

TE KAUNIHERA O TE AWA KAIRANGI | HUTT CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of an ordinary meeting of The Hutt City Council held in the Council Chambers,
2nd Floor, 30 Laings Road, Lower Hutt on
Monday 26 August 2024 commencing at 11.30am

PRESENT:

Mayor C Barry (Chair)	Deputy Mayor T Lewis
Cr G Barratt	Cr J Briggs
Cr K Brown	Cr B Dyer
Cr S Edwards	Cr A Mitchell
Cr K Morgan	Cr C Parkin
Cr N Shaw	Cr T Stallinger
Cr G Tupou	

APOLOGIES: There were no apologies.

IN ATTENDANCE:

J Miller, Chief Executive
J Griffiths, Director Strategy and Engagement
J Kingsbury, Director Economy and Development (part meeting)
R Hardie, Head of Strategy and Policy (part meeting)
C Parish, Head of Mayor's Office
O Miller, Policy Advisor
R Houlbrooke, Policy Lead (part meeting)
S Bascand, Engagement Advisor (part meeting)
V Gilmour, Democracy Advisor
J Kilty, Democracy Advisor
H Clegg, Minute Taker

PUBLIC BUSINESS**1. OPENING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA TIMATANGA**

Whakataka te hau ki te uru
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga
Kia mākinakina ki uta
Kia mātaratara ki tai
E hī ake ana te atakura
He tio, he huka, he hau hū
Tihei mauri ora.

*Cease the winds from the west
Cease the winds from the south
Let the breeze blow over the land
Let the breeze blow over the ocean
Let the red-tipped dawn come with
a sharpened air.
A touch of frost, a promise of a
glorious day.*

2. **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies.

3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS**

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

4. INITIAL REPRESENTATION PROPOSAL - HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS

Report No. HCC2024/4/237 by the Policy Lead

The Head of Strategy and Policy elaborated on the report. He spoke to an electronic presentation available here: [Representation Review 2024: Consultation feedback on the initial representation proposal](#)

In response to questions from members, the Head of Strategy and Policy advised that moving the area south of Burdan's Gate from the Wainuiomata Ward to the Eastbourne Ward had no significant effect on the +/-10% rule for each ward. He agreed to provide details on the origin of the request to move Korokoro from the Petone Ward to the Western Ward. Additionally, he agreed to include a suburb breakdown of survey responses to the Council meeting on 6 September 2024.

Hearing of Submissions

Belinda Moss and Murray Gibbons representing the Eastbourne Community Board (the Board) presented the Board's submission. Belinda Moss acknowledged the costs associated with community boards but argued that they were effective and efficient, emphasising the need to extend democracy rather than reduce it. She highlighted the community boards benefits and cost savings, such as civil defence leadership. She noted the boards value in fostering community engagement. She noted the low survey participation from Eastbourne residents and urged Council to improve engagement methods. She believed the Independent Review Panel (the Panel) had focused too much on inequality and its report had lacked sufficient consultation with each board. She concluded that community boards played a vital role in local government, offering a fair and effective way for communities to be heard.

Murray Gibbons added that the Board played a crucial role in connecting Council with residents. He believed community boards were key to making Lower Hutt City a great place to live, work, and play

In response to questions from members, Belinda Moss expressed concern that the Panel had undermined community boards by overlooking their advocacy work. She noted that, despite the Board meeting with the Panel, their input was not reflected in the final report. She said that charging residents for community boards was inequitable, as some areas might be more able or willing to pay. She added that community boards cost approximately \$20 per resident annually.

Mike Fisher, Semi Kuresa and Matthew Roberts (via audio-visual link) representing the Petone Community Board (the Board) presented the Board's submission. Mike Fisher highlighted the role community boards in representing diverse communities and connecting them with Council. He noted the community boards support for ward councillors, advocacy efforts and the organisation of events. He said abolishing the community boards would place these responsibilities on a single councillor. He emphasised the Local Government New Zealand's conference focused on localism. He pointed out that many councillors had a background in community boards. He urged Council to strengthen the existing system rather than abolish community boards.

Semi Kuresa acknowledged the Board's diverse representation but highlighted

challenges in gaining Māori and Pacifica residents' trust, citing lower voter participation due to trust issues. He believed community boards could address this by acting as grassroots steering groups and amplifying the community's voice.

Matthew Roberts advocated for retaining both the Eastbourne and Petone Community Boards. He urged Council to consider their benefits beyond costs. He noted that the Boards submission effectively highlighted their value.

In response to a question from a member, Semi Kuresa suggested that existing community boards must demonstrate their value and urged Council to actively promote them.

In response to questions from members, Mike Fisher attributed the low number of submissions from the Petone area to a lack of understanding about community boards and local government, noting past strong community engagement on key issues. He believed current disengagement might stem from life pressures. He advocated for retaining community boards, expanding them to other areas, and redistributing councillors to improve representation balance, particularly in underrepresented areas. He said the Board preferred maintaining the status quo.

Bruce Spedding presented the submission. He opposed the abolishment of community boards, arguing the Panel provided insufficient evidence and overlooked their importance in representing those who struggle with local government. He criticised the Panel for assessing costs without offering alternatives and noted its recommendations mirrored current community board functions. He called for proper consultation to better understand the community boards roles in their communities.

In response to questions from members, Bruce Spedding stated that no cost analysis was provided for the potential abolition of community boards and that the report was unbalanced.

Cr Mitchell advised that following requests, Council had published the cost of community boards on its website.

Richard Arlidge presented the submission via audio-visual link. He opposed the establishment of a Māori ward, citing concerns about the referendum's cost to ratepayers and the potential for racial divisions. He believed it would undermine democratic equality and give disproportionate influence to a Māori ward, with its councillors focused solely on Māori interests.

Robert Ashe presented the submission via audio-visual link. He believed community boards were composed of skilled and well-connected individuals, and the Panel overlooked their positive impact. He suggested that Council's Standing Orders needed revision. He disagreed with the Panel's opposition to expanding community boards citywide, noting that Wellington's multiple advisory groups complicate local democracy. He supported redrawing the Wainuiomata and Eastbourne Ward boundaries and agreed communities with community boards could pay a targeted rate.

Barbara Sullivan presented the submission and shared an electronic presentation available here: [52 roles of community boards](#). She argued for the retaining of the Eastbourne Community Board (ECB) to ensure fair and effective representation for Eastbourne and the Eastern Bays. She cited sections 10 and 52 of the Local Government

Act (LGA) supporting community board's role. She questioned how local democracy for Eastbourne would be achieved without the ECB and believed a councillor from outside the community couldn't represent it effectively. She requested the retention of community boards.

In response to questions from members, Barbara Sullivan noted that local flooding in her neighbourhood was resolved through the ECB's coordination with Council. She emphasised the importance of maintaining community boards as outlined in the LGA and mentioned that she hadn't considered using targeted rates for areas with a community board.

Stephen Greenside, representing Lowry Bay Residents Association (via audio-visual link), presented the association's submission. He opposed abolishing the community boards, describing the ECB as a proactive link between residents and Council. He emphasised the ECB's role in addressing issues like bird protection, pollution, traffic management and the shared path project. He believed that the Panel's reasons for disestablishment, based on the idea that if not everyone has a community board then no one should, was flawed.

Cr Stallinger left the meeting at 12.43pm.

Emily Keddell presented the submission. She argued that removing community boards would undermine localism in Lower Hutt. She believed the community boards effectively engaged with Council and addressed local issues that a larger council might overlook. She explained the Panel's recommendations were counterproductive, diminishing community representation and emphasised that elected community board members were accountable and ensured diverse representation. She urged Council to consider the efficiency and value of community boards.

In response to questions from members, Emily Keddell noted that community boards could amplify voices from harder-to-engage areas like Taitā and Naenae. She agreed that geographic isolation, such as that of Eastbourne and Wainuiomata, often strengthened community connections.

Cr Stallinger rejoined the meeting at 12.46pm.

Deputy Mayor Lewis left the meeting at 12.49pm.

Malcolm Sime presented the submission. He asked Council to listen to all submitters and retain the community boards. He suggested that if costs were a concern, savings could be found elsewhere in Council. He recommended focusing on expanding community boards to areas without them instead of removing existing boards.

In response to a question from a member, Malcolm Sime said he supported implementing a targeted rate for communities with community boards.

Deputy Mayor Lewis rejoined the meeting at 12.54pm.

Te Awa Puketapu, Chair of the Wainuiomata Community Board (the Board) presented the Board's submission. She advised the submission reflected community views and that as a new board, more time was needed to effectively represent Wainuiomata. She highlighted the community board's role in sustainability and as intermediaries between

Council and the community. While acknowledging concerns about inequities, she stressed the need for Council support and believed community boards should be restructured, not abolished. She noted the value of community boards for developing future councillors and youth leaders.

Cr Parkin left the meeting at 1.12pm.

In response to questions from members, Te Awa Puketapu suggested implementing a more comprehensive induction programme for board members. She noted the Board had consulted Wainuiomata contacts about the Panel's recommendations though few submissions came from the area. She mentioned recent Board meetings had been well attended and advocated for community boards to represent all city communities. She believed that Council's Standing Orders were unsuitable for community boards.

Cr Parkin rejoined the meeting at 1.14pm.

Graham Wilson presented the submission.

Cr Dyer and Cr Brown left the meeting at 1.15pm.

Graham Wilson supported retaining community boards for their crucial leadership in emergencies, especially in areas like the Eastern Bays, which rely on assistance from Wellington and lack local police. He also cited a recent Prime Minister directive on democratic decision-making, arguing that removing community boards would undermine this principle.

Cr Dyer rejoined the meeting at 1.18pm.

Mike Fisher presented the submission.

Cr Brown rejoined the meeting at 1.19pm

Mike Fisher stressed the importance of retaining community boards and suggested adjusting ward boundaries. He recommended a partial targeted rate for Lower Hutt and expressed concern that cost was the main reason for disbanding boards. He questioned who would organise local events if boards were disestablished. He requested retaining the existing community boards and adding at least three more for better representation.

In response to questions from members, Mike Fisher suggested establishing a Western, a Stokes Valley and Eastern Community Boards, arguing that eliminating boards due to cost or isolation would be a mistake. He believed community boards were essential in metropolitan areas.

Frank Vickers presented the submission. He expressed disappointment with the Panel's limited scope and believed a broader scope would have improved the outcome. He noted many current councillors came from community boards and highlighted the need for boards in isolated communities like Eastbourne and Stokes Valley. He advocated for community boards in all city areas and supported the introduction of a targeted rate to fund community boards.

Sally-ann Moffat, representing the Petone Community House, presented the house's submission. She expressed concern that without the PCB, meaningful consultation with

the Petone community might not happen. She urged Council to recognise existing distrust within the community and support community boards as an effective tool for building trust and communication. She noted that people found Council meetings too formal and intimidating, preferring the more approachable community board settings.

In response to questions from members, Sally-ann Moffat supported establishing community boards elsewhere, suggesting that only the chairs be salaried with other members serving as volunteers.

Joy Baird presented the submission. She argued that community boards were vital for effective governance and would be even more important with future local government changes. Disappointed with the Panel's recommendations, she emphasised that community boards were the best way to address local concerns in Council decisions. She highlighted their accessibility and advocacy for communities. She suggested that Ward councillors focus on local residents while At-Large councillors engage with special interest groups.

Cr Stallinger thanked Joy Baird for her past service to Council and for today's presentation.

In response to questions from members, Joy Baird felt that community boards had been imposed on communities without recognising their true value. She said they should engage with local leaders, communicate broadly and promote civic education in schools. She emphasised these functions would be even more critical if boards were disestablished.

Sally Selwood presented the submission. She was strongly opposed disbanding community boards, citing their role in informing residents and providing local knowledge. She advocated for increasing their number, recognising their achievements and strengthening their role.

Jeremy Winter presented the submission and shared an electronic presentation available here: [Submission on Hutt City Council's Representation Review 2024 - Community Boards and Community Engagement](#). He advocated for the retention of community boards, noting the ECB was deeply involved in the community. He questioned the cost of replacing community boards and why a functional structure was being dismantled.

Gary Quirke presented the submission. He supported keeping and expanding community boards in each ward, noting their value in understanding local issues. He proposed 13 councillors and six community boards. He opposed the establishment of a Māori ward, criticised the ward boundary process and suggested Manor Park should be included in Stokes Valley.

Derek Wilshere presented the submission and shared an electronic presentation available here: [2024 Representation Review](#). He found the Panel's report lacking, criticising its dismissal of community boards and the claim that the current structure was outdated. He opposed the proposed boundary change between Eastbourne and Wainuiomata Wards, preferring the current structure, number of councillors and the proposed Māori ward. While valuing residents' associations, he noted they lacked democratic election. He supported retaining the ECB for productive outcomes and the establishment of city-wide community boards, regardless of ward boundaries.

Huia Puketapu, Deputy Chair of Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika Trust, presented the submission. She supported keeping all community boards and adding one for Waiwhetū, noting its unique needs and the importance of local advocacy. She noted that a Waiwhetū board might cross ward boundaries and emphasised the need to protect and advocate for the community. She stressed including cultural and community values in discussions and supported the creation of a Māori Ward.

Haiying Shi presented the submission and shared an electronic presentation available here: [Keep the Eastbourne Community Board](#). She supported the ECB, stressing the importance of local channels for community feedback to Council. She said that each city area had unique needs and requested the retention of community boards.

David Smith presented the submission. He saw community boards as crucial for gathering local opinions and voicing concerns. He noted gaps in the Panel's report, such as missing financial perspectives, and questioned whether Council could ask the Panel to review their decision. He called for greater transparency on the proposed Māori Ward to boost public support.

The meeting adjourned at 2.30pm and resumed at 3.00pm.

Karen Arraj-Fisher presented the submission. She stressed the value of community boards, especially the PCB, for representing local views and nurturing future leaders. She preferred keeping the current system, noting the PCB's trust within the community and suggesting that the low number of submissions might be due to residents' time or knowledge constraints.

Karen (Kaz) Yung presented the submission. She highlighted the need to recognise local characteristics, like those in Waiwhetū, and called for a thorough review of ward boundaries. She suggested expanding community boards citywide and improving their support structures, including training and information. She proposed reinstating a three-month calendar of council meetings and briefings for board members. She supported having six wards with boundary adjustments and six community boards.

Wal Loudon presented the submission. He opposed abolishing community boards, stressing their role in representing local issues, especially in unique areas like the Eastern Bays. He argued that one ward councillor couldn't replace the ECB's work and highlighted the minimal cost and high value of community boards.

Elizabeth Palmer presented the submission. She argued for retaining community boards because of their democratic election, local presence and proactive engagement. She suggested expanding the model citywide, emphasising the effective partnership between boards and ward councillors. She also noted that the Harbour and Wainuiomata Wards had higher populations.

Sandra Greig presented the submission. She advocated for abolishing community boards, arguing the \$357,000 cost could be better spent and that Residents' Groups could address community issues. She questioned the community boards' democratic nature and noted public disengagement with local government. She proposed a targeted rate for areas with community boards or a return to volunteer-based representatives.

Michael Draper presented the submission. He supported abolishing community boards, citing their limited and inequitable delegated authorities. He suggested redistributing

their funding citywide. He valued their role during emergencies. He proposed either elected non-voting community representatives or restructuring communities boards with broader mandates and more councillors per ward.

Pete Matcham, representing Grey Power Lower Hutt, presented the group's submission. He proposed replacing community boards with a project-based structure to better include disenfranchised voices. He acknowledged current board members' efforts but found the system ineffective, supporting the Panel's recommendations for restructuring rather than expanding boards.

Pete Matcham, representing Normandale Residents Association, presented the association's submission.

Jan Wijninckx presented the submission. He considered Council ignored community input, citing an 18% rates increase. He called for a referendum if community boards were removed and suggested a better system should replace them. He proposed reducing the number of councillors from 13 to nine, with seven city-wide for efficiency. He emphasised the need for public input and transparency. He believed a decision had already been made.

Ross Jamieson presented the submission. He noted the history of community boards and believed any replacement would be equally costly. He suggested that the decision on whether to keep community boards should be made by the community.

Elle Abel presented the submission via audio-visual link. She opposed disestablishing the community boards, believing they were the best way for community voices to be heard. She noted that addressing Council could be daunting and argued that community boards provided a more approachable platform.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm and resumed at 4:19pm.

In response to questions from members, the Head of Strategy and Policy advised Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act required 10% of a community needed to petition Council. He said he would investigate further and report back including information regarding the actual process involved.

The Director of Strategy and Engagement noted that the threshold for a petition was 15% for communities with a population of 1500 or less people.

Members asked that officers report back on the following:

- clarification on community board composition and whether members could be selected from specific areas within a ward;
- a breakdown by suburb of the representation review survey results;
- a process for establishing a community board without a community petition;
- the cost implications of disestablishing community boards;
- the potential uses of a targeted rate for areas with community boards and whether

rates could vary by community;

- the possibility of establishing a community board for Waiwhetū; and
- requested a briefing to explore alternative community engagement options.

The Chief Executive advised the mana whenua partnership was working well and that having a Māori ward remained on the table. She added no official view from mana whenua on establishing a community board had been received.

Mayor Barry advised that the Panel's report highlighted poor Council engagement citywide which needed addressing. He observed that submissions from ECB and Eastbourne residents were higher than from other areas with community boards.

The Chief Executive stated that a decision on the issue would be made at the Council meeting on 10 September 2024. She said a workshop was planned to present options for alternative engagement methods.

Deputy Mayor Lewis noted that current issues in Eastbourne and increased community awareness of local government decisions might have influenced the higher turnout of submitters. Cr Brown agreed with this comment, noting that communities without community boards might not have submitted feedback due to lack of awareness.

In response to a question from a member, the Director Strategy and Engagement advised Council's previous representation review had been overturned by the Local Government Commission because the decision had not related to the underlying data.

5. CLOSING FORMALITIES - KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA

Unuhia!	<i>Release us from the supreme sacredness</i>
Unuhia!	<i>of our tasks</i>
Unuhia i te uru-tapu-nui	<i>To be clear and free</i>
Kia wātea, kia māmā	<i>in heart, body and soul in our continuing</i>
Te ngākau, te tinana, te wairua i te ara	<i>journey</i>
takatū	<i>Oh Rongo, raise these words up high</i>
Koia rā e Rongo whakairihia ake ki	<i>so that we be cleansed and be free,</i>
runga	<i>Yes indeed, we are free!</i>
Kia wātea, kia wātea!	<i>Good and peaceful</i>
Ae rā, kua wātea!	
Hau, pai mārire.	

There being no further business the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.57 pm.

C Barry
MAYOR

CONFIRMED as a true and correct record
Dated this 1st day of October 2024