



Determination

of representation arrangements to apply for
the election of the Horowhenua District Council
to be held on 12 October 2019

Background

1. All territorial authorities are required under sections 19H and 19J of the Local Electoral Act 2001 (the Act) to review their representation arrangements at least every six years. These reviews are to determine the number of councillors to be elected, the basis of election for councillors and, if this includes wards, the boundaries and names of those wards. Reviews also include whether there are to be community boards and, if so, membership arrangements for those boards. Representation arrangements are to be determined so as to provide fair and effective representation for individuals and communities.
2. The Horowhenua District Council (the council) last reviewed its representation arrangements prior to the 2013 local authority elections. Therefore, it was required to undertake a review prior to the next elections in October 2019.
3. The arrangements that applied for the 2013 and subsequent 2016 local elections were determined by the Commission following receipt of appeals against the council's final proposal. The Commission provided for a council comprising a mayor and 10 councillors elected as follows:

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from district average population per councillor	% deviation from district average population per councillor
Kere Kere	5560	2	2780	-283	-9.24
Miranui	2980	1	2980	-83	-2.71
Levin	15,950	5	3190	+127	+4.15
Waiopahu	6140	2	3070	+7	+0.23
Total	30,630	10	3063		

*Based on 2011 population estimates

4. In addition, the Foxton Community Board was retained with five elected members and one appointed member.
5. For the current review the council decided, on 18 April 2018, as its initial proposal to retain its existing arrangements for the number of councillors and

wards but to disestablish the Foxton Community Board. The arrangements for councillors and wards were as follows.

Wards	Population*	Number of councillors per ward	Population per councillor	Deviation from district average population per councillor	% deviation from district average population per councillor
Kere Kere	5780	2	2890	-356	-10.96
Miranui	3080	1	3080	-166	-5.11
Levin	16,950	5	3390	+144	+4.44
Waiopehu	6650	2	3325	+79	+2.43
Total	32,460	10	3246		

*Based on 2017 population estimates

6. A submission period ran from 2 May to 6 June 2018. The council received 104 submissions. Key statistics from the submissions are:
 - 74 submissions (71.2 per cent) supported the status quo proposal for the council
 - 18 submissions (17.3 per cent) opposed the status quo proposal for the Council
 - 12 submissions (11.5 per cent) did not express a view either way
 - 15 submissions (14.4 per cent) supported the proposal to disestablish the Foxton Community Board
 - 86 submissions (82.7 per cent) and a petition with 242 names, opposed the proposal to disestablish the Foxton Community Board
 - 3 submissions (2.9 per cent) either did not express a view or were unclear.
7. In those submissions supporting the status quo proposal for the council most thought the number of councillors was about right, it seemed fair with a good balance, and most wanted to retain the ward system.
8. Those submissions opposing the status quo proposal for the council sought the Single Transferable Vote (STV) electoral system, thought there were too many councillors, preferred elections at large, thought the ward system was not working, thought there was an imbalance of voters across the wards, and/or wanted to introduce a Māori ward.
9. Those submissions supporting the disestablishment of the Foxton Community Board considered that the community board is too costly, Foxton is over-represented, the community committee structure works well, it is an anomaly in the district and no longer relevant or opposed having to subsidise Foxton through rates.
10. Submissions opposing the disestablishment of the Foxton Community Board considered that Foxton would lose a community voice, a community board has more authority than a community committee, the board represents the Foxton Beach community interests, it's doing a great job, Foxton would be disadvantaged without it, it has an important role monitoring the council, historical reasons for having the Board remain valid, there was a lack of confidence in the current council, there is a need for better representation not less, and that the board is a successful advocate. Some submitters encouraged more community boards in the district.

11. Some submitters expressed concern about what would happen to the Foxton Beach Freeholding Account¹ if the community board was disestablished. There may have been some confusion in the community that this is controlled and administered by the community board. In actual fact the board has an advocacy or advisory role but the council is directly responsible for the Fund.
12. After considering submissions the Council decided to retain its initial proposal for councillors and wards but also to retain the Foxton Community Board (rather than dis-establishing it).
13. The Council acknowledged that the Kere Kere Ward does not meet the '+/- 10% rule' (-10.96%). The council's reason for non-compliance was that "altering the boundaries of the Kere Kere Ward to make it compliant would limit effective representation of communities of interest by dividing a community of interest between wards". As required by section 19V(4) the council referred that aspect of its review to the Commission for determination.

Appeals against the Council's final proposal

14. Four appeals against the Council's final proposal were received by the deadline of 17 August 2018.
15. In summary, the grounds for the appeals and objections are:
 - Peter Ward who seeks the single member Miranui Ward to be merged with another rural ward to give voters better choice and representation
 - Michael Harland who considers that the council has failed to review all the matters required by sections 19H and 19J of the Local Electoral Act, the Kere Kere Ward (with 5 community board members in addition to ward councillors) has a higher level of representation than other wards, and the questions asked by the council through the submission process did not ask about all matters residents could comment on as part of the review
 - Christina Paton who is concerned about several matters relating to the decision to retain the Foxton Community Board
 - Anne Hunt who seeks a Foxton Beach Community Board, is concerned about the protections given to the Foxton Beach Freeholding Fund, and is concerned that the council did not review the boundaries of the Foxton Community as suggested by the Commission in 2013

Hearing of appeals

16. The Commission met with the council and three of the appellants at a hearing held in Levin on 27 February 2019.
17. The council was represented by mayor Michael Feyen, chief executive David Clapperton. The chair of the Foxton Community Board, David Roache also appeared at the hearing.

¹ The Foxton Beach Freeholding Account contains funds from the sale of endowment land in Foxton Beach. The endowment land was originally granted to the Foxton Harbour Board. When the harbour board was abolished in 1955 the endowment land passed to the Manawatu County Council. The 1989 local government reorganisation resulted in the land being transferred to the Horowhenua District Council. The purposes for which the fund can be used for are set out in the Reserves and Other Lands Disposal Act 1968.

Matters raised at hearing and in appeals

Horowhenua District Council

18. The mayor and chief executive outlined the council's process and the reasons for its decisions (which are generally reflected elsewhere in this determination).
19. In relation to particular points they advised that:
 - The process as a whole engendered a healthy debate, particularly about the Foxton Community Board, and it was good to see the community display such interest in local politics
 - The current ward system was retained because the council considered it best reflects communities of interest
 - Making the Kere Kere Ward compliant with the '+/-10% rule' would split the community of interest of whichever ward had an area transferred from it. Population projections suggested that increased growth would correct the situation in the future
 - The decision to retain the Foxton Community Board reflected the fact that the submission process showed that the board had significant support from the community
 - The council considers that it followed proper practice in relation to the petition supporting the retention of the Foxton Community Board and refutes the suggestion that it acted contrary to the law
 - The Mayor acknowledged the points made about changing community dynamics and believed the council should do another review in three years' time.

Chair, Foxton Community Board

20. David Roache, chair of the board, spoke in support of maintaining the current boundaries of the Kere Kere Ward and agreed with the council that population growth would self-correct the current non-compliance of that ward. In relation to the Foxton Community Board he said that there are wider issues involved than just the management of the Foxton Beach Freeholding Fund. The board performs a valuable role in relation to facilities and council activities in both Foxton and Foxton Beach. Although the two are physically separate there many linkages and shared facilities. In response to a question he advised that there had always been at least one councillor for the Kere Kere Ward from Foxton Beach.

Peter Ward

21. Peter Ward considered that the council's thinking about the ward system was based on past thinking and did not take into account the fact that population growth over coming years would dilute attitudes about the current system and change views about communities of interest and representation. Miranui Ward, with one councillor, is placed in a difficult position. Voters have limited choice amongst candidates and having one councillor can isolate the ward politically.
22. There have been efforts over a number of years to improve dialogue and the relationship between the ward and the council, but no enduring solution had been found.

23. Options to improve the situation were either a two-ward system (an urban ward and a single rural ward) or a merger of the Miranui and Kere Kere wards.

Christina Paton

24. Christina Paton considered the council's decision-making and the process leading to it was illegal. Perceived deficiencies she pointed to include the failure for the petition to be checked against the electoral roll and a failure to apply the Local Government Commission's guidelines on petitions for polls on reorganisation proposals.
25. In relation to the Kere Kere Ward she considered it was a clear cut case of non-compliance with the legislation and should be dealt with on that basis. Any suggestion that the issue would self-correct with population growth is highly speculative.

Anne Hunt

26. Anne Hunt highlighted the concerns raised in her appeal about the management of the Foxton Beach Freeholding Fund. Her particular concerns include:
 - The use of the fund for facilities outside Foxton Beach which she was contended is outside the original legislated purpose of the fund
 - The fact that Foxton Beach often has to pay twice for facilities, through the fund and through targeted rates.
27. A Foxton Beach Community Board, with the ability to make recommendations about the use of the fund, would be able to maintain better oversight of it and help ensure it is used as originally intended.
28. She acknowledged that Foxton and Foxton Beach worked together well and had some common facilities but maintained that they are separate communities.

Matters for determination by the Commission

29. Section 19R of the Act makes it clear that the Commission, in addition to consideration of the appeals and objections against a council's final representation proposal, is required to determine, in the case of a territorial authority, all the matters set out in sections 19H and 19J which relate to the representation arrangements for territorial authorities. This interpretation was reinforced by a 2004 High Court decision which found that the Commission's role is not merely supervisory of a local authority's representation arrangements decision. The Commission is required to form its own view on all the matters which are in scope of the review.
30. Given this requirement, any concerns expressed by appellants/objectors relating to the council's review process are not matters that the Commission needs to address. We may, however, comment on a council's process if we believe it would be of assistance to the council in a future review.
31. Two at least of the appeals question aspects of the process the council went through. It is not the Commission's role to audit the process. Rather it is the Commission's role to consider all the substantive matters raised in the review or required to be determined by the Act.
32. Therefore, the matters in scope of the review are:
 - whether the council is to be elected from wards, the district as a whole, or a mix of the two

- the number of councillors
- if there are to be wards, the area, boundaries and names of wards and the number of councillors to be elected from each ward
- whether there are to be community boards
- if there are to be community boards, the area, boundaries and names of their communities, and the membership arrangements for each board.

Key considerations

33. Based on legislative requirements, the Commission’s *Guidelines for local authorities undertaking representation reviews* identify the following three key factors when considering representation proposals:

- communities of interest
- effective representation of communities of interest
- fair representation for electors.

Communities of interest

34. The Guidelines identify three dimensions for recognising communities of interest:

- *perceptual*: a sense of identity and belonging to a defined area or locality as a result of factors such as distinctive geographical features, local history, demographics, economic and social activities
- *functional*: ability of the area to meet the needs of communities for services such as local schools, shopping areas, community and recreational facilities, employment, transport and communication links
- *political*: ability to represent the interests of local communities which includes non-council structures such as for local iwi and hapū, residents and ratepayer associations and the range of special interest groups.

35. We note that in many cases councils, communities and individuals tend to focus on the perceptual dimension of communities of interest. That is, they focus on what intuitively they ‘feel’ are existing communities of interest. While this is a legitimate view, more evidence may be required to back this up. It needs to be appreciated that the other dimensions, particularly the functional one, are important and that they can also reinforce the ‘sense’ of identity with an area. In other words, all three dimensions are important but should not be seen as independent of each other.

36. In addition to evidence demonstrating existing communities of interest, evidence also needs to be provided of *differences* between neighbouring communities i.e. that they may have “few commonalities”. This could include the demographic characteristics of an area (e.g. age, ethnicity, deprivation profiles) and how these differ between areas, and evidence of how different communities rely on different services and facilities.

37. The council has described its communities of interest as contained within wards as follows:

Kere Kere Ward	The townships of Foxton and Foxton Beach, and surrounding rural areas
Levin Ward	The town of Levin

Miranui Ward	The townships of Shannon and Tokomaru and surrounding rural areas
Waiopēhu Ward	The townships of Waitarere Beach, Hokio Beach, Waikawa Beach and Manukau and surrounding rural areas

38. We are satisfied that, as a starting point, these are reasonable groupings of communities of interest.

Effective representation of communities of interest

39. Section 19T of the Act requires the Commission to ensure that:

- the election of members of the council, in one of the ways specified in section 19H (i.e. at large, wards, or a mix of both) will provide effective representation of communities of interest within the city
- ward boundaries coincide with the boundaries of the current statistical meshblock areas determined by Statistics New Zealand and used for parliamentary electoral purposes
- so far as is practicable, ward boundaries coincide with community boundaries (where they exist).

40. ‘Effective representation’ is not defined in the Act, but the Commission sees this as requiring consideration of factors including the appropriate total number of elected members and the appropriate basis of election of members for the district concerned (at large, wards, or a mix of both).

41. The Commission’s Guidelines note the following factors need to be considered when determining effective representation:

- avoiding arrangements that may create barriers to participation, such as at elections by not recognising residents’ familiarity and identity with an area
- not splitting recognised communities of interest between electoral subdivisions
- not grouping together two or more communities of interest that share few commonalities of interest
- accessibility, size and configuration of an area including access to elected members and vice versa.

42. Section 19A of the Act provides that a territorial authority shall consist of between 5 and 29 members, excluding the mayor. The Horowhenua District Council comprised 12 elected members (excluding the mayor) when it was constituted in 1989 and for the 1992 elections, 11 members for the 1995 elections and 10 members subsequently.

43. From its constitution in 1989, Horowhenua has been divided into wards. Originally it was divided into three wards. A fourth was introduced in 1995 to better reflect communities of interest. As part of the current process, the Council identified several alternative ward structures, including three and two-ward systems. The Council concluded however that “the existing ward structure is well understood by electors and the Council is satisfied that the ward structure will continue to provide effective representation for distinct communities of interest.”

44. Peter Ward has proposed in his appeal that the single member Miranui Ward be merged with another ward to give voters in that ward a better choice of representation. This would require the Miranui Ward to be merged with either the Kere Kere Ward or the Waiopahu Ward. We appreciate Mr Ward's point about choice. However we consider that under either option the resulting wards would contain disparate communities of interest. Merger with the Kere Kere Ward would in one sense create a "Foxton-Shannon" ward containing two urban centres almost at opposite ends of the ward. We do not see this as being a cohesive grouping. Likewise, a merger with Waiopahu Ward would contain an area surrounding Shannon on the one hand, and a number of beach communities to the west of Levin. We do not see this as being a cohesive grouping either.
45. At the hearing Peter Ward suggested a further option – a single rural ward. We consider that this raises some of the same issues about cohesiveness referred to in the previous paragraph. Ideas such as this are best pursued through wider engagement with the community. A future review undertaken by the council may be able to deal with such issues if a wide perspective is taken to what should be consulted on.
46. Subject to decisions about fair representation we have decided that the Miranui Ward should continue with its current boundaries.
47. We acknowledge that Peter Ward has raised wider issues about representation for the Miranui Ward but we do not think that they are all appropriately solved through a representation review.

Fair representation for electors

48. For the purposes of fair representation for the electors of a district, section 19V(2) of the Act requires that the population of each ward divided by the number of members to be elected by that ward must produce a figure no more than 10 per cent greater or smaller than the population of the district divided by the total number of members (the '+/-10% rule').
49. As noted above, the existing Kere Kere Ward does not comply with the '+/- 10 per cent rule'. The Council considered changes to the number of elected members or boundaries to comply with the rule. However, changing the number of elected members moved non-compliance to the Waiopahu Ward. The Council considered changing the ward boundaries would "limit effective representation of communities of interest by dividing a community of interest between wards". They also noted that the minor non-compliance may self-correct if future growth occurs as predicted in the Council's draft Growth Strategy for 2020.²
50. Section 19V(3)(a) permits non-compliance with the '+/-10% rule' for territorial authorities in some circumstances. Those circumstances are:
 - non-compliance is required for effective representation of communities of interest within island or isolated communities
 - compliance would limit effective representation of communities of interest by dividing a community of interest

² The statistics in the Growth Strategy suggest that in 2020 the Kere Kere Ward will sit at 9.26%. Population estimates from Statistics New Zealand for 2018 indicate that the ward is currently sitting at 10.94% (marginally down from 10.96% in 2017).

- compliance would limit effective representation of communities of interest by uniting two or more communities of interest with few commonalities.
51. Where a council decides on representation arrangements that do not comply with the +/-10% rule it must refer those arrangements to the Commission. The Commission must decide whether to uphold that decision or alter it to something that is compliant or more compliant.
 52. In altering the proposal, the Commission has the following choices:
 - Provide for the council to be elected at large in which the issue of fair representation would not be an issue (although it is noted that this did not gather support through the council's consultation process)
 - Alter ward boundaries so that the arrangements are compliant
 - Alter the total number of councillors
 53. In making any such changes the Commission would also need to be satisfied that the requirement for effective representation of communities of interest is being met. The two criteria – effective representation and fair representation – cannot be considered in isolation.
 54. The council has argued that making the Kere Kere Ward compliant would limit effective representation of communities of interest by dividing communities of interest between wards. It also contends that population predictions for 2020 indicate that the ward will be compliant by then.
 55. Populations projections are not within the criteria the Commission must apply to this issue. We do note, however, that applying 2018 population estimates (as opposed to the 2017 estimates used for this review) shows a slight change in the degree of non-compliance from -10.96% to -10.94%.
 56. We have considered how changing the boundaries of the Kere Ward to achieve compliance would impact on community of interest.
 57. The eastern boundary of the Kere Kere Ward, with the Miranui Ward, is formed by the Manawatu River. The only roading access between the two wards along this boundary is near Shannon. The river forms a strong divide between communities and we do not consider that the boundary here is one that could be altered to deal with the non-compliance issue.
 58. If the boundary to the south, with the Waiopahu Ward, were to be altered the constraints of meshblock boundaries mean that a new ward boundary would either abut Waitaere Beach township or touch the outskirts of Levin. We do not consider that these would be boundaries that reflect communities of interest or are conducive to effective representation of those communities of interest.
 59. Wider boundary alterations would probably exacerbate the problem of dividing communities of interest.
 60. Accordingly, we have decided to uphold the council's proposal that Kere Kere Ward not comply with the '+/-10% rule'.

Communities and community boards

61. Section 19J of the Act requires every territorial authority, as part of its review of representation arrangements, to determine whether there should be community

boards in the district and, if so, the nature of those communities and the structure of the community boards. The territorial authority must make this determination in light of the principle in section 4 of the Act relating to fair and effective representation for individuals and communities.

62. The particular matters the territorial authority, and where appropriate the Commission, must determine include the number of boards to be constituted, their names and boundaries, the number of elected and appointed members, and whether the boards are to be subdivided for electoral purposes. Section 19W also requires regard to be given to such of the criteria as apply to reorganisation proposals under the Local Government Act 2002 as is considered appropriate. The Commission sees two of these criteria as particularly relevant for the consideration of proposals relating to community boards as part of a representation review:
- Will a community board have an area that is appropriate for the efficient and effective performance of its role?
 - Will the community contain a sufficiently distinct community or communities of interest?
63. Following public consultation on the initial proposal, the Council amended its proposal to retain the Foxton Community Board. The Council's reasons cited were:
- *“the submissions from the Foxton and Foxton Beach townships and immediate area indicate strong support for the retention of the Foxton Community Board;*
 - *whilst the Council retains full responsibility for use of the Foxton Beach Freeholding Account (and always has) and there is formal protection in the form of legislation, the community has a strong view that the Foxton Community Board have influence over the use of funds and their oversight provides additional protection; and*
 - *the costs associated with a community board are regarded by the community as less significant than the Council expressed in the Initial Proposal, particularly when compared with the benefits that the whole District reaps from the projects funded from the Foxton Beach Freeholding Account.”*
64. Three of the four appeals relate to community boards. The issues raised in them are as follows.
65. Michael Harland is concerned about the robustness of the council's review in relation to community boards: in particular that it focused on the Foxton Community Board rather than addressing the matter of community boards across the whole district. He is also concerned that the existence of the Foxton Community Board gives the Kere Kere Ward a greater level of representation than other wards. Peter Ward also referred to this matter when appearing at the hearing.
66. It is probably a fair point that the council's review focused on the Foxton Community Board. However, subject to Anne Hunt's appeal for a Foxton Beach Community Board, we do not detect a particular desire for additional community boards or an obvious gap in governance that the establishment of additional community boards could fill.
67. Should there be a desire for a new community board in a specific part of the district Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act contains a process whereby residents can

petition for the establishment of a community. This process would allow a focused debate on a specific proposal to occur.

68. While the existence of the Foxton Community Board does give part of the Kere Kere Ward additional representation we do not see that as being at the expense of other parts of the district. Different parts of a district may have different needs for representation, governance and engagement. A community board has been considered appropriate for Foxton and Foxton Beach and other mechanisms appropriate for other parts of the district.
69. The relevant legislation either enables community boards to be established in only parts of a district or does not prohibit it.³ Throughout New Zealand there are different approaches to community boards. Some districts have no boards, some have complete coverage, and some have partial coverage. The system in Horowhenua District is therefore not outside the norm.
70. Christina Paton's appeal relates the decision to procedural matters relating to the decision to retain the Foxton Community Board and considers that the decision is not valid. In particular:
 - She notes an error in the council's public notice of its final proposal in that reference is made to the "Foxton Fund" rather than the "Foxton Beach Community Fund"
 - She is concerned that the Local Government Commission's guidelines on seeking a poll on a final reorganisation proposal were not applied by those supporting the petition attached to the Foxton Community Board's submission on the council's initial proposal
 - She is concerned that the signatures on the petition were not checked against the electoral roll
71. It is not the role of the Commission to determine procedural matters relating to a representation review. It is the Commission's role to determine the substantive matters relating to a review. We will however comment on some of the matters Christina Paton has raised.
72. The Commission's guidelines referred to relate to a different and very specific process – the petitioning for a poll on a reorganisation proposal under the Local Government Act. There is no requirement that those guidelines be used for petitions attached to submissions.
73. The Commission does not expect that signatories on a petition of this type will be checked against the electoral roll. The reasons for this are that:
 - there is no requirement that a submitter on a representation review be a resident from the district or area concerned, or on the electoral roll
 - we take the authenticity of submissions at face value (subject to any other information suggesting the contrary) and because the petition referred to was attached to and therefore part of a submission we would assume the same approach would be applied.

³ See sections 19J and 19W, Local Electoral Act 2001, and Schedule 6, Local Government Act 2002.

74. Anne Hunt seeks the establishment of a Foxtton Beach Community Board, principally to ensure that the Foxtton Beach Freeholding Fund is properly protected and managed. She is also concerned that the council did not review the boundaries of the Foxtton Community as suggested by the Commission in 2013.
75. While the proper protection and management of the Foxtton Beach Freeholding Fund are important we do not consider they form a sufficient reason for the establishment of a separate community board. Any community board must have wider purpose than a responsibility such as this. From the information we have gathered through the process and from what we have observed we believe there is a connection between Foxtton and Foxtton Beach that makes them an appropriate grouping for a community board. While there is a geographic separation between the two there are also common interests and facilities.
76. We note that in the submission process there was broad support for continuation of the Foxtton Community Board, a view that was ultimately supported by the council. We conclude from this that the board plays an accepted role in the governance of Foxtton. We have therefore decided that the Foxtton Community Board should be retained.
77. As Anne Hunt has noted, in 2013 the Commission stated that as part of its next review the council should further consider the appropriateness of the boundaries of the Foxtton Community Board to ensure their relevance for the future and that any changes be identified in time for them to be discussed with Statistics New Zealand so that any necessary meshblock changes could be made
78. In relation to the review of boundaries the council has commented as follows:

The Commission included this recommendation for particular attention in the 2018 review. There were submissions from some residents living adjacent to the existing boundaries requesting to be included and others advising that they did not want to be included within the community. Maps were drawn showing the mesh blocks with facilities servicing Foxtton that could be included. The Community Board requested an extension of the boundaries to include those generally living in an urban or lifestyle manner on the periphery of the existing community. The Council, when determining to retain the Community Board as part of its final proposal, noted that the Community Board had not consulted with the people in the affected areas when recommending an extension of the boundaries and an increase in the size of the community had not been part of the initial proposal on which the Council had consulted the community. In the end the Council determined that no change to the boundaries should be made.
79. The Commission does not feel it has been in a position to have carried out, itself, a review of the boundaries of the type it suggested happen. Notwithstanding the fact that the council's initial proposal was for disestablishment of the Foxtton Community Board it would have been good if the council had also consulted on boundaries as an "Option B" that could be pursued should the process result in the board being retained (as has happened). Further consideration of the boundaries of Foxtton Community cannot now be undertaken until the next representation review (other than the limited opportunities that section 19JA of the Act provides).

Commission's determination

80. Under section 19R of the Local Electoral Act 2001, the Commission determines that for the general election of Horowhenua District Council to be held on 12 October 2019, the following representation arrangements will apply:

1. Horowhenua District, as delineated on Plan LG-042-2013-W-1 deposited with the Local Government Commission, will be divided into four wards.
2. Those four wards will be:
 - i. Kere Kere Ward, comprising the area delineated on Plan LG-042-2013-W-2 deposited with the Local Government Commission
 - ii. Miranui Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO 37403 deposited with Land Information New Zealand
 - iii. Levin Ward, comprising the area delineated on SO 37862 deposited with the Local Government Commission
 - iv. Waiopahu Ward comprising the area delineated on Plan LG-042-2013-W-3 deposited with the Local Government Commission.
3. The Council will comprise the mayor and 10 councillors elected as follows:
 - i. 2 councillors elected by the electors of Kere Kere Ward
 - ii. 1 councillor elected by the electors of Miranui Ward
 - iii. 5 councillors elected by the electors of Levin Ward
 - iv. 2 councillors elected by the electors of Waiopahu Ward.
4. There will be a Foxton Community comprising the area delineated on SO 36870 deposited with Land Information New Zealand.
5. The Foxton Community Board will comprise five elected members and two members representing Kere Kere Ward appointed to the community board by the council.

81. 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.

Local Government Commission



Commissioner Pita Paraone (Chairperson)

Janie Annear

Commissioner Janie Annear

9 April 2019