
31	3:05 pm	Pete Matcham	Normandale Residents Association	In Person	N	104
32	3:10 pm	Jan Wijninckx (pronounced Yan Vaynings)	Individual	In Person	N	107
33	3:15 pm	Ross Jamieson	Individual	In Person	N	108
	3:20 pm	Peggy Luke-Ngaheke	General Manager, Waiwhetū Marae	In Person	N	110
34	3:30 pm	Huia Puketapu (Deputy Chair) (verbal submission)	Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika Trust	In Person	N	N/A
35	3.40 pm	Liz Mellish (Palmerston North Māori Reserves (Chair)) (verbal submission) Te Karanga O Te Tui Marino (Environmental Liaison Officer, Hikoikoi Management Limited) (verbal submission) Richard Te One (Relationships Liaison Officer, Hikoikoi / Wellington Tenth Trust Trustee, Palmerston North Māori Reserves Trustee) (in support) Vicki Hollywell (Tumu Whakarae, Hikoikoi) Manager Ltd (in support)	Wellington Tenth Trust	In Person	N	N/A
		End of hearings				

Eastbourne Community Board | Belinda Moss

Hutt City Representation Review Eastbourne Community Board submission

This submission is by Eastbourne Community Board members. It is based on our informed views and conversations with Eastbourne residents since the proposal to disestablish community boards was announced in June.

Our submission focuses mainly on the proposal to disestablish community boards and a recommendation about Ward boundaries. It also challenges the independent panel's statements about the role of community boards.

The proposal to disestablish community boards

The independent panel erred in its assessment by not limiting its focus to the principles of fairness and effectiveness outlined in s4 of the Local Electoral Act. The panel has based its argument to disestablish community boards on inequality.

Inequality

The independent panel argues that there are only three community boards representing three communities, which is inequitable because not all Te Awa Kairangi | Hutt City residents have access to them. On page 32 of its report, the panel suggests that inequality is as important as fairness and effectiveness. We agree that equality is important, but it is not the test here, and the panel erred in considering inequality as one of the principles.

Even if it were a principle under the Local Electoral Act, it is incorrect to suggest that having only three community boards in Hutt City is inequitable.

Under section 49 of the Local Government Act 2002, any community can petition for a community board to be established to represent its interests. Communities like Stokes Valley, Naenae and Taita could all have a community board if they wanted one.

New community boards are regularly established throughout Aotearoa, for example, the Puketapu-Bell Block Community Board and the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, formed in 2022.

If Councillors vote to adopt the independent panel's proposal to disestablish community boards, they risk the cost of electoral polls being held to reinstate them.

If the Panel is correct in its argument, many cities and districts would be getting rid of community boards as many others have only partial coverage, but this is not happening.

The role of community boards in the twenty-first century

The report claims community boards are no longer relevant in the twenty-first century. However, the reasons community boards were established in 1989 are equally valid today, if not more so.

Community boards were created to help councils stay in touch with their communities' grassroots. Councils have been required to get larger; the matters they address are broader and more complex, and their regulatory responsibility is greater.

Moreover, with suggestions that Hutt City amalgamates with other Councils in the future, community grassroots representation will be even more critical. Maintaining community boards will future-proof local representation and advocacy.

Councils can be complicated and intimidating to navigate and work with. Community boards bring residents and local government closer. They are part of the community, not its governance.

We believe the need for ready, face-to-face access to elected representatives who are neighbours in our communities has never been more important. In an increasingly digital world, community boards provide a vital human connection.

The issues the panel suggests in its argument against community boards, such as diversity and representation, are the reason for having them. Community boards provide a safe place to start understanding democracy and becoming involved in Councils. The number of councillors representing Hutt City who started on community boards shows their value as a pathway to democratic representation. Anything that aids in developing strong representation when democratic processes are at risk should be valued. It is at community boards where a more comprehensive representation is likely to happen, especially given Hutt City has chosen to remain with First Past the Post.

There was too little time or consideration in the report about the effectiveness of community boards on matters beyond those in the statute, and regrettably, there was no thought as to how to ensure community boards could be more effective. We are not here to blow our trumpet but believe we have been a very effective and supportive arm of the Council on many matters beyond the statutory role and equally important to Eastbourne residents and Council.

We are proud of our work in this respect, including effectively championing the Tupua Horo Nuku resilience and shared path project. We believe we have been effective and are disappointed that the Panel has not reflected on or attempted to understand our work.

In a seismic, harbour-side area and a world facing climate change, communities need local representation and knowledge to help prepare for change and emergencies, as well as leadership and a point of contact in the event of an emergency.

We challenge the section about awareness of community boards.

The report lists the stated powers of community boards without referring to their advocacy and liaison roles. It refers to the mismatch between what community boards do and what the community thinks they do without examining whether and what community boards are delivering outside the stated delegations. It even refers to the

potential benefits of community boards without making any apparent effort to understand what we already do.

These are not potential benefits. Advocacy and liaison are actual benefits delivered by community boards like the Eastbourne Community Board every day.

Community boards are crucial in providing fair and effective representation for residents and communities. Community boards help ensure residents' voices are heard, and their members act as community representatives, advocates, and connectors.

Ward boundaries

The Eastbourne Community Board asked the independent panel to address the anomaly that sees the Pencarrow Road from Burdan's Gate to the lighthouse as part of Wainuiomata General Ward rather than Harbour Ward. Successive Eastbourne Community Boards have also asked Council to address this.

The current Ward boundary makes no sense. The road is accessed from Eastbourne and is used by Eastbourne residents and visitors from throughout the region. There is no public road access from Pencarrow Road to Wainuiomata. It is often Eastbourne residents who alert the Council to road damage or maintenance issues.

A boundary change would have no material impact on the number of residents in either Ward. Refer to Appendix 1. It could be achieved by moving Pencarrow Head suburb to the Harbour Ward and shifting the ward boundary accordingly.

Recommendations

The Eastbourne Community Board recommends that Council:

1. Retain community boards so all Hutt City residents can retain or have the opportunity to establish a community board and to future-proof local representation.
2. Moves the Wainuiomata and Harbour Ward boundary so that the road between Burdan's Gate and Pencarrow Lighthouse is part of Harbour Ward.

The Eastbourne Community Board wishes to speak to this submission at the August hearing.

*Belinda Moss, Emily Keddell, Bruce Spedding, Murray Gibbons and Frank Vickers
Eastbourne Community Board
31 July 2024*

Appendix 1:
Pencarrow Head suburb is currently in Wainuiomata General Ward. Moving it to Harbour Ward would move the Pencarrow Road to Harbour Ward.



Petone Community Board | Mike Fisher

Kia ora koutou,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Review Panel recommendations.

Community Boards are, and should continue to be, a vital part of local democracy in Te Awakairangi ki Tai - Hutt City:

Naturally, we are predominantly submitting on the Panel's proposal to disestablish Community Boards in Te Awa Kairangi ki Tai /Hutt City.

We strongly oppose disestablishing Community Boards in Hutt City. We believe this would be a significant loss of local democracy. We support all wards having a Community Board because we believe that communities are best served by local representation. We have seen the benefit and rich history of the Harbour Ward having two distinctive boards – with their own respective voices.

Petone has had its own local government representation since 1888. First as Petone Borough Council from 1888 to 1989. Since then, through the Petone Community Board.

Petone is a distinct part of Te Awa Kairangi/ Hutt City with Jackson St at its heart. The board area also includes significant commercial areas in Seaview, Gracefield and Petone and residential settlements from the harbours edge up to Korokoro, across Moerā, to Waiwhetū South.

Petone Community Board provides a formal avenue for this community to have input on Council decision making representing a community that has unique needs:

- The protection and vitality of the Jackson Street retail precinct.
- Being the part of the city at greatest risk from sea level rise and climate change.
- Being a key employment hub for the wider region.
- Being home to thousands of residents.

In the mid 2000's the lack of acknowledgement of Eastbourne's needs saw calls for secession from Hutt City.¹ Eastbourne like Petone has a long history of its own identity and local government representation. Eastbourne and bays are a distinct community of interest. Settlements that share a narrow coastal road and housing the stretches up to the bush clad hills.

These different histories and different future needs are why Petone and Eastbourne would benefit from retaining their separate community boards.

The representation review recommendation to abolish community boards is flawed

The representation review found that people the Panel engaged with, liked the idea of Community Boards, as it sounded like a mechanism that could enhance local democracy if supported and resourced well. Council could give boards the delegations needed to realise their full potential. We

¹ [Deborah Coddington](#): [Absolutely Positively stick with Hutt City - NZ Herald](#)

note that the parts of the city with Community Boards had the highest levels of support. This shows that when people have more opportunity to understand the role of the Boards first hand they have higher levels of support.

Community Boards are based on geographic representation. One example cited in the review was of Community Boards not representing the Pasifika Community. We recognise the importance of ethnic communities having their voices heard but note that the geographic model of local government is not designed to promote specific interest groups other than by geography. Council advisory groups can provide forums for specific groups based on factors other than geography to have their voices heard. We also note Hutt City is adding a Māori ward.

Community boards are fit for the 21st century

The Panel's report reflects on a view that formal structures like Community Boards positioned between the community and the Council are not likely to be effective in the 21st century. We do not believe that is just 'between' the community but actually alongside it, helping to understand the various decisions and functions of Council, and providing alternative ways to connect with the work of the Local Authority; and in the same way connecting Council more deeply to the community.

The panel's view is counter to the localism movement. Localism is about empowering communities to make decisions about their own futures.

"Localism provides a way to strengthen and build upon those things that make us special - developing better, local solutions to problems, fostering stronger local ties and engagement, and, ultimately, ensuring the places where people live, and work become the places they want them to be."²

Community Boards do have an operating cost to the city, as do all representative roles, as the representation review highlights. However, the review does not consider the wider benefits that include more effective solutions when council and communities work together; belonging is strengthened and those impacted by decisions are involved in decision making.

Examples of Petone Community Board making a difference are:

- Protecting the heritage of Jackson St
- Helping prevent Petone Recreation ground becoming a sports facility for the almost exclusive use of Wellington Phoenix
- Fighting for the retention and upgrade of McKenzie Baths
- Helping prevent the demolition of Petone wharf, at least for now
- Submissions on Plan changes that would erode the identity of Petone
- Assessing and granting funding requests for community groups
- Coordinating local ANZAC Day services
- Helping get better footpaths in Korokoro
- Keeping a library in Moerā and reinvestment in Petone Library

Community boards in general help:

- Ensure local communities' voices aren't lost in the big picture conversations/kōrero.

² [Why localism](#) in New Zealand

