



## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION**

**Decision on elector-initiated proposal to transfer part of  
Tararua District (Woodville area) to Palmerston North  
City**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	3
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	3
<b>SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSAL</b>	5
<b>THE HEARING</b>	6
<b>PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS</b>	7
<b>STATUTORY CRITERIA</b>	8
<b>CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSAL UNDER THE STATUTORY CRITERIA</b>	12
<b>COMMISSION'S DETERMINATION</b>	22

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1 This decision relates to a reorganisation proposal (“the proposal”), initiated by 121 electors of the Tararua District, for the transfer of the Woodville Township and an area to the north and west of the township from Tararua District to Palmerston North City. It also relates to modifications to the proposal suggested by Jay Reid, one of the initiators of the proposal.
  
- 2 Following initiation of the proposal, the Tararua District Council (“the TDC”) and the Palmerston North City Council (“the PNCC”) agreed to refer the proposal directly to the Local Government Commission (“the Commission”) under clause 10(2) of Schedule 3 of the Local Government Act 2002 (“the Act”). This provision requires the Commission to use the process set out under subpart 4 (excluding clauses 40 and 49 to 58) of Schedule 3 of the Act to consider the proposal.

## **BACKGROUND**

- 3 In March 2005 the Tararua District and Palmerston North City councils received a reorganisation proposal initiated under clause 9 of Schedule 3 of the Act from Jay Reid, of 2 Vogel Street, Woodville. The proposal requested that an area covering the Woodville Township, together with an area of land to the north and west of the Township, be transferred from Tararua District to Palmerston North City. The area proposed to transfer comprises meshblocks 1543500, 1543600, 1543800, 1543900, 1540500, 1540600, 1540700, 1540800, 1540900, 1541000, 1541100, 1541200, 1541300, 1541400, 1541500, 1541600, 1541700, 1541800, 1541900, 1542000, 1542100, 1542200, 1542300 and 1542400.
  
- 4 The proposal met the requirements of clause 1(1)(c) of Schedule 3 of the Act in that it contained the signatures of at least 10% of the electors of the area

that is subject to the proposed reorganisation. The proposal also satisfied the requirements of clause 2 of Schedule 3.

- 5 The TDC and the PNCC consulted and agreed that the proposal should be referred directly to the Commission, to be dealt with under subclause 10(2) of Schedule 3. This requires the Commission to consider the proposal under subpart 4 of Schedule 3 (excluding clauses 40 and 49 to 58).
- 6 On 11 May 2005 the Commission agreed that Jay Reid, one of the proposers, should be the representative of electors, in accordance with clause 36(1) of subpart 4 of Schedule 3.
- 7 On 20 May 2005 the Commission initiated a consultation process in accordance with clause 37 of subpart 4 of Schedule 3. It wrote to parties and organisations that it considered would be affected by the proposal, seeking their views. It also sought the views of those organisations listed under clause 37(1)(c) of Subpart 4 of Schedule 3. It provided all submitters with the opportunity to present their submissions at a hearing in Woodville. While the Act does not require the Commission to meet and hear submitters, it considers this practice to be a useful means of consultation. Clause 37(4) enables the Commission to undertake any inquiries and consultations in relation to the proposal with whomever it considers appropriate.
- 8 Five hundred and eighty-eight submissions on the proposal were received by the closing date of 29 July 2005. Fifteen submitters expressed their desire to meet, and be heard by, the Commission.
- 9 A copy of the submissions was provided to Mr Reid on 3 August 2005, in accordance with clause 38(1) of Schedule 3. The Act provides an opportunity for the representative of electors to withdraw the proposal within

20 working days of this date. On 24 August 2005, Mr Reid informed the Commission of his intention to proceed with the proposal.

- 10 The Commission arranged to hold separate meetings with the TDC, the PNCC, and the Manawatu District Council (“the MDC”) on 20 September 2005, and with the proposers on 21 September 2005.
- 11 It also arranged to hold a hearing of submitters on 21 September 2005 at the Woodville Community Centre.

### **SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSAL**

- 12 A number of submissions contained arguments for retaining the status quo and not proceeding with the proposal. Mr Reid’s submission called for the Commission to issue a modified draft reorganisation scheme based on the following modifications to the proposal:

- (i) *“the affected area (should) be expanded to include meshblocks 2219900, 1542500, 1542600, 1542700, 1542800, 1544000, 1542900, 1543700, and 1758900.”*
- (ii) *“The representation arrangements (of an expanded Palmerston North City should) include a Woodville Ward and councillor for a transitional period of three years as an isolated community and thereafter a Woodville-Ashurst Ward to comply with the population criteria for Palmerston North City.”*
- (iii) *“The re-establishment of the Woodville Community.”*

## THE HEARING

- 13 The hearing commenced with Steven Paewai presenting a submission on behalf of Rangitane o Tamaki Nui a Rua Incorporated. The TDC's submissions were made by Mayor Maureen Reynolds and Chief Executive Roger Twentyman. John Annabell then presented a submission on behalf of the PNCC. He was followed by W H Davidson. Mr Reid was then offered the opportunity to comment on the modifications proposed in his written submission. Submitters then proceeded in the following order: Ivan Johanson, Sheryl Marshall, Gerard Murray, John Harman (representing the Eketahuna Community Board), Derek Batchelor, Adrian Gover, Doug Watson, Colin Thew and Richard Taylor (representing the Dannevirke Community Board), Ross Evans (representing the Woodville Business Group), Rob Dodd (representing Phyllis and Louis O'Neil), Anne Cummings, and Paul Cleghorn (representing Woodville Districts' Vision Incorporated). The hearing concluded with a submission from Mr Reid representing the proposers.

Note: The Commission had granted Mr Reid, at his request, the opportunity to speak last at the hearing of submitters. In initiating proceedings, it drew attention to a map of the expanded area presented in Mr Reid's written submission and invited submitters to comment on this proposed modification. Following Mr Davidson's submission, the Commission considered it useful to interrupt the proposed schedule to allow Mr Reid to comment on his proposed modifications. This would allow other submitters appearing at the hearing to be sufficiently informed to offer their views on these proposed modifications.

## PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON SUBMISSIONS

- 14 As noted above, clause 39 of Schedule 3 of the Act enables the Commission, following its consultations and inquiries under clause 37 of Schedule 3, to either:
- (a) *prepare a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal, or on some modification or variation of the proposal resulting from the consideration of submissions, consultations, or inquiries; or*
  - (b) *decide not to proceed with the proposal and give public notice accordingly.*
- 15 The Act does not provide any guidance as to the scope of modifications or variations that could be included in any draft reorganisation scheme issued. Clearly, however, it does require the Commission to consider all submissions and information resulting from its inquiries before making a decision on the proposal. The Commission considers that submissions suggesting modifications to a proposal would need to be compelling in order for it to issue a draft reorganisation scheme based on such modifications.
- 16 As noted in paragraph 12 above, Mr Reid suggests that the Commission include provisions determining the representation arrangements relating to the affected area in any reorganisation scheme it issues. In the case of a boundary alteration proposal, the Act does not allow for such provisions. If the Commission decided to issue a draft reorganisation scheme, the Act would only enable it to attach the affected area to an existing Palmerston North City ward. The PNCC would then be required to determine representation arrangements for the affected area at its next representation review.
- 17 The proposal was initiated under clause 1(1)(c) of Schedule 3, which states:  
*“A reorganisation proposal that involves the alteration of a boundary or the transfer of a responsibility may be made by a petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of the area subject to the proposed reorganisation.”*

- 18 In his submission, Mr Davidson argued that a proposal initiated under this subclause would require a petition signed by at least 10% of the electors of the whole of Palmerston North City, and the whole of the Tararua District.
- 19 The Commission disagrees with this interpretation. It notes that clause 1 of Schedule 3 sets different requirements for the initiation of reorganisation proposals involving either:
- (1) the alteration of a boundary or the transfer of a responsibility;
  - (2) the constitution of a new district;
  - (3) the abolition of a district; or
  - (4) a territorial authority becoming a unitary authority.
- 20 For the last three types of reorganisation proposals, the Act specifically refers to electors of districts or regions. This is not the case with a reorganisation proposal involving the alteration of a boundary or the transfer of a responsibility. Therefore, in the context of the legislation, the Commission interprets the expression '*...electors of the area subject to the proposed reorganisation*', contained in subclause 1(1)(c) of Schedule 3 of the Act, to mean '*...electors of the area proposed to be transferred*'.

## **STATUTORY CRITERIA**

- 21 The statutory provisions relating to the Commission's hearing, consideration, and determination of this boundary alteration proposal are contained in subpart 4 (excluding clauses 40 and 49 to 58) of Schedule 3, and clauses 3 and 4 of Schedule 3 of the Act.
- 22 Subpart 4 (excluding clauses 40 and 49 to 58) of Schedule 3 of the Act sets out the procedures the Commission is required to follow when considering a reorganisation proposal referred to it by local authorities under clause 10(2) of Schedule 3.

23 Clause 37 of Schedule 3 of the Act sets out the process the Commission must undertake when consulting on the proposal. This clause states:

*37. Consultation on proposal by Commission—*

- (1) As soon as practicable after receiving a reorganisation proposal, the Commission must—*
  - (a) take the action that it considers necessary to ensure that the persons or organisations who may be interested in a reorganisation proposal are informed of the proposal; and*
  - (b) give public notice of the proposal, which must—*
    - (i) advise the location where the proposal may be inspected or how a copy of the proposal may be obtained; and*
    - (ii) invite submissions on the proposal; and*
  - (c) seek the views of—*
    - (i) the affected local authorities; and*
    - (ii) the proposer; and*
    - (iii) the Auditor-General; and*
    - (iv) the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment; and*
    - (v) the Secretary for Local Government; and*
    - (vi) the Secretary for the Environment; and*
    - (vii) the Chief Executive of Te Puni Kokiri; and*
    - (viii) any affected Maori organisations identified by Te Puni Kokiri; and*
    - (ix) any other persons or organisations that the Commission considers appropriate.*
- (2) Any body or person that wishes to make a submission on a proposal must make the submission to the Commission within 60*

*days after the first public notification of the proposal or within any further time that the Commission may allow.*

*(3) The Commission must grant the opportunity to meet with, and be heard by, the Commission on the proposal to—*

*(a) the affected local authorities; and*

*(b) each local authority whose district or region adjoins or is coterminous with an affected local authority; and*

*(c) the proposer.*

*(4) The Commission may also undertake, in a manner that it thinks fit, inquiries and consultations in relation to the proposal with whomever it considers appropriate.*

24 Clause 39 of subpart 4 of Schedule 3 requires the Commission, following compliance with the consultation requirements set out in clause 37(1) and 37(4) of Schedule 3, to either:

*(a) prepare a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal or on some modification or variation of the proposal resulting from the consideration of submissions, consultations, or inquiries; or*

*(b) decide not to proceed with the proposal and give public notice accordingly.*

25 Clauses 3 to 7 of Schedule 3 detail the criteria to be applied by the Commission when considering a reorganisation proposal. The clauses relevant to this proposal are clauses 3 and 4. Clause 3 provides as follows:

### **3 Promotion of good local government**

*(1) When considering a reorganisation proposal or scheme, the Commission must satisfy itself that the proposal or scheme will -*

- (a) promote good local government of the districts or regions concerned; and*
- (b) ensure that each local authority provided for under the proposal will -*
  - (i) have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its responsibilities, duties, and powers; and*
  - (ii) have a district or region that is appropriate for the efficient and effective performance of its role as specified in section 11; and*
  - (iii) contain within its district or region a sufficiently distinct community of interest or sufficiently distinct communities of interests; and*
  - (iv) be able to meet the requirements of section 76.*
- (2) When considering the matters specified in subclause (1) in relation to any reorganisation proposal or scheme, the Commission must have regard to -*
  - (a) the area of impact of the responsibilities, duties, and powers of the local authorities concerned; and*
  - (b) the area of benefit of services provided; and*
  - (c) the likely effects on a local authority of the exclusion of any area from its district or region; and*
  - (d) any other matters that it considers appropriate.*

26 Clause 4 of Schedule 3 details matters relating to boundary determinations under a reorganisation scheme. It states:

#### **4 Appropriate boundaries**

*In determining boundaries under any reorganisation proposal or scheme, the Commission must ensure that,-*

- (a) if practicable, the boundaries of regions conform with catchment boundaries; and*
- (b) if practicable, the boundaries of districts conform with the boundaries of regions; and*
- (c) the boundaries of regions and the boundaries of districts conform with the boundaries of statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for parliamentary electoral purposes.*

### **CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSAL UNDER THE STATUTORY CRITERIA**

#### **Subclause 1(a) - *Will the proposal promote good local government of the districts or regions concerned?***

27 The Commission is required to assess proposals against the criteria specified in clauses 3 and 4 of Schedule 3 of the Act. Clause 3(1)(a) requires the Commission to satisfy itself that a proposal will promote the good local government of the districts concerned. For this proposal the affected districts are the Tararua District and Palmerston North City.

28 As noted in paragraph 12, Mr Reid suggested an expansion of the affected area. This includes meshblock 1758900, which is located in the area of the Manawatu District bordering both the Tararua District and Palmerston North

City. Manawatu District would also be an affected district if the Commission accepted this element of Mr Reid's submission.

29 With regard to the word "promote", the Commission is satisfied that in the context of the legislation the clear intention is that the word should have the meanings "to advance, help forward, enhance, or improve".

30 The expression "good local government" is not defined in the Act. However, the Commission has adopted the view that the achievement of the purposes of local government, and principles relating to local authorities, contained in sections 10 and 14 of the Act, would be the basis of good local government. It is therefore required to determine whether the proposal will enhance the ability of the local authorities for the Tararua District and Palmerston North City to achieve these purposes and principles.

31 In his submission, Mr Reid states:

"The focus of the Commission's consideration should be on governance and accountability as essential elements of future good local government". He notes the following principle, contained in section 14(1)(a)(i) of the Act, which states:

*"a local authority should conduct its business in an open, transparent, and democratically accountable manner"*.

32 During the course of its consultations and inquiries, the Commission heard no evidence to suggest that the proposal would enhance the ability of the TDC or the PNCC to conduct their business in an open, transparent, and democratically accountable manner.

33 The Commission is concerned that some of the arguments presented by Mr Reid in support of the proposal refer to the performance and actions of local

authority staff and elected members. These are not matters relevant to the criteria for considering reorganisation schemes contained in clauses 3 and 4 of Schedule 3. If Mr Reid wished to pursue these matters they would be more appropriately referred to the Ombudsman or the Office of the Controller and Auditor-General. In general terms, the criteria for considering local government reorganisation relate to the *structure* of the affected local authority's boundaries, and the effect of these boundaries on the ability of each affected local authority to provide good local government.

- 34 Considering the purpose of local government contained in section 10 of the Act, and the principles relating to local authorities contained in section 14 of the Act, the Commission found it first necessary to determine whether the proposal would result in territorial authority districts with recognisably distinct communities of interest. This is important because, in the Commission's view, the division of a recognised community of interest between local government boundaries would have a detrimental effect on the ability of the TDC and the PNCC to achieve the purposes of local government, which are to:

- (a) enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities, and*
- (b) promote the social, environmental, economic, and cultural well-being of present and future communities.*

- 35 Woodville is situated on State Highway 2, which extends along the eastern side of the Ruahine and Tararua Ranges. This highway connects the five country townships located in the Tararua District: Norsewood, Dannevirke, Woodville, Pahiatua, and Eketahuna. Each of these townships provides a long-standing, central community focus for a surrounding rural hinterland. The affected area shares a common geography and land use with the other township communities in the Tararua District.

- 36 The Commission is satisfied that residents of the affected area have well-developed linkages with Pahiatua and Dannevirke. They rely on services and facilities located in the Tararua District, including banking, schooling, sporting clubs, essential supplies, professional services, farming supplies, and emergency and medical services.
- 37 Woodville is also situated on the eastern extremity of State Highway 3, which leads through the Manawatu Gorge towards Palmerston North City. The Saddle Road and the Pahiatua Track also provide access between the affected area and Palmerston North City. Statistics New Zealand information reveals that, at the time of the 2001 census, 303 residents of the *urban* area of Woodville Township worked in the Tararua District, while 147 worked in Palmerston North City. Fifteen Woodville residents worked in the Manawatu District. A comparison with the workplaces of residents in the Fielding and Pahiatua urban areas can be seen in the following table. The situation for Woodville is very similar to that for Fielding.

**2001 Census Usually Resident Count by Workplace Address**

Usual Residence Area	Workplace Address		
	Manawatu District	Palmerston North City	Tararua District
UA 106 Feilding	63%	36%	<1%
UA 246 Woodville	3%	32%	65%
UA 263 Pahiatua	<1%	11%	88%

- 38 Many residents of the Tararua, Manawatu, and Horowhenua districts make use of the services and opportunities available in Palmerston North. This reflects the regional significance of the city. Residents of one local government area utilising facilities located in other local government areas commonly occurs throughout New Zealand – it is not necessarily a reason for changing local government boundaries.

- 39 Stephen Paewai, representing Rangitane o Tamaki nui a Rua Incorporated, submitted that while all Rangitane hapū shared common interests, there were clearly stronger community ties between Rangitane hapū to the north and east of Te Apiti (the Manawatu Gorge) than those shared with Rangitane hapū to the west of Te Apiti. In the Commission's view, the proposal would create an artificial separation, in terms of local government boundaries, between Ngāti Te Koro and Ngāti Te Rangiwhakaewa hapū o Rangitane and other northern and eastern Rangitane hapū.
- 40 The Manawatu Gorge provides a significant barrier between communities to the west (Palmerston North City) and east (Tararua District) of it, both physically and as a matter of perception. The Manawatu Gorge Road, and to a lesser extent, the Saddle Road and the Pahiatua Track, are prone to closure due to slips, adverse weather, and accidents. The Commission believes that if Woodville were to be included in Palmerston North City, the result would be a community at high risk of isolation from the remainder of its local authority area.
- 41 Few arguments suggested that the affected area has common social, economic, environmental, or cultural interests at the district level with Palmerston North City that outweigh the linkages of the affected area with the rest of the Tararua District. In contrast, it is clear there are strong community ties between the affected area and communities within the Tararua District.
- 42 The affected area, as originally proposed, sharply separates the urban area of Woodville Township from most of its rural hinterland. In his submission, Mr Reid seeks to address this separation by expanding the affected area to include those meshblocks identified in paragraph 12 above.

- 43 At the hearing of submissions the proposers, and others in opposition to the proposal, submitted that the community of interest centred around Woodville Township, including its surrounding rural hinterland, would also include additional areas toward the settlements of Kumeroa and Maharahara. The Commission is satisfied that both the proposal, and the modifications to the proposal suggested by Mr Reid, would create an artificial local government boundary through the recognisably distinct community of interest centred around, and including, Woodville township and its surrounding rural hinterland.
- 44 Based on these considerations, the Commission is of the view that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the ability of the affected local authorities to achieve the purposes of local government.
- 45 Having determined that the proposal fails the test of good local government required under section 3(1)(a) of Schedule 3, the Commission believes that it need not consider the proposal and submissions relating to it any further. However, it has decided to make some observations with respect to the criteria of subsections (1)(b) and (2) of Schedule 3. These observations reinforce its view that the proposal, if given effect to, would not enhance the good local government of the Tararua District and Palmerston North City.

***Subclause 1(b)(i) - Will each local authority provided for under the proposal have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its responsibilities, duties, and powers?***

- 46 At the time of the 2001 census the Tararua District had a population of approximately 17,859 residents. The initial proposal represents 1,479 residents, while the expanded area as submitted by Mr Reid contains 2,070 residents. These proposals comprise approximately 8.3% and 11.6% of the total population of the Tararua District respectively.

- 47 Information from the TDC suggests that the TDC would lose 9% of its existing rating revenue if the proposal as originally submitted were to proceed. If the expanded area as submitted by Mr Reid were to be transferred to Palmerston North City, this would result in an approximate loss of 16.2% of the total rates revenue of the TDC.
- 48 The Commission accepts the view expressed by the TDC's Chief Executive that the TDC would continue to have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its responsibilities, duties, and powers regardless of whether the proposal were to proceed or not. However, if the proposal were to proceed, the principal reduction in the TDC's operating costs would be in its local road servicing costs. Operating costs relating to activities which have a district-wide benefit or relevance, would remain unchanged. The Commission is concerned that the removal of either 9% or 16.2% of the total rates revenue of the TDC would result in the remaining residents of the Tararua District facing a rates increase in order for the TDC to maintain current levels of service.
- 49 Implementation of a reorganisation scheme based on the proposal or on the suggested modifications would increase the area of Palmerston North City by approximately 7,083 or 21,852 hectares. No evidence was presented to suggest that the PNCC would not have the resources necessary to enable it to carry out its responsibilities, duties, and powers in respect of the affected area if a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal or on the suggested modifications were to proceed.

**Subclause 1(b)(ii) - Will each local authority provided for under the proposal have a district that is appropriate for the efficient and effective performance of its role as specified in section 11?**

- 50 The Manawatu Gorge has historically been recognised – by pre-colonial Rangitane hapū, and Scandanavian and Celtic immigrants who settled within the area known as ‘the 70-Mile Bush’ in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century – as a significant geographical obstacle between communities to its east and west. The local government boundaries affected by the proposal, and by the proposed modifications, are long-standing.
- 51 At present, there is almost no common boundary between the Tararua District and Palmerston North City. Under the proposal it would not be possible to travel from the affected area to other parts of Palmerston North City without travelling through either Tararua District (via the Manawatu Gorge) or Manawatu District (via the Saddle Road). While the inclusion of meshblock 1758900, which is located in Manawatu District, would create a wider common boundary between the affected area and Palmerston North City, it would have no bearing on the difficult terrain separating the affected area from Palmerston North City.
- 52 To date, the PNCC’s strategic plans for city growth have not included areas to the east of the Manawatu Gorge. Rather, its wider interests are reflected in joint initiatives with the MDC. The proposal would require the PNCC to significantly expand and diversify its planning processes and servicing operations in order to provide good local government to the affected area.
- 53 In the Commission’s opinion, the proposal would result in ineffective local government boundaries, creating inefficiencies for the PNCC and the TDC. This view also applies to the modifications proposed by Mr Reid.

**Subclause 1(b)(iii) - Will each local authority provided for under the proposal contain within its district a sufficiently distinct community of interest or sufficiently distinct communities of interests?**

54 The Commission considers that the proposal and the submitted modifications fail to adequately recognise the community of interest of Woodville and its surrounding rural hinterland. It is satisfied that a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal, or on submitted modifications to the proposal, would split the affected area from its wider community of interest, which is located in the Tararua District. Implementation of the proposal would also result in the community of Woodville and its peripheral rural hinterland being isolated from the remainder of the Palmerston North City.

**Will each local authority provided for under the proposal be able to meet the requirements of section 76?**

55 Section 76 relates to decision-making and consultation by local authorities. The Commission sees the proposal as having little impact on the ability of the TDC or the PNCC to maintain processes that would comply with the requirements of this section.

**Subclause (2)(a) and (b) - What will be the impact of the proposal on the area of impact of the responsibilities, duties, and powers of the local authorities concerned and the area of benefit of services provided?**

56 There was no evidence presented to suggest that the PNCC would not be able to provide appropriate local government services to the affected area. However, the Commission considers that the proposal would require the PNCC to significantly expand and diversify its planning processes and servicing operations in order to provide good local government to the

affected area. This is due to the lack of sufficient common social, economic, environmental, and cultural ties between residents of the affected area and residents of Palmerston North City at the district level, and the significant geographical obstacle presented by the Manawatu Gorge.

**Subclause (2)(c) – What will be the likely effects on a local authority of the exclusion of any area from its district or region?**

- 57 Information provided by the TDC indicates that if the original proposal proceeded the Tararua District would lose approximately 8.3% of its population, 1.8% of its land area, 2.3% of its rateable land value, 1.9% of its non-rateable land value, and 9% of its general rates income.
- 58 If a draft reorganisation scheme based on the modifications proposed by Mr Reid was issued, TDC information indicates that the Tararua District would lose approximately 11.6% of its population, 5.1% of its land area, 9.3% of its rateable land value, 9% of its non-rateable land value, and 16.2% of its general rates income.
- 59 The loss to the TDC of the affected area would mean that district-wide administrative and overhead costs would have to be allocated over fewer ratepayers. In the Commission's opinion, the redistribution of costs of this magnitude would have a detrimental effect on the ability of the TDC to carry out its responsibilities, duties, and powers.

**APPROPRIATE BOUNDARIES**

The Commission also considered the proposal against the requirements of clause 4 of Schedule 3 of the Act regarding appropriate local government boundaries.

60 The proposal is not relevant to the existing regional boundaries. Both the boundaries identified in the initial proposal, and those boundaries identified in Mr Reid's proposed modifications, conform with the boundaries of statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for parliamentary electoral purposes.

### **COMMISSION'S DETERMINATION**

61 Having considered the proposal, and all submissions made to it, including those modifications to the proposal submitted by Mr Reid, the Commission has decided not to proceed with the proposal. It is satisfied that a draft reorganisation scheme based on the proposal, or on the modifications to the proposal suggested by Mr Reid, would not promote the good local government of the Tararua District or of Palmerston North City.

### **THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION**

Grant Kirby (Chairman)

Gwen Bull (Commissioner)

Sue Piper (Commissioner)

28 October 2005