

**MINUTES OF WESTERN BAY OF PLENTY DISTRICT COUNCIL
COUNCIL MEETING NO. CL24-12
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1484 CAMERON ROAD, TAURANGA
ON WEDNESDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 2024 AT 9.30AM**

1 KARAKIA

Whakatau mai te wairua	Settle the spirit
Whakawātea mai te hinengaro	Clear the mind
Whakarite mai te tinana	Prepare the body
Kia ea ai ngā mahi	To achieve what needs to be achieved.
Āe	Yes

2 PRESENT

Mayor J Denyer, Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour, Cr T Coxhead, Cr G Dally, Cr M Grainger, Cr A Henry, Cr R Joyce, Cr M Murray-Benge, Cr L Rae, Cr A Sole, Cr D Thwaites and Cr A Wichers.

3 IN ATTENDANCE

J Holyoake (Chief Executive), R Davie (Deputy CEO/General Manager Strategy and Community), A Henderson (General Manager Corporate Services), A Curtis (General Manager Regulatory Services), C Crowe (General Manager Infrastructure Services), E Watton (Strategic Policy and Planning Programme Director), P Watson (Reserves and Facilities Manager), L Balvert (Communications Manager), V Duncan (Customer Services Manager), J Proverbs (Communications Specialist), R McLeod (Senior Communications and Engagement Specialist), P Osborne (Senior Governance Advisor), H Wi Repa (Governance Systems Advisor), E Logan (Governance Advisor), J Duncan (Governance Coordinator) and R Leahy (Senior Governance Advisor).

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

1 Member of the Media

4 APOLOGIES

Nil

5 CONSIDERATION OF LATE ITEMS

Nil

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

7 PUBLIC EXCLUDED ITEMS

Nil

8 REPORTS**8.1 FORMAL DECLARATION OF BRETT WATERHOUSE FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE MAKETU COMMUNITY BOARD**

Council considered a report dated 20 November 2024 from the Senior Governance Advisor. The report was taken as read.

The Mayor called Mr Waterhouse to the lectern to make and sign the declaration. The making, attesting and signing of the declaration required of the Maketu Community Board members was witnessed by the Mayor.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.20

Moved: Cr L Rae

Seconded: Cr A Wichers

1. That the Senior Governance Advisor's report dated 20 November 2024 titled 'Formal Declaration of Brett Waterhouse for Appointment to the Maketu Community Board' be received.
2. That the oral and written declaration by Brett Waterhouse is witnessed and signed by Mayor James Denyer.

CARRIED

9.35am The hui adjourned.

10.00am The hui reconvened.

8.2 PROPOSAL TO OFFICIALLY NAME THE LAND CURRENTLY KNOWN AS PARK ROAD AND BEACH ROAD RESERVE, KATIKATI

Council considered a report dated 20 November 2024 from the Reserves and Facilities Manager, who provided an overview of the report and recommendations therein.

The Reserves and Facilities Manager introduced Janie Hemoata Wanakore-Flavell, Tineka Wanakore, Mōwai Wanakore Eruera and Mārire Te Ripo Wanakore Eruera, being the whānau of Paeahi Wanakore.

Presenters responded to pātai as below:

- The whānau noted that although Paeahi was often known as Pae, this was more of a nickname to help those who may have struggled to say his full name. It was important to the whānau that in this instance his full name was honoured.
- Staff would work with the whānau on the possibility of having a storyboard or QR code at the reserve that provided some further information about Paeahi, should they wish to.
- Staff had talked with the whānau around creative ways to have reserve signage that would better reflect the mana of Paeahi, including consideration of carved signage.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.21

Moved: Cr A Henry

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

1. That the Reserves and Facilities Manager's report dated 20 November 2024 titled 'Proposal to Officially Name the land currently known as Park Road and Beach Road Reserve, Katikati' be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That Council approves that staff initiate the process to officially name an area of land currently identified as 'Park Road and Beach Road Reserve' to 'Paeahi Wanakore Reserve'.
4. That if, in Item 3 above, the Committee approves the proposal to rename the Park Road and Beach Road Reserve to 'Paeahi Wanakore Reserve', staff be instructed to initiate a one-month public consultation process before making a recommendation to Council for a formal resolution.

CARRIED

9 PUBLIC FORUM

9.1 SUE MATTHEWS – REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Ms Matthews was in attendance on behalf of the Paengaroa Community Association Incorporated to speak to the following points:

- The Paengaroa Community Association Incorporated held a Spring Festival at the Paengaroa Domain to celebrate their volunteers, highlight local businesses and engage with the community on the review of the Community Development Plan.
- 1,400 people (estimated) attended the event, with 90 stalls and 96 respondents to their survey.
- She noted that this event was put on at no cost to ratepayers, and therefore reiterated the fact that they did not feel as though Paengaroa required a Community Board.

Ms Matthews responded to pātai as follows:

- She was only speaking on behalf of the Paengaroa Community Association, which was the rateable area of the community hall.
- The format of the last Te Puke-Maketu Community Forum was a great way for community members to engage with council staff, acknowledging that the Association had good relationships with Council.
- The Paengaroa Community Association had 45 members, noting that she was of the understanding that there was a population of around 1,200 people in Paengaroa.
- They were satisfied with the relationship that they had with Council.

9.2 GARRY WEBBER – REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Former Mayor Garry Webber was in attendance to speak to the following points:

- Although his personal submission to the Representation Review sought two Community Boards that included every resident, he acknowledged that given all the other submissions, Option 5C was an elegant, consistent and inclusive compromise.
- He believed that Option 5C did not prevent Residents and Ratepayers Associations from also being present.
- There were a number of rural and lifestyle residents that were not included in a Community Board area, which he felt was unfair.

Mr Webber responded to pātai as follows:

- Matakana Island should be represented somewhere in the process.

9.3 BRETT WATERHOUSE – REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Mr Waterhouse was in attendance in his personal capacity to speak to the following points:

- He believed that keeping the current five Community Boards with the adjustment of the boundary for Maketu, aligned with 74% of the submitters who supported this option.

- He proposed that further boundaries could be adjusted without dismantling the structure of the current Community Boards, to help with those that were not currently included in a Community Board area.
- He was worried that presenting options that were not consulted on undermined the consultation process and could affect the community's trust in Council.
- He did not feel that it was fair to include the 74% support for Community Boards as support for Option 5C (being three ward based Community Boards), as this particular option was not consulted on.
- The proposal of Option 5C was to have one Maketu representative, which he did not feel was adequate to advocate for the needs of Maketu.

Mr Waterhouse responded to pātai as follows:

- It was acknowledged that Option 5C would mean a lower cost to ratepayers, which was always welcomed, however there was work that needed to be done to Maketu and that rate was made higher to help the Community Board undertake some of that work.
-

9.4 KEITH HAY - REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Mr Hay was in attendance on behalf of the Waihi Beach-Katikati Residents and Ratepayers Association, noting the following points:

- He provided an overview of what Council proposed to Community Boards in the last Representation Review.
- Of the 386 submissions that related to Community Boards, 74% were in favour of them being retained.
- He also did not feel that it was fair to include the 74% support for Community Boards as support for Option 5C, which was to disestablish with the existing five Community Boards and replace with three new ones.
- The Association did not believe that a Community Board that covered the whole ward would be effective.
- The Association was opposed to the reduction of the Katikati boundary, noting that this view was supported by feedback heard during the 'table talk' session in Katikati.
- He noted that the Representation Review had more options now than it did when it first began.

Mr Hay responded to pātai as follows:

- He believed there should be an individual Community Board for Katikati and Waihi Beach, and that the size of the Katikati Community Board area should not be reduced.
 - He did not see anything wrong with the Katikati-Waihi Beach Residents and Ratepayers Association covering both areas, as they represented both.
-

9.5 JOHN CLEMENTS – REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Mr Clements was in attendance on behalf of the Katikati Community Board, noting the following points:

- Katikati was a unique town, therefore he believed that merging Waihi Beach and Katikati together would not work.
 - He felt as though two of the options provided were contradictory, being the shrinking of current Community Board boundaries to focus on communities of interest, and on the other hand, enlarging them to cover the entire ward.
 - He believed that consultation to date showed support for retaining the Katikati Community Board and its boundary.
 - Some of the options on the table were not consulted on, and therefore a cost analysis had not been undertaken to highlight the intended and unintended consequences, should it play out.
 - He believed the new option would have a significant impact on the way that Community Board operated, and therefore deserved community input.
-

9.6 ROSS GOUDIE – REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Mr Goudie was in attendance in his personal capacity, noting the following points:

- Although Section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001 outlined the process for Council to respond to submissions on its initial proposal, including the need to amend the resolution made to adopt the initial proposal 'as it thinks fit', he believed it was best practice to consult with the community.
 - As Option 5C was not consulted on, he did not believe it should be considered.
-

9.7 STEPHAN SIMPSON – REPRESENTATION REVIEW

Mr Simpson was in attendance to speak to the following points:

- He and members of his whānau had served on the Maketu Community Board, and had lived in Maketu for many years.
- He reiterated that Maketu was a unique place.
- He was in favour of expanding the boundary of the Maketu Community Board, noting that most locals considered it as being 'crossing to crossing'.
- He acknowledged that Māori treated the Maketu Community Board as a heart/living thing, therefore he felt taking the heart out of Maketu should not be an option.
- He noted that the Community Board was a mechanism for Council to hear the local perspectives.

Mr Simpson responded to pātai as follows:

- He was in favour of expanding the boundary of the Maketu Community Board.
 - He did not believe that one person could speak for Maketu.
-

- He believed that there would be many members in the community, especially Māori, who would see parts of their community as living things.
-

10 REPORTS CONTINUED

10.1 FINAL PROPOSAL FOR REPRESENTATION REVIEW 2024

Council considered a report dated 20 November 2024 from the Strategic Policy and Planning Programme Director. The report was taken as read with a brief overview of the process undertaken to date and the recommendation therein.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- The requirements of the Local Electoral Act required Council to make specific resolutions on the specific components of the proposal. This was different legislation than what Council used for other consultation processes, such as the Long Term Plan (LTP), which required Council to set out the options that were being considered and indicate a preferred option. The requirements of the Local Electoral Act was prescriptive in what the initial proposal contained. Council had taken the additional step of including other options that were considered but not preferred for the initial proposal, to provide further context, to provide those giving feedback with further insight.
 - The decision in front of Council related to the 'final proposal'. This was still referred to as a proposal, as this was the terminology used through the legislation and the Local Government Commission guidance, noting it remained a proposal until the appeal or objection period had concluded.
 - If Council resolved to adopt the initial proposal, it would only be eligible for appeal from those that had submitted on it, noting that they could only appeal on points made within their original submissions.
 - If Council resolved to amend the initial proposal on any other matter, it would be open for objection by any person, on any of the amended matters.
 - All of the options provided within the report were practicable, and legally within scope.
 - Council was required to consider feedback on Māori Ward/s, just like any key aspect of the initial proposal. The Māori Ward decision was unique as the decision was taken earlier in the process, and due to legislation changes Council was also required to previously reaffirm this decision prior to adopting its initial proposal.
 - In regard to Option 5C, the default option, as discussed through workshops, was to have two councillors appointed to the Community Board, as they were now. Councillors could seek an amendment to up to three appointees, should they see fit, based on the total number of community board members proposed for each community board.
-

- It would be a decision for the incoming Mayor as to who the Councillors appointed to the respective community board would be. The number of Councillors to be appointed, needed to be determined through this Representation Review process.
-

RESOLUTION CL24-12.22

Moved: Cr M Grainger

Seconded: Cr R Joyce

1. That the Strategic Policy and Planning Programme Director's report dated 20 November 2023 titled 'Final proposal for Representation Review 2024' be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of **high** significance in terms of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That Council receives all submissions (written and spoken) from the consultation period 16 September to 11 October 2024, as set out in Attachment 1 and 2 to this report.

CARRIED

Council did not have a mover and seconder to adopt the initial proposal without amendment, therefore the following recommendations were taken in parts to work through and amend the issues and options individually.

ISSUE 1 BASIS OF ELECTIONS

Council considered issue 1 being 'Basis of elections'.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.23

Moved: Cr R Joyce

Seconded: Cr A Henry

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:
 - (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 1: Basis of elections

Option 1A

That Council proposes to continue with its current basis of elections, that being on a 'by ward' basis.

CARRIED

Reasons for decision:

- Aligned with community feedback, where 380 submitters (86%) supported the three general ward structure.
- Election by ward was a familiar concept to the community and would not require additional education around the subject.

ISSUE 2 NUMBER OF WARDS

Council considered issue 2 being 'Number of Wards'.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.24

Moved: Cr R Joyce

Seconded: Cr D Thwaites

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:
- (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 2: Number of wards

Option 2A

That Council proposes three general wards to be known as Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward, Kaimai Ward and Maketu-Te Puke Ward and one Māori ward to be known as Waka Kai Uru.

Ward name	Communities of interest	Geographic reference
Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward	Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward, comprising the area delineated on Plan LG-022-2019-W-2 deposited with the Local Government Commission, with the exclusion of a small north-western portion.	The Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward proposed boundaries shown at Attachment 4 and 5 of this report.
Kaimai Ward	Kaimai Ward, comprising the area delineated on Plan LG-022-2019-W-2 deposited with the Local Government Commission, with the inclusion of a small north-western portion of the current Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward and the	The Kaimai Ward proposed boundaries shown at Attachment 4, 5 and 6 of this report.

	exclusion of a small north-eastern portion.	
Maketu-Te Puke Ward	Maketu-Te Puke Ward, comprising the area delineated on Plan LG022-2013-W-4 deposited with the Local Government Commission, with the inclusion of a small north-eastern portion of the current Kaimai Ward.	The Maketu-Te Puke Ward proposed boundaries shown at Attachment 4 and 6 of this report.
Waka Kai Uru Ward	Māori electoral population district -wide	The entire district – proposed boundaries of which are shown at Attachment 7 of this report.

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Cr Thwaites, Cr Wichers, Cr Coxhead, Cr Dally, Cr Grainger, Cr Joyce, Cr Henry, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour and Mayor Denyer

Against: Cr Murray-Benge, Cr Rae and Cr Sole

CARRIED 9/3

Reasons for decision:

- 389 submitters (86%) supported the three general wards and 278 submitters (53%) supported the establishment of a Māori ward.
- This proposal provided for fair and effective representation of communities of interest across the district, and met the required +/- 10% rule set out in the Local Electoral Act (LEA).
- The ward structure was a familiar concept to the Western Bay communities and would not require additional education around the subject.
- The establishment of a Māori ward allowed those on the Māori electoral roll to vote for a representative on Council. The voting rights of other members of the community would not be affected.
- The establishment of a Māori ward was supported by both Tangata Whenua Partnership Forums, Te Ihu o te Waka o Te Arawa and Te Kāhui Mana Whenua o Tauranga Moana.
- The establishment of a Māori Ward enhanced authentic Te Tiriti based relationships as expressed by Tangata Whenua and supported Council's strategic priority of growing authentic Te Tiriti based relationships.
- The establishment of a Māori Ward provided for improved representation for Māori.
- Enabled the concept of Māori wards to be more broadly tested through a binding poll alongside the 2025 local elections.

ISSUE 3 NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

Council considered issue 3 being 'Number of Councillors'.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.25

Moved: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

Seconded: Cr D Thwaites

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:

- (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 3: Number of councillors

Option 3A

That Council proposes reducing the overall number of councillors to 10, made up of **8 general ward councillors** (2 representing the Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward, 3 representing the Kaimai Ward and 3 representing the Maketu-Te Puke Ward), **1 Māori ward councillor** (representing Waka Kai Uru Ward) and the **Mayor** (elected 'at large')

Ward	Population	Members	Population-member ratio	difference from applicable quota
Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward	14,530*	2	7,265	8.53%
Maketu-Te Puke Ward	18,580*	3	6,193	7.48%
Kaimai Ward	20,440*	3	6,813	1.79%
totals	53,550*	8		
*takes into account two ward boundary changes per initial proposal				
Waka Kai Uru Ward	7,240	1	7,240	7.54%

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Cr Thwaites, Cr Wichers, Cr Coxhead, Cr Dally, Cr Grainger, Cr Joyce, Cr Henry, Cr Sole, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour and Mayor Denyer

Against: Cr Murray-Benge and Cr Rae

CARRIED 10/2

Reasons for decision:

- 224 submitters (53%) supported the initial proposal to reduce the number of Councillors and 278 submitters (53%) supported the establishment of a Māori ward.
- The current budget for remuneration of Councillors would be divided by a smaller number of Councillors, resulting in them receiving a larger salary and potentially attracting a wider range of candidates.
- Reducing the number of councillors may enhance efficient and focused decision-making.
- Reducing the number of councillors and undertaking two minor ward boundary adjustments would enable both general ward and Māori ward members to represent a similar amount of the population which met the fair representation requirement (+/- 10% rule).
- The establishment of a Māori ward allowed those on the Māori electoral roll to vote for a representative on Council. The voting rights of other members of the community will not be affected.
- The establishment of a Māori ward was supported by both Tangata Whenua Partnership Forums, Te Ihu o te Waka o Te Arawa and Te Kāhui Mana Whenua o Tauranga Moana.
- The establishment of Māori Ward enhanced authentic Te Tiriti based relationships as expressed by Tangata Whenua and supported Council's strategic priority of growing authentic Te Tiriti based relationships.
- The establishment of a Māori Ward provided for improved representation for Māori.

ISSUE 4 WARD BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

Council considered issue 4 being 'Ward Boundary Adjustments'.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.26

Moved: Cr M Grainger

Seconded: Cr L Rae

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:

- (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 4: Ward boundary adjustments

Option 4A

That Council proposes that two minor ward boundary adjustments are undertaken between Katikati-Waihi Beach and Kaimai Wards AND between Kaimai and Maketu-Te Puke Wards as set out in **Attachments 5 and 6**.

CARRIED

Reasons for decision:

- 218 submitters (49%) supported the boundary change proposal for Kaimai/Katikati-Waihi Beach wards, and 204 submitters (45%) supported the boundary change proposal for Kaimai/Maketu-Te Puke.
 - The two minor ward boundary adjustments would enable General Ward and Māori Ward members to represent a similar amount of the population, which met the fair representation requirement (+/- 10% rule). This rule meant that all votes were of approximately equal value and was a requirement for general wards. This was not a requirement for general wards against Māori wards, however Councillors representing approximately the same amount of people was a more equitable approach.
 - The proposed boundary changes were still generally consistent with communities of interest.
-

ISSUE 5 COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION

Council considered issue 5 being 'Community Representation'.

MOTION

Moved: Cr A Wichers

Seconded: Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:

- (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 5: Community representation

Option 5C

That Council proposes to disestablish its current five Community Boards, being Waihī Beach, Katikati, Ōmokoroa, Te Puke and Maketu Community Boards and establish three new Community Boards, each to cover one of the three wards. To be known as the Maketu-Te Puke Community Board, Kaimai Community Board and Katikati-Waihī Beach Community Board. Each to comprise of six elected members and two councillors appointed from the respective ward, with subdivisions as set out in the table below and shown on the map in **Attachment 12**.

	Population	Members	Population-member ratio	Difference from quota
Maketu-Te Puke Ward Community Board (*see Note 1 below)				
Te Puke	13,000	3	4,333	15.04%
Maketu	2,740	1	2,740	-27.26%
Eastern	6,860	2	3,430	-8.94%
	22,600	6		
Kaimai Ward Community Board				
Ōmokoroa	7,480	2	3,740	1.45%
Kaimai West	7,300	2	3,650	-0.99%
Kaimai East	7,340	2	3,670	-0.45%
	22,120	6		
Katikati-Waihī Beach Ward Community Board (*see Note 2 below)				
Waihī Beach	4,100	3	1,367	-48.65%
Katikati	11,870	3	3,957	48.65%
	15,970	6		

AMENDMENT

Moved: Cr G Dally

Seconded: Cr M Grainger

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:

- (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 5: Community representation

Option 5C

That Council proposes to disestablish its current five Community Boards, being Waihi Beach, Katikati, Omokoroa, Te Puke and Maketu Community Boards and establish three new Community Boards, each to cover one of the three wards. To be known as the Maketu-Te Puke Community Board, Kaimai Community Board and Katikati-Waihi Beach Community Board. The Maketu-Te Puke Community Board and Kaimai Community Board to comprise of six elected members and three councillors appointed from the respective ward, and Katikati-Waihi Beach Community Board to comprise of six elected members and two councillors appointed from the respective ward, with subdivisions as set out in the table below and shown on the map in Attachment 12.

The amendment was voted on and declared lost on show of hands.

LOST 3/9

RESOLUTION CL24-12.27

Moved: Cr A Wichers

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

4. That following consideration of the submissions, pursuant to section 19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, Council resolves to:

- (ii) Amend the initial proposal on the basis of the following preferred options for the issues set out below for the reasons stated, as its final proposal intended to apply to the 2025 and 2028 triennial elections, being:

Issue 5: Community representation

Option 5C

That Council proposes to disestablish its current five Community Boards, being Waihi Beach, Katikati, Omokoroa, Te Puke and Maketu Community Boards and establish three new Community Boards, each to cover one of the three wards. To be known as the Maketu-Te Puke Community Board, Kaimai Community Board and Katikati-Waihi Beach Community Board. Each to comprise of six elected members and two councillors appointed from the respective ward, with subdivisions as set out in the table below and shown on the map in Attachment 12.

	Population	Members	Population-member ratio	Difference from quota

Maketu-Te Puke Ward Community Board (*see Note 1 below)				
Te Puke	13,000	3	4,333	15.04%
Maketu	2,740	1	2,740	-27.26%
Eastern	6,860	2	3,430	-8.94%
	22,600	6		
Kaimai Ward Community Board				
Ōmokoroa	7,480	2	3,740	1.45%
Kaimai West	7,300	2	3,650	-0.99%
Kaimai East	7,340	2	3,670	-0.45%
	22,120	6		
Katikati-Waihī Beach Ward Community Board (*see Note 2 below)				
Waihī Beach	4,100	3	1,367	-48.65%
Katikati	11,870	3	3,957	48.65%
	15,970	6		

***Note 1**Rationale for Maketu-Te Puke Ward Community Board proposed subdivision arrangements

The proposed subdivision arrangements for the Maketu-Te Puke Ward Community Board do not comply with the +/- 10% rule for fair representation. This is considered appropriate given the nature of the ward and the communities within it. The three subdivisions represent three distinct areas within the ward – Te Puke, Maketu, and then the broader eastern area including the communities of Pukehina, Pongakawa and Paengaroa. These areas are connected for schooling, shopping, recreational, employment and social activities at a ward level. Given the distribution of the communities and electoral population, it is considered that there are few options for electoral subdivision boundaries that comply with the +/-10% fair representation requirement, while also appropriately reflecting communities within the ward.

Council considers that aligning the community board area with the ward boundary will achieve an area that is appropriate for the efficient and effective performance of its role. This is because all areas within the ward are equitably represented by a community board, rather than large areas in the eastern part of the ward that are currently not part of a community board area. This includes the communities of Pukehina, Pongakawa and Paengaroa that are not currently represented by a community board (albeit with some active ratepayer/community associations). The universality of coverage lends to greater delegation and function of the community board, and potential for increased funding given that all properties in the ward would contribute through future rates. This could lead to enhanced localism. There is also the potential for a reduced rates burden for Maketu Community.

The Maketu-Te Puke ward is well understood by the community, having been in effect since 2013 (albeit with some minor boundary adjustments to maintain fair

representation requirements as between wards). Prior to this, Maketu and Te Puke were separate wards, originally being formed out of the 1989 local government reorganisation arrangements. As a result, there is strong familiarity and identity with the ward – both from outside the ward area and from those communities within it. The former Maketu ward covered Maketu and also Pukehina.

- It was considered that splitting the Te Puke area between separate electoral subdivisions would not effectively reflect that community, which is the largest urban centre in the ward. We also heard through submissions that reducing the area to just the urban limits does not accurately reflect the community of Te Puke, which includes the townships of Waitangi and Manoeka. This is also generally reflective of the spatial extent identified through the Te Puke Spatial Plan process that is currently underway.
- Given the long-established community of Maketu and its community board representation, it was considered important that this area is reflected by an electoral subdivision. Following the boundaries created by State Highway 2 and the coastline creates an easily understood area. The smaller population in Maketu makes it challenging to align with the $\pm 10\%$ rule for fair representation, whilst effectively recognising it as a communities of interest. There is also some anticipated growth in terms of Papakāinga on Te Arawa Land Holdings land within Maketu village, and a private Plan Change for Arawa Road is currently being determined by an independent panel of RMA hearings commissioners. Over time, these types of developments could address the level of non-compliance with the $\pm 10\%$ rule.
- For the eastern area, it is considered that there are sufficient commonalities between the rural areas and smaller communities of Pukehina, Pongakawa and Paengaroa. This subdivision area is compliant with the $\pm 10\%$ rule. These communities are considered to be distinct from the larger urban settlement of Te Puke and the coastal settlement of Maketu. They have their own schools, some significant employers and local retail offerings. The Paengaroa community has an active community association and its own community plan. The Pukehina community also has an active resident/ratepayer association. It is important to acknowledge future growth anticipated within this area as set out in the Future Development Strategy – namely the new Eastern Town that is currently planned in the long term, but will likely be brought forward to satisfy land supply requirements.

***Note 2**Rationale for Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward Community Board proposed subdivision arrangements

The proposed subdivision arrangements for Katikati-Waihi Beach Ward Community Board do not comply with the +/- 10% rule for fair representation. However, this is considered appropriate given the nature of the ward and the communities within it. The two subdivisions represent two distinct areas within the ward – Waihi Beach and Katikati. These areas are connected for schooling, shopping, recreational, employment and social activities at a ward level.

Council considers that aligning the community board area with the ward boundary will achieve an area that is appropriate for the efficient and effective performance of its role. This is because all areas within the ward are equitably represented by a community board (excluding Matakana and Rangiwaea Islands). The existing two community boards (Katikati and Waihi Beach) already cover the ward in its entirety (excluding Matakana and Rangiwaea Islands), when combining their current areas. The areas are well known to the community, and significant support has been demonstrated through the submission process for these to be retained.

The Katikati-Waihi Beach ward boundary is well understood by the community, having been in effect since 2013 (albeit with some minor boundary adjustments to maintain fair representation requirements as between wards). Prior to this, Waihi Beach and Katikati were separate wards, originally being formed out of the 1989 local government reorganisation arrangements. As a result, there is strong familiarity and identity with the ward – both from outside the ward area and from those communities within it.

Given the long-established communities of Waihi Beach and Katikati and their respective community boards, it was considered important that these areas are reflected by electoral subdivisions. This includes considerations for size and location of the areas including access to elected members. It is also noted that Waihi Beach has significant increases in population through the peak summer period, which creates a range of unique issues and potentially increased demand on community board members. Council considers that the electoral populations required to be used for the purposes of the representation review do not adequately reflect peak summer population.

Council's initial proposal sought to reduce the area covered by Katikati Community Board area and leave the Waihi Beach Community Board area as it currently stands. Katikati Community Board supported leaving the boundaries of the Katikati Community Board as they currently stand, acknowledging that the town and rural surrounds see themselves as sharing a community interest centred around the town. Several submitters from the outlying communities of Ongare Point, Tanners Point and Fairview Estate opposed the proposal to be excluded from the Katikati Community Board area. The Community Board noted that Katikati is a service town to the local rural area and

the two have been linked for 150 years. The proposed electoral subdivision area aligns with the current Community Board boundary. Waihi Beach Community Board also submitted in opposition to reducing the Katikati Community Board area.

The motion was voted on and a division was called and recorded as follows:

For: Cr Wichers, Cr Thwaites, Deputy Mayor Scrimgeour, Cr Grainger, Cr Dally and Mayor Denyer

Against: Cr Sole, Cr Rae, Cr Murray-Benge, Cr Joyce, Cr Henry and Cr Coxhead.

Due to an equality of votes, the Mayor exercised his right for a casting vote and voted for the motion.

CARRIED 7/6

Reasons for decision:

- Responded to feedback relating to the inequitable coverage of community boards in the district, as every property in the District would be included in one of the community boards (excluding Matakana and Rangiwaea Islands – estimated electoral population of 250).
 - Aligned with the strong community feedback to retain community boards – 346 submitters (74%). Noting that this feedback was in response to retaining the five existing community boards rather than this option specifically.
 - Potentially set the foundation for greater delegation to community boards, given the universality of coverage across the District, leading to enhanced localism.
 - Addresses feedback from some communities that currently did not have a community board but may have expressed a desire to have one, as well as other suggestions to combine community boards or look to broader ward level coverage.
 - Responded to feedback received on the initial proposal about reducing the area for Te Puke and Katikati Community Boards to only cover the urban areas of those communities, and the importance of connection to rural areas.
 - It was essentially a hybrid of the community board model and the option to disestablish the five community boards and replace them with three community committees.
 - The proposed ward level community boards would be elected and subject to the same requirements for community boards under legislation as those that were currently operating.
 - Addressed concerns about the committees being appointed rather than elected, and a perception that Council would only appoint people who would be favourable.
 - 389 submitters (86%) supported the current three general ward approach, and feedback generally supported that the three ward was being a fair and effective
-

way to represent the various communities of interest (both urban and rural) across the District. The three ward model had longevity and familiarity with residents.

- Use of subdivisions within each board area could reflect the specific communities of interest, particularly those that currently had a community board.
- Rating implications to be considered through the Annual Plan process, but likely that some properties currently within community boards areas would pay less.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.28

Moved: Cr D Thwaites

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

5. That Council directs the Chief Executive to notify submitters and issue public notice in relation to the appeal and objection period, which takes place between 22 November and 13 December 2024, pursuant to Sections 19O and 19P of the Local Electoral Act 2001.
6. That Council directs the Chief Executive to prepare a decision document for approval by the Mayor, either at the end of the appeal/objection period or following LGC determination, depending on the outcome of the appeal/objection process.

CARRIED

12.28pm The hui adjourned.

12.40pm The hui reconvened.

10.2 JUBILEE PARK - APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO A NEW LEASE WITH TE PUKE ART SOCIETY INCORPORATED UNDER THE RESERVES ACT 1977

Council considered a report dated 20 November 2024 from the Reserves and Facilities Manager. The report was taken as read.

Staff responded to pātai as below:

- The building already existed on the park, noting that it could be identified on the map (Attachment 1) as the building with the large grey roof on Commerce Lane.

RESOLUTION CL24-12.29

Moved: Cr M Murray-Benge

Seconded: Deputy Mayor J Scrimgeour

1. That the Reserves and Facilities Manager’s report dated 20 November 2024 titled ‘Jubilee Park - Approval to enter into a New Lease with Te Puke Art Society Incorporated under the Reserves Act 1977’ be received.
2. That the report relates to an issue that is considered to be of low significance in terms of Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.
3. That Council, in its capacity as administrating body of the reserve, **grants** the Te Puke Art Society Incorporated the right to lease for up to 30 years (10+10+10) for 180m² of land, more or less, being part of Lot 2 DP 483391 contained in Record of Title 681972 to allow for a community art and craft activities facility situated on Jubilee Park.

CARRIED

11 INFORMATION FOR RECEIPT

NIL

12 RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

RESOLUTION CL24-12.30

Moved: Cr T Coxhead
 Seconded: Cr M Grainger

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting. The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
12.1 – Award Memo for Waihi Beach Library and Community Hub	s7(2)(b)(ii) - the withholding of the information is necessary to protect information where the making available of the information would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information	s48(1)(a)(i) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7

CARRIED

The Meeting closed at 12.55pm.

Confirmed as a true and correct record at the Council meeting held 12 December 2024.



.....

Mayor J Denyer

CHAIRPERSON / MAYOR