



LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

Determination

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

Background

1. The Auckland City Council (the Council) elected at the 2004 local elections comprises the mayor and 19 councillors elected as follows:

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per councillor
Avondale-Roskill	92,900	4	23,225	+835.53	+3.73
Eastern Bays	46,600	2	23,300	+910.53	+4.07
Eden-Albert	60,600	3	20,200	-2,189.47	-9.78
Hauraki Gulf Islands	9,470	1	9,470	-12,919.47	-57.70
Hobson	84,500	3	28,167	+5,777.53	+25.80
Tamaki-Maungakiekie	91,000	4	22,750	+360.53	+1.61
Western Bays	40,400	2	20,200	-2,189.47	-9.78
TOTALS	425,400	19	22,389.47		

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

2. Currently there are 10 community boards in Auckland City as follows:
 - the Avondale and Mount Roskill Community Boards covering the area of the Avondale-Roskill Ward with five elected members each and two appointed members each;
 - the Eastern Bays Community Board covering the area of the Eastern Bays Ward with five elected members and two appointed members;
 - the Eden-Albert Community Board covering the area of the Eden Albert Ward with six elected members and three appointed members;
 - the Great Barrier Island and Waiheke Community Boards covering parts of the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward with five elected members each and one appointed member each;
 - the Hobson Community Board covering the area of the Hobson Ward with six elected members and three appointed members;

- the Tamaki and Maungakiekie Community Boards covering the area of the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward with five elected members each and two appointed members each; and
 - the Western Bays Community Board covering the area of the Western Bays Ward with five elected members and two appointed members.
3. In March 2006 a Council-appointed electoral working party, comprising elected members, reported to the Council:
- confirming that current representation arrangements, introduced in 1998, still largely reflect the three key electoral principles of community of interest, effective representation and fair representation;
 - noting that the Hobson Ward now no longer complies with the fair representation requirement (+/-10% rule); and
 - identifying six options to reduce the size/population of the Hobson Ward to comply with the +/-10% rule for the purposes of community engagement (including with community boards).
4. On 22 June 2006 the Council resolved, under sections 19H and 19J of the Local Electoral Act 2001 (the Act), its initial proposed representation arrangements to apply for the 2007 local elections. The Council's initial proposal was as follows:
- (a) the Council comprise 19 councillors (and the mayor) elected from seven wards as follows:

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per councillor
Avondale-Roskill	92,900	4	23,225	+835.53	+3.73
Eastern Bays	46,600	2	23,300	+910.53	+4.07
Eden-Albert	67,800	3	22,600	+210.53	+0.94
Hauraki Gulf Islands	9,470	1	9,470	-12,919.47	-57.70
Hobson	73,000	3	24,333	+1,943.53	+8.68
Tamaki-Maungakiekie	95,200	4	23,800	+1,410.53	+6.30
Western Bays	40,400	2	20,200	-2,189.47	-9.78
TOTALS	425,400	19	22,389.47		

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

- (b) the existing 10 community boards be retained subject to boundary adjustments to reflect the modified ward boundaries electing a total of 52 members.
5. The initial proposal (option 2 of six identified by the electoral working party) involved the following areas being moved from the Hobson Ward to address its current non-compliance with the +/-10% rule:
- enlarge Eden-Albert Ward to include Eden Terrace sector;
 - enlarge Eden-Albert Ward to include Epsom South area; and
 - enlarge Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward to include One Tree Hill area.

6. In notifying its initial proposal on wards, the Council noted that its reasoning for the ward boundary alterations was it considered that retaining seven wards and 20 elected members (the mayor and 19 councillors) provided citizens of Auckland City with fair and effective representation and that the revised ward boundaries and subsequent ward population adjustments comply with the Act.
7. In notifying its initial proposal on community boards, the Council noted that its reasoning was based on the requirement for boundaries of communities to coincide, as far as practicable, with ward boundaries and that the changes to community boundaries reflect this where practicable.
8. The Council received a total of 94 submissions on its initial proposal. An analysis by the Council showed:
 - 54 submitters supported the proposal; and
 - 36 submitters opposed the proposal.
9. The submissions received identified 272 comments/issues which the Council summarised as follows:
 - two did not want any changes to be made to the wards;
 - 28 opposed the proposed move of Epsom South to the Eden-Albert Ward;
 - seven raised consultation issues;
 - 67 raised political or other issues;
 - five did not want the central business district (CBD) to be divided between separate wards;
 - 44 did not want the CBD moved from the Hobson Ward;
 - 28 supported other ward adjustment options.
10. Following consideration of submissions, the Council, on 28 September 2006, agreed its final proposal in relation to the basis of election and the number of councillors (i.e. 19 councillors plus the mayor) elected from seven wards.

Wards	Population*	No. of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	Percentage deviation from city average population per councillor
Avondale-Roskill	92,900	4	23,225	+835.53	+3.73
Eastern Bays	47,800	2	23,900	+1510.53	+6.75
Eden-Albert	65,700	3	21,900	-489.47	-2.19
Hauraki Gulf Islands	9,470	1	9,470	-12,919.47	-57.70
Hobson	73,800	3	24,600	+2,210.53	+9.87
Tamaki-Maungakiekie	95,300	4	23,825	+1,435.53	+6.41
Western Bays	40,400	2	20,200	-2,189.47	-9.78
TOTALS	425,400	19	22,389.47		

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

11. The Council also amended its initial proposal relating to community representation in order that the existing 10 communities reflected the amended ward proposals.

12. The final proposal (described as option 6A by the Council, being a modification of original option 6 identified by the electoral working party) involved the following areas moved from the Hobson Ward to address its current non-compliance with the +/-10% rule:
 - enlarge Eden-Albert Ward to include Eden Terrace sector and Grafton;
 - enlarge Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward to include One Tree Hill area but not Epsom East;
 - enlarge Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward to include part St Johns area but not Mt Wellington Quarry area (from Eastern Bays); and
 - enlarge Eastern Bays Ward to include Abbots Park area.

13. In its statement of final proposal, the Council stated that the reasons for the amendments to its initial proposal was:
 - the CBD should be retained as one community of interest and not be split;
 - the Epsom South area has more affinity with and should be retained in the Hobson Ward;
 - the Eden Terrace/part Grafton area has more affinity with and should be included with the Eden-Albert Ward;
 - the part One Tree Hill area has more affinity with and should be included with the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward;
 - the Abbots Park area has more affinity with and should be included with the Eastern Bays Ward;
 - the Mt Wellington Quarry area should remain in the Eastern Bays Ward (to allow for future growth); and
 - the part St Johns area has more affinity with and should be included with the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward.

14. A total of 310 appeals/objections, plus 2 late ones (which were accepted as they did not raise new matters), against the Council's final proposal were received. An analysis of the 312 appeals/objections (the vast majority of which were on the standard Council-provided form) showed:
 - eight in support of the Council's proposals;
 - 299 object specifically to the proposal to transfer the "Abbots Park" area from the Hobson Ward to the Eastern Bays Ward; and
 - seven object to other aspects of the Council's proposal including the process in general and the adoption of option 6A.

Hearing

15. The Commission met with the Council, appellants/objectors and a representative of one community board who accepted an invitation to appear in support of the Council's proposal, at a hearing held in the Auckland Town Hall on 6 March 2007. The Council was represented by the Deputy Mayor Bruce Hucker, Councillor Richard Northey and the Council's Electoral Officer Dale Ofoske. The appellants/objectors who appeared at the hearing were: Belinda Keith on behalf of the manager and a number of residents of the

Remuera Gardens Retirement Village, Jim Chen, Brenda Cook, Dayalal Siriwardane, Lloyd Hill (also on behalf of other residents), Gillian Hood, Greg Nikoloff (also on behalf of other residents), Jennie Hayman also representing the Remuera Community Committee, Bruce and Linda Darwin, Colin Davis from the Eastern Bays Community Board, Stuart Ryan and David Haigh from the Grafton Residents Association, Toni Millar on behalf of Auckland Citizens and Ratepayers Now Councillors, and Geoffrey Marler.

Matters raised in appeals, objections and at the hearing

16. The main arguments presented in support of the Council's proposal were:
 - it avoids the transfer of Epsom South from Hobson Ward to Eden-Albert Ward (as in option 2) which splits the community of interest people of this area have with the Hobson Ward (e.g. schools, shopping centre, public transport);
 - it retains the CBD in one ward;
 - do not believe an increase in councillors to 20 is wise given uncertainty about the future structure of local government in the Auckland Region and particularly suggestions for a regional "one Auckland" structure which may reduce territorial authority roles and responsibilities;
 - did not believe an increase in the number of councillors would be acceptable to the Commission.

17. The main arguments presented in relation to the proposal to transfer part of Remuera (referred to as "Abbotts Park" for the purpose of identifying the area concerned) from the Hobson Ward to the Eastern Bays Ward were as follows:
 - live in Remuera and don't know the area "Abbotts Park" or identify with it;
 - community of interest is with Remuera (shopping centre, library, schools, community services) not with Eastern Bays;
 - don't identify with or have any community of interest with Eastern Bays Ward;
 - wish to retain postal address of Remuera;
 - bought property because it is Remuera, a transfer will result in devaluation of property and affect school zoning;
 - wont be able to vote on local issues;
 - can not be appropriately represented by someone so far removed in Eastern Bays;
 - "Abbotts Park" area would be better transferred to the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward;
 - not previously informed/lack of transparency in process;
 - a different approach is required, should not be a "number crunching" exercise;
 - support the alternative of an additional councillor for Hobson Ward and this requires no boundary changes;
 - prefer the initial proposal (i.e. option 2);

- to adjust Hobson Ward, increase the areas transferred to Tamaki and Eden Wards;
 - the population of Eastern Bays Ward will increase with development of Mt Wellington Quarry.
18. Other arguments presented in opposition to the Council's final proposal were:
- opposed to transfer of the St John's area from Eastern Bays Ward to Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward as it has no community of interest with this ward, is separated by a clear physical barrier of the railway line and open space, and the proposed boundary will create traffic management problems;
 - the Grafton area is clearly distinct from the Eden Terrace area, being separated by the motorway, and should remain in the Hobson Ward with which it has social, historical and economic links; and
 - a number of the proposed ward boundaries go down the middle of a street which is not desirable and should be avoided if at all possible.
19. Some appellants/objectors raised procedural issues relating to the Council's approach to the review including in particular the Council's consultation and decision-making processes. These are not matters over which the Commission has jurisdiction. In any event the Commission makes its own determination based on the information presented to it and as a result of its own investigations.

Matters for Determination

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

19R. Commission to determine appeals and objections

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

- (3) *The Commission must, before 11 April in the year of a triennial general election, complete the duties it is required to carry out under subsection (1).*

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

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

19J. Review of community boards

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

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

Consideration by the Commission

Effective and fair representation

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

Auckland City

24. Auckland City has elected its representatives using a ward system since 1986. The Council's last full review of representation arrangements was undertaken in 1997, although a review was also undertaken in 2001. As a

result of a Commission determination in 1997, the number of wards was reduced from 10 to seven and the number of communities from 11 to 10. The number of councillors was also reduced from 24 to 19 and the number of community board representatives reduced from 66 to 52.

25. We note that the Council at its meeting in March 2006 resolved to confirm that current representation arrangements, introduced in 1998, still largely reflect the principles of communities of interest, effective representation and fair representation. We received no appeals/objections or heard no arguments seeking a change to the basis of election or that, in broad terms, the current seven-ward structure was not appropriate. On this basis, we uphold the Council's proposal that councillors be elected from a seven-ward structure reflecting communities of interest as follows:
- Avondale-Roskill
 - Eastern Bays
 - Eden-Albert
 - Hauraki Gulf Islands
 - Hobson
 - Tamaki-Maungakiekie
 - Western Bays.
26. We note firstly that the Hauraki Gulf Islands does not comply with the fair representation requirement (+/-10% rule) set out in section 19V(2). Section 19V(3)(a) provides that where the Council or the Commission considers that the effective representation of communities of interest within island communities so requires, wards may be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply with subsection (2).
27. We asked the Council to substantiate the argument that the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward should not have to comply with section 19V(2). Since the hearing the Council has provided us with more information in this regard and, as a result, we are satisfied that an exception to the +/-10% rule should be made in respect of this ward based on its separation and distinct character from the rest of Auckland City. In summary, the argument for this exception is that:
- the ward covers a vast area encompassing over 65 islands with the largest two being Great Barrier and Waiheke, the former being larger than the Auckland isthmus;
 - the islands are separated by large distances from the mainland (Waiheke is a 35 minute ferry ride from downtown Auckland and Great Barrier is a 35 minute flight to Mangere or a 4.5 hour boat ride to down town Auckland);
 - the ward's distinct character is recognised by its inclusion in the area defined by the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000, the purpose of which includes to:
 - integrate the management of the natural, historic and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands and catchments; and

- recognise the historic, traditional, cultural and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua with the Hauraki Gulf and islands;
 - both Great Barrier and Waiheke had their own county councils prior to 1989;
 - the islands comprise the only rural zoned land in Auckland City; and
 - the small population of the islands compared to other Auckland City Wards (Waiheke: 7,689; Great Barrier: 852; Little Barrier: 3; Rangitoto, Rakino and Motutapu: 75; Kaikoura and Rangiahua: 9) would mean incorporation of the Gulf Islands Ward in another ward is most unlikely to provide effective representation).
28. Given the decision to make an exception to the +/-10% rule in respect of the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward, we were then required to address requirements for effective representation of communities of interest and fair representation of electors for the balance of the city. We note firstly the discretion that section 19V(3)(b) of the Act provides the Commission in respect of the balance of the city. The section provides that wards may be defined and membership distributed between them in a way that does not comply with subsection 19V(2).
29. In the absence of other guidance, the Commission believes the principle of fair representation of electors, as defined in the Act by the +/-10% rule, remains an important criterion. It also notes that the requirements for effective representation of communities of interest and other factors, as set out in section 19U of the Act, still apply. These provide, among other things, that the Commission must ensure that the number and boundaries of wards will provide effective representation of communities of interest.
30. We then considered the other proposed wards of Auckland City and in particular the Hobson Ward which does not comply with the +/-10% rule. A number of appellants/objectors pointed out that the addition of one councillor for the Hobson Ward would enable this ward to comply with the +/-10% rule. We considered this option and canvassed the views of most of the appellants/objectors at the hearing. There did appear to be a reasonable level of support for such an option if it meant leaving ward boundaries unchanged. We also sought the views of the Council representatives on the question. They told us that the Council did not propose this change as it considered it unwise given present discussions on the future structure of local government in the region and its possible impact on the roles and responsibilities of the existing territorial authorities. They also said the Council considered the Commission was unlikely to support this option, given the recent history of Commission decisions.
31. We note that any history of Commission decisions on the total number of councillors is not a factor for consideration under the legislation. This Commission will determine the matter, under the legislative criteria, as it deems appropriate.
32. We did not hear a strong argument to increase councillor numbers other than to meet the +/-10% rule. On this basis we believe it is appropriate to consider other options for meeting the fair representation requirement.

33. The Council's electoral working party identified six options to address the non-compliance of the Hobson Ward. Initially the Council proposed option 2 which attracted 94 submissions, with 54 supporting the proposal and 36 opposed. Following consideration of submissions, the Council resolved to adopt a slightly modified option 6 which attracted 310 objections (299 of which opposed the proposed transfer of the "Abbotts Park" area out of the Hobson Ward).
34. We do not agree with the vast majority of the 299 appellants/objectors who believed that the transfer of their area for electoral purposes would have the dramatic impact on their lives that they predicted. We understand that the Council identified an area to be transferred between wards (in order to achieve compliance with the +/-10% rule) and labelled it "Abbotts Park" based on its statistical area unit appellation to assist its identification. It would not mean a change of residential address, postal code, or school zones, or require a change in daily habits such as shopping or use of other community facilities.
35. However, we did hear strong expressions of the sense of identity with and belonging to the Remuera community of interest. As we are required to ensure effective representation of communities of interest, we believe it is appropriate to acknowledge the apparent strength of this community of interest and keep it intact as far as practicable.
36. We were also persuaded by the arguments of appellants/objectors in respect of two other areas the Council was proposing to transfer between wards: namely the St John's area and the Grafton area. It was demonstrated to us that the Council's proposal in respect of these two areas failed to recognise distinct communities of interest. In the case of St John's, the area was physically separated from, and had little community of interest with, Glen Innes in the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward. In the case of Grafton, the area is clearly distinct from the Eden Terrace area, being separated by the motorway, and should remain in the Hobson Ward with which it has social, historical and economic links.
37. Given our decisions to support appeals/objections in respect of the Remuera, St John's and Grafton areas, which form the basis of the Council's final proposal (i.e. its option 6A), we then considered the other options identified by the Council's electoral working party. We concluded that option 2 (Council's initial proposal, appeared to provide the best outcome in terms of recognition of existing communities of interest and least disruption to existing arrangements. Option 2 has the advantage over other identified options in that it does not split the CBD between wards which a number of submitters and appellants/objectors raised concerns over.
38. In summary, adoption of option 2 means:
 - the "Abbotts Park" area and Grafton would both remain in the Hobson Ward, aligned with their identifiable communities of interest;
 - the St John's area would remain in the Eastern Bays Ward, aligned with its identifiable community of interest;
 - Eden Terrace would transfer from the Hobson Ward to the Eden-Albert Ward (affecting 3,090 people);

- the One Tree Hill area would, as some described it, “return to its natural home” in Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward (affecting 4,210 people); and
- the Epsom South area would transfer from the Hobson Ward to the Eden-Albert Ward (affecting 4,100).

39. We did hear a representative of the Eden-Albert Community Board say the community of interest of Epsom South lay in the Hobson Ward in relation to such things as schools, shopping centres and public transport. We also heard from another appellant who questioned the accuracy of the level of reported opposition to the transfer of Epsom South (28 submitters on the Council’s initial proposal) and whether this was actually a true community reflection.
40. On balance, we believe option 2 still represents the best outcome in relation to effective representation of communities of interest for Auckland City as a whole. The option also complies with the requirement for fair representation of Auckland City electors with the exception of the Hauraki Gulf Islands. The relationship between these decisions on ward boundaries, the number of councillors per ward, and the requirements of section 19V(2) is illustrated in the following table:

Wards	Population*	No. of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from city average population per councillor	% deviation from city average population per councillor
Avondale-Roskill	92,900	4	23,225	+835.53	+3.73
Eastern Bays	46,600	2	23,300	+910.53	+4.07
Eden-Albert	67,800	3	22,600	+210.53	+0.94
Hauraki Gulf Islands	9,470	1	9,470	-12,919.47	-57.70
Hobson	73,100	3	24,366.66	+1,977.19	+8.83
Tamaki-Maungakiekie	95,200	4	23,800	+1,410.53	+6.30
Western Bays	40,400	2	20,200	-2,189.47	-9.78
TOTALS	425,400	19	22,389.47		

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

Communities and community boards

41. Section 19W of the Act sets out criteria for community board reviews. These include requirements for effective representation of communities of interest within the community and fair representation of electors.
42. We note that the Council in both its initial and final proposal proposed the retention of the existing ten community boards subject to any boundary changes to wards. We heard no appeals/objections against this proposal. Accordingly we determine that the existing ten community boards will be retained covering the ward or part of the ward that each currently covers, with their existing membership of elected and appointed members.

Commission’s Determination

43. Under section 19R of the Local Electoral Act 2001, the Commission determines that for the general election of the Auckland City Council to be

held on 13 October 2007, the following representation arrangements shall apply –

- (1) Auckland City as delineated on SO Plan 63496 deposited with Land Information New Zealand, shall be divided into seven wards;
- (2) Those seven wards shall be -
 - (a) the Avondale-Roskill Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 69292 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (b) the Eastern Bays Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 63509 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (c) the Eden-Albert Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 69291 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (d) the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 63508 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (e) the Hobson Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 63510 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (f) the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 69290 deposited with Land Information New Zealand; and
 - (g) the Western Bays Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 63512 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
- (3) The Council shall comprise the mayor and 19 councillors elected as follows -
 - (a) four councillors elected by the electors of the Avondale-Roskill Ward;
 - (b) two councillors elected by the electors of the Eastern Bays Ward;
 - (c) three councillors elected by the electors of the Eden-Albert Ward;
 - (d) one councillor elected by the electors of the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward;
 - (e) three councillors elected by the electors of the Hobson Ward;
 - (f) four councillors elected by the electors of the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward; and
 - (g) two councillors elected by the electors of Western Bays Ward;
- (4) There shall be 10 communities as follows:
 - (a) the Avondale Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 375800 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (b) the Mount Roskill Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 375801 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (c) the Eastern Bays Community, comprising the area of the Eastern Bays Ward;

- (d) the Eden-Albert Community, comprising the area of the Eden-Albert Ward;
 - (e) the Great Barrier Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 63560 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (f) the Waiheke Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 63561 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (g) the Hobson Community, comprising the area of the Hobson Ward;
 - (h) the Maungakiekie Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 351826 deposited with Land Information New Zealand;
 - (i) the Tamaki Community, comprising the area delineated on SO Plan 351827 deposited with Land Information New Zealand; and
 - (j) the Western Bays Community, comprising the area of the Western Bays Ward;
- (5) The membership of the community board for each community shall be comprised as follows:
- (a) the Avondale Community Board: five elected members and two members of the Council representing the Avondale-Roskill Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (b) the Mount Roskill Community Board: five elected members and two members of the Council representing the Avondale-Roskill Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (c) the Eastern Bays Community Board: five elected members and two members of the Council representing the Eastern Bays Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (d) the Eden-Albert Community Board: six elected members and three members of the Council representing the Eden-Albert Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (e) the Great Barrier Community: five elected members and one member of the Council representing the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (f) the Waiheke Community: five elected members and one member of the Council representing the Hauraki Gulf Islands Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (g) the Hobson Community: six elected members and three members of the Council representing the Hobson Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;
 - (h) the Maungakiekie Community: five elected members and two members of the Council representing the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council;

- (i) the Tamaki Community: five elected members and two members of the Council representing the Tamaki-Maungakiekie Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council; and
- (j) the Western Bays Community: five elected members and two members of the Council representing the Western Bays Ward and appointed to the community board by the Council.

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

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

Sue Piper	(Chair)
Gwen Bull	(Commissioner)
Wynne Raymond	(Commissioner)

10 April 2007