



**PAPAIOEA**  
PALMERSTON  
NORTH  
CITY

---

# **PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL**

---

AGENDA

# **COUNCIL**

---

**9AM, WEDNESDAY 6 OCTOBER 2021**

COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR  
CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
32 THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON NORTH

---

# MEMBERS

---

<b>Grant Smith (Mayor)</b>	
<b>Aleisha Rutherford (Deputy Mayor)</b>	
<b>Brent Barrett</b>	<b>Patrick Handcock ONZM</b>
<b>Susan Baty</b>	<b>Leonie Hapeta</b>
<b>Rachel Bowen</b>	<b>Lorna Johnson</b>
<b>Zulfiqar Butt</b>	<b>Billy Meehan</b>
<b>Vaughan Dennison</b>	<b>Orphée Mickalad</b>
<b>Renee Dingwall</b>	<b>Karen Naylor</b>
<b>Lew Findlay QSM</b>	<b>Bruno Petrenas</b>

AGENDA ITEMS, IF NOT ATTACHED, CAN BE VIEWED AT

[pncc.govt.nz](http://pncc.govt.nz) | Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square  
City Library | Ashhurst Community Library | Linton Library

---

## Heather Shotter

Chief Executive | PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

---

## **COUNCIL MEETING**

6 October 2021

## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**1. Apologies**

**2. Notification of Additional Items**

Pursuant to Sections 46A(7) and 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to receive the Chairperson's explanation that specified item(s), which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded, will be discussed.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7) must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7A) may be received or referred to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. No resolution, decision or recommendation can be made in respect of a minor item.

**3. Declarations of Interest (if any)**

Members are reminded of their duty to give a general notice of any interest of items to be considered on this agenda and the need to declare these interests.

**4. Confirmation of Minutes**

"That the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of 15 September 2021 Public be confirmed as a true and correct record."

Page 7

5. **Confirmation of Minutes** Page 11  
"That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of 21 September 2021 Public be confirmed as a true and correct record."

## REPORTS

6. **Representation Review 2021- Final Proposal** Page 15  
Report, presented by Hannah White, Democracy & Governance Manager.
7. **Draft Support and Funding Policy - Approval for consultation** Page 31  
Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy & Policy Manager.
8. **Council Work Schedule** Page 61

## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

9. **Presentation of the Public Planning & Strategy Committee's Recommendations from its 8 September 2021 Meeting** Page 65
10. **Presentation of the Public Finance and Audit Committee's Recommendations from its 22 September 2021 Meeting** Page 67
11. **Exclusion of Public**

To be moved:

"That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution
12.	Minutes of the extraordinary meeting - Confidential- 15 September 2021	For the reasons set out in the extraordinary minutes of 15 September 2021, held in confidential session.	
13.	Trustee Appointments to Globe Theatre Trust Board	Privacy	s7(2)(a)
14.	Presentation of the Finance and Audit Committee's Recommendations - Confidential from its 22 September 2021 Meeting	For the reasons set out in the ordinary minutes of 22 September 2021, held in confidential session.	

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

Also that the persons listed below be permitted to remain after the public has been excluded for the reasons stated.

*[Add Third Parties]*, because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report/s [or other matters as specified] and answering questions, noting that such person/s will be present at the meeting only for the items that relate to their respective report/s [or matters as specified].



# PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Extraordinary Council Meeting Public, held in the Conference & Function Centre, 354 Main Street, Palmerston North on 15 September 2021, commencing at 9.15am.

**Members Present:** Grant Smith (The Mayor) (in the Chair) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

Councillor Rachel Bowen left the meeting at 12.36pm during consideration of clause 108-21. She was not present for part of clause 108-21 to 109-21 inclusive.

### **106-21 Suspension of Standing Orders**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Karen Naylor.

#### **RESOLVED**

That Standing Order 2.1.4 Member's right to speak (specifically the requirement for members to stand to address Council) be suspended for the duration of the Council meeting.

Clause 106-21 above was carried 16 votes to 0.

### **107-21 Presentation - Peter Wells, Chair of the Food and Fibre Group**

Presentation, by Peter, Wells, Chair of the Food and Fibre Group.

Mr Wells, Chair of the Food and Fibre Group spoke on item 5 Approval of Best Practicable Option for Palmerston North Wastewater Solution (clause 108-21)

He said that the group supported option 2 (from the officer's recommendation in the report item 5) but urged Council to cap the land used for wastewater discharge to 760 hectares.

He expressed doubt with the proposal to use irrigation as a way to dispose of wastewater as most of the land area around the city has poor draining soil. He acknowledged that the proposal could work on imperfectly drained soil but this would require more land which he opposed.

He questioned the viability of wastewater irrigation as dairy farms

cannot use human wastewater irrigation because of consumer perceptions overseas. This perception is likely to prohibit it being used on beef and lamb farms as well.

He was concerned with the impact of the proposal on the rural community and asked for certainty. He did not want people to be pressured into selling their land and did not want to see productive Class 1 and II horticultural soil being used for wastewater irrigation.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Council receive the presentation from Peter Wells, Chair of the Food and Fibre Group for information.

Clause 107-21 above was carried 16 votes to 0.

## **REPORT**

**108-21**

### **Approval of Best Practicable Option for Palmerston North Wastewater Solution**

Memorandum, presented by Sarah Sinclair, Chief Infrastructure Officer, David Warburton, Chair, BPO Project Steering Group, Robert van Bentum, Chief Engineer, Melania Voss, Wastewater BPO Project Manager and Jim Bradley, Stantec.

Councillor Lew Findlay QSM left the meeting at 10.30am.

The meeting adjourned at 10.50am  
The meeting resumed at 11.08am

Councillor Lew Findlay QSM returned to the meeting at 11.13am.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

### **RESOLVED**

1. That Council adopts as the Best Practicable Option for managing wastewater from Palmerston North for the next 50 years Option 2 with the highest practicable treatment level (Level 4) and a minimum 75% diversion of wastewater from the river when the river flow is below half median, and that land acquisition is restricted to 760 hectares, including buffer zones, for the purpose of this wastewater consent.

Clause 108-21-1 above was carried 10 votes to 6, the voting being as follows:

#### **For:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Vaughan



Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad and Bruno Petrenas.

**Against:**

Councillors Brent Barrett, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lorna Johnson, Karen Naylor and Aleisha Rutherford.

Councillor Bowen left the meeting 12.36pm.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Bruno Petrenas.

**RESOLVED**

2. That Council confirms support to continue exploring other practicable options to increase the diversion of wastewater from the river during the period of the consent through the adoption of an Adaptive Management approach.

Clause 108-21-2 above was carried 15 votes to 0.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Bruno Petrenas.

**RESOLVED**

3. That an Adaptive Management Strategy (AMS), be developed by Council with the involvement of Rangitāne and Iwi in the region who continue to be involved in the BPO consent. This may be developed under an agreed Project partnership or Governance group, to be determined upon deciding the BPO. That this group establish the AMS in order to define the resource consent and may continue to be established as part of the consent delivery over time, subject to a terms of reference being agreed by Council. This group needs to be formed in consultation with Rangitāne and Iwi in the first instance.

Clause 108-21--3 above was carried 14 votes to 1.

**Note:**

On an amendment that the words "including a staged approach within the first 35 years to achieving the 53% level of diversion indicated in Option 6." be added to the end of the officer's recommendation 1.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Aleisha Rutherford

The amendment was lost 6 votes to 10, the voting being as follows:

**For:**

Councillors Brent Barrett, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lorna Johnson and Aleisha Rutherford.

**Against:**

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Susan Baty, Vaughan Dennison, Lew

## EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

### 109-21 Recommendation to Exclude Public

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

#### RESOLVED

“That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution
7.	Request for support for Manawatū Jets	Third Party Commercial	s7(2)(b)(ii)

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

Clause 109-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0.

The public part of the meeting finished at 12.55pm

Confirmed 6 October 2021.

**Mayor**

# PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Council Meeting Public, held in the Conference & Function Centre, 354 Main Street, Palmerston North on 21 September 2021, commencing at 9.00am

**Members Present:** Grant Smith (The Mayor) (in the Chair) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Orphée Mickalad, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Aleisha Rutherford.

**Apologies:** Councillor Vaughan Dennison

Councillor Vaughan Dennison entered the meeting at 9.59am during consideration of clause 116-21.

### 111-21 **Apologies**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That Council receive the apologies.

Clause 111-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0.

### 112-21 **Representation Review 2021 - Hearing of Submissions**

Council considered submissions on the Representation Review together with supporting oral statements including additional tabled material.

The following persons appeared before Council and made oral statements in support of their submissions and replied to questions from elected members.

Mr Miko Kirschbaum (submission 72) spoke to his submission and made no additional comments. He tabled additional material and presented a powerpoint on his submission.

Ms Jean Hera (submission 33) representing Te Ha Hine-dhu-one PN Women's Health Collective spoke to their submission and made the following additional comments:

- Believe having geographic wards, each represented by the same number of councillors would provide a better balance and would

be fairer - as every voter would get the same number of votes.

- Geographical wards would better support low-income communities as they could connect more easily with their local representatives.
- Community Boards haven't worked well in the past but we need a mechanism to ensure the voices of those less likely to be heard are heard, and the voices of the more powerful could be managed.
- Supports having 2 Māori ward councillors as it would enable better representation and would allow a more supportive working environment to be created.

Mr Gavin Lees (submission 64) spoke to his submission and made the following additional comments:

- Believes an 'at large' system consisting of two Maori ward councillors, two General ward councillors and 11 councillors elected at large would be a more equitable system. This would allow everyone to vote for the same number of councillors.
- Having a Māori ward lends itself to having geographical wards, to improve voter equity.

Ms Julia Manssen (submission 69) spoke to her submission and made the following additional comments:

- Believes council is over represented with 15 councillors, the current ratio of 1 councillor for every 5,000 residents is too high. Would prefer to have 8 councillors.
- Believes that without wards – there is no proper structure in place to make sure that councillors are accountable to residents. Without wards, councillors don't know who they are representing or where their responsibilities lie and when they are required to fulfil their duties.
- Would like to see community boards installed as they enable the people's voice, but councillors need to be committed to regularly attending board meetings.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

## **RESOLVED**

That Council

1. Hear submissions from presenters who indicated their wish to be heard in support of their submission.
2. Note the Procedure for Hearing of Submissions, as described in the procedure sheet.

Clause 112-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0.

**113-21 Representation Review 2021 - Summary of submissions and consultation**  
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Democracy & Governance Manager.

The Democracy & Governance Manager made the following updates to the report:

- Submitter 73 has withdrawn their submission which brings the total submissions to 80.
- Submitter 65 had wished to change their submission to support the proposal for 15 councillors.

The table of submitters' responses will be amended to reflect these changes in the deliberation report due to Council on 6 October 2021.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

**RESOLVED**

That the memorandum 'Representation Review 2021- Summary of submissions and consultation' presented to Council on 21 September 2021 be received.

Clause 113-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0.

**114-21 Confirmation of Minutes**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of 1 September 2021 - public and confidential be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 114-21 above was carried 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

**115-21 Council Work Schedule - September**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Aleisha Rutherford.

**RESOLVED**

That the Council receive its Work Schedule dated September 2021

Clause 115-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETING

**116-21 Planning & Strategy Committee Public - 8 September 2021**  
Consideration was given to Planning & Strategy Committee recommendations as appended to these minutes.

Councillor Vaughan Dennison joined the meeting at 9:59am.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

### RESOLVED

1. That the Council approve the draft Palmerston North Stormwater Bylaw 2022 Consultation Document (as attached as attachment one in the report titled "Draft Stormwater Bylaw – approval for consultation" presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 8 September 2021) for public consultation.
2. That the Chief Executive be authorised to approve minor amendments to the consultation document prior to publication.

Clause 116-21 above was carried 16 votes to 0.

The public part of the meeting finished at 10.00am

Confirmed 6 October 2021

**Mayor**

Report
--------

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 6 October 2021

**TITLE:** Representation Review 2021- Final Proposal

**PRESENTED BY:** Hannah White, Democracy and Governance Manager

**APPROVED BY:** Sheryl Bryant, Assistant Chief Executive

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL**

1. That the Council resolves to retain its Initial Proposal (Option 1) and adopts the following representation arrangements as its Final Proposal for the 2022 and 2025 triennial local elections, pursuant to sections 19H and 19J and clauses 1 and 2 of Schedule 1A of the Local Electoral Act 2001:
  - a) The Palmerston North City Council to comprise the mayor elected at-large and 15 councillors to be elected under the ward system, specifically 13 general ward councillors and two Māori ward councillors;
  - b) The Palmerston North City Council to comprise two wards, these being:
    - (i) Te Hirawanui General Ward as delineated on Plan LG-040-2013-W-1 deposited with the Local Government Commission and represented by 13 general ward councillors (elected by those electors city-wide on the general electoral roll);
    - (ii) Te Pūao Māori Ward as delineated on Plan LG-040-2013-W-1 deposited with the Local Government Commission and represented by two Māori ward councillors (elected by those electors city-wide on the Māori electoral roll);
  - c) No community boards be established.
  
2. That, as required by s19N of the Local Electoral Act 2001, the Council reject submissions:
  - a. containing objections outside of the scope of the representation review consultation.
  - b. containing objections to the number of councillors. The reason being that 15 councillors is an appropriate number to fairly and effectively represent the city.
  - c. containing objections to the at-large basis of election. The reason being that Palmerston North has a single, cohesive and city-wide community of interest that tightly overlaps the functional, perceptual and political dimensions of its population.

- d. containing objections to the proposal to continue not to have any community boards. The reason being that there are no communities that are sufficiently distinct or isolated to warrant community board representation and that there are sufficient mechanisms for fair and effective representation already available.

- 3. That the Council place public notice of its Final Proposal noting an appeal period of one month.

**SUMMARY OF OPTIONS ANALYSIS FOR**

<b>Problem or Opportunity</b>	Consideration of submissions to Initial Proposal before putting Final Proposal
<b>OPTION 1:</b>	<b>Adopt Initial Proposal as Final Proposal</b>
Community Views	Submissions covered a range of views. A majority favoured each of the three aspects of the proposal.
Benefits	Proposal for adoption has been out for consultation.
Risks	Submitters may appeal Final Proposal.
Financial	Not applicable
<b>OPTION 2:</b>	<b>Adjust Initial Proposal so that the basis of election is wards</b>
Community Views	Submissions covered a range of views. 20% of submitters preferred ward as basis of election.
Benefits	Localised representation may allay some submitters' concerns about councillor visibility, access and representation in general.
Risks	Change required disproportionate as those favouring wards are not a majority view in submissions.  Would need to first determine that any ward boundaries relate to specific and different communities of interest. This would require a further report to an extraordinary meeting of Council. In order to meet Local Electoral Act timeframes a meeting would need to be held and public notice published by 18 October 2021.  Any substantive amendment to the Initial Proposal may result in a greater number of appeals and objections being lodged with the Local Government Commission.
Financial	Financial and time costs of ward committees set up and ongoing administration.



## RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY

- 1.1 Council has completed consultation on its Initial Proposal for its representation arrangements for local elections in 2022 and 2025. It has heard those who wished to be speak to their submission.
- 1.2 Council must now consider submissions and either confirm its Initial Proposal as its Final Proposal, and in doing so resolve to reject submissions which made objections, or make adjustments in response to submissions and give reasons for doing so.

### 2. BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS COUNCIL DECISIONS

- 2.1 The Initial Proposal was agreed by Council on 4 August 2021. The Initial proposal being:
  - The mayor elected at large
  - Two city-wide wards
    - Te Pūao Māori Ward comprising of 2 councillors and
    - Te Hirawanui General Ward comprising of 13 councillors
  - No community boards to be established
- 2.2 The Local Electoral Act (19N) expects that any amendments to the Initial Proposal would be made through submission. The Local Government Commission Guidelines on Representation Reviews (10.24) state any changes should only be made based on submission feedback.
- 2.3 It is important to note that the establishment of Māori wards, and the use of the STV voting system are decisions outside of the scope of the representation review consultation.
- 2.4 Submissions on the Initial Proposal have been circulated to councillors and submitters heard by Council on 21 September 2021. Please note, since first publication of the 21 September agenda (and before the 21 September meeting) one submission was withdrawn by the submitter and another submitter wrote to inform their change of position on the number of councillors.
- 2.5 Analysis of submissions by theme are attached to this report.

**3. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS**

**Adopt Initial Proposal as Final Proposal, unchanged.**

3.1 The majority of submissions supported each part of the Initial Proposal. Based on the results of the consultation the Council may confirm the Initial Proposal as the Final Proposal for the electoral arrangements for Palmerston North City Council for the 2022 and 2025 local body elections.

**Table 1: Submission Form Response Summary**

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Q1: 15 councillors</b>	48	27	5	0	80
<b>Q2: at-large</b>	51	23	4	2	80
<b>Q3: no community boards</b>	54	18	7	1	80

3.2 As set out in Table 1 above, a majority of respondents supported the proposal of 15 councillors, with 2 councillors to be drawn from Te Pūao Māori Ward and 13 councillors from Te Hirawanui General Ward. Of the 27 submitters who opposed the proposal, 16 explicitly linked their opposition not to the number of councillors but to the introduction of Māori wards (a question outside of the scope of the consultation). 13 submissions expressed a preference for less councillors. 6 of these did so on a misunderstanding that less councillors would mean less cost to the ratepayer.

3.3 As set out in Table 1 above, a majority of respondents supported the proposal to remain at-large as the basis of election. Of the 23 submitters who opposed, 16 specified a preference for geographical wards as a basis of election. Some potential applications of the ward system were proposed which are discussed in the Officers comments column of Appendix 1.

3.4 As set out in Table 1 above, a majority of respondents supported the proposal not to introduce any community boards. 18 submissions opposed the proposal. Of note, only four suggested that the villages have different representation needs. The variety of comments on community boards shows there is not one shared concept of what a community board might look like. A similar result was reflected in the pre-engagement in-depth interviews. This research was presented to the Council on 4 August 2021 before making the Initial Proposal.

3.5 The submission form also included a space for general comments. These have also been grouped by theme in Appendix 1.

**Amend Initial Proposal in response to submissions.**

3.6 As acknowledged above, not all submissions supported all parts of the proposal. Some submissions called for (a) less councillors (16%) and (b) geographical wards (20%).

- 3.7 When a council chooses to amend its Initial Proposal in response to public submissions, there is no obligation to re-consult. Rather, if a change is made, then any interested person can lodge an objection during the one-month appeal period. Where there is no change to the Initial Proposal then only those who made a submission may lodge an appeal.
- 3.8 Should the Council wish to reconsider the Initial Proposal on the number of councillors, it must remember the legislative context, in particular the limitations set out in the Local Electoral Act determining the number of Māori councillors as a percentage of total electoral population and total number of councillors. Should a smaller total number of councillors be put, then the number of Māori councillors would also drop.
- 3.9 Should the Council wish to deliberate on Option 2: 'Adjust the Initial Proposal so that the basis of elections is wards,' then the following must be considered:
- 3.9.1 Natural geographical divisions would need to be found which map well with community distinctions. It should be noted that in the previous reports to the Council the conclusions were that there were not obvious reasons for geographical division.
- 3.9.2 The +/- 10% rule, which sets out that no geographical ward may have a ratio of councillors to electors more or less than 10% of any other geographical ward, would need to be applied. To do so requires validation of population numbers in meshblocks by Statistics New Zealand. An extraordinary meeting of Council would need to be called in order to put these numbers before the Council. Further, any extraordinary meeting would need to be called before 15 October to comply with the legislation requiring public notice of final proposal within 6 weeks of consultation on the initial proposal closing.
- 3.9.3 The interplay between the voting system we use in Palmerston North (being Single Transferable Vote (STV)) and a ward system must be considered. The voting system has already been decided by Council. Multi member wards should therefore be large to accommodate the advantages of the electoral system which would otherwise have occurred in an at-large system with STV.
- 3.9.4 There are also additional financial implications of introducing a ward system where one is not already in place. These have not been estimated at this time.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 Officers recommend that the Council adopts the Initial Proposal as its Final Proposal for its representation arrangements for local elections in 2022 and 2025. In doing so, it must resolve to reject submissions which made objections as per the Local Electoral Act 2001.

**5. NEXT ACTIONS**

- 5.1 Public notice must be given of Palmerston North City Council's Final Proposal for representation arrangements to apply to the 2022 local body elections by 18 October 2021 at latest (Local Electoral Act 19N(1)).
- 5.2 If Council decides Option 2, then an extraordinary meeting of Council must be called and occur before 15 October in order that Public Notice be placed by 18 October 2021.
- 5.3 Should appeals (or objections) be lodged, the Local Government Commission (LGC) will undertake an appeals process. The final decision on representation arrangements must be made by the LGC by April 2022.
- 5.4 If no appeals (or objections) are lodged then the Final Proposal will become the Final arrangements for 2022 and 2025 following the close of the appeal period. Further Public notice will be put.

**6. OUTLINE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS**

- 6.1 The consultation process was covered in the memorandum to Council on 21 September 2021. The pre-engagement process was covered in the report to Council of 4 August 2021.

**COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION**

Does the Council have delegated authority to decide?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the decisions significant?	<b>No</b>
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	<b>No</b>
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	<b>No</b>
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	<b>No</b>
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	<b>Yes</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 5: A Driven & Enabling Council	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Governance and Active Citizenship	

The action is: Hold a representation review	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Consideration of all submissions contributes to robust decision-making. Regular review of representation arrangements is appropriate to ensure population and community changes are adequately taken into account.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Submissions analysis [↓](#) 



**REPRESENTATION REVIEW INITIAL PROPOSAL****Themes to comments****Question 1: We are proposing to have 15 councillors.**

This means 2 councillors will be elected from the Te Pūao Māori Ward and 13 councillors from will be elected from the Te Hirawanui General Ward. The Mayor will be elected by the whole city.

**Do you agree with the proposal to have 15 councillors?**

Theme	Submission Number(s)	Officer comment
<b>Support proposed 15 (13 + 2)</b>		
Purpose of representation review is not to provide opportunity for payrise	1, 21	
Less councillors more work	1	
Less does not mean less cost	7	
Agree with 2 Māori ward councillors	7, 13, 21, 28, 32, 63	
Status quo is working	21, 59	
An appropriate number for effective responsiveness to growing diverse population and workload	21, 59, 62	
An appropriate number to allow for appropriate candidate selection	28	
15 allows fair and appropriate ratio of population to councillor	21, 48, 70	
Larger number will contribute to voter participation	63	
At upper end when compared to others so no more needed	75	
Mana whenua support 2 Māori ward seats, Council should show commitment to partnership	22	
Maximise strong independent Māori voice as step toward honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi	22	
<b>Prefer less</b>		
Too many compared to other cities	10, 19, 36	
Less would mean less spent on remuneration	9, 18, 19, 43, 66, 71	Inaccurate. Remuneration Authority sets pool for 'size'

		of city to be divided by number of councillors.
Less would be more effective (efficient)	34, 55	
Less would mean increase in remuneration for individual councillors which may encourage more to stand	78	
Less is better	81	
Oversized and lacks accountability	77	
<b>Other comments</b>		
Support Māori wards	18, 19, 27, 32, 47, 58, 64	Māori ward establishment not a matter for the consultation
Do not support Māori wards	20, 42, 41, 43, 46, 50, 56, 57, 66, 69, 80, 81	Māori ward establishment not a matter for the consultation
Poll result showed ratepayers did not want Māori wards	23, 25, 55, 77, 81	Māori ward establishment not a matter for the consultation
New Māori seats will cost more	23	Inaccurate
Iwi views already taken into account	57, 59	
Diversity from larger number needs to be balanced against fair remuneration	60	
Too many, however needs to be proportionate to growing Māori population	62	
Use community boards rather than so many councillors	80	
Comments which refer to settings under the Local Electoral Act	6, 36, 37	
Comments outside of scope of consultation	31	



**Question 2: We are proposing to remain “at-large” for our basis of election.**

“At-large” means we are not proposing to divide the city into any geographic wards. Electors will vote from across the city for their preferred candidate standing in either the Te Pūao Māori Ward (for those on the Māori Electoral Roll) or the Te Hirawanui General Ward (for those on the General Electoral Roll).

**Do you agree with the proposal to remain “at-large” for our basis of election?**

Theme	Submission Number(s)	Officer comment
<b>Support at large proposal</b>		
Status quo is ok	7, 21, 28, 57	
Councillors live across city	9, 21, 81	
At-large means all have access to all councillors regardless of where they live	21	
At-large means all responsible for Māori representation	27	
At-large makes more sense	47	
At-large least cumbersome	75	
At-large means should not have Māori wards	50	Inaccurate, Māori ward proposal is also for at-large representation.
City population too small for wards	56	
Residents' geographical location not a significant factor in interests	63	
Geographical wards would restrict candidates	63	
<b>Prefer geographical wards</b>		
Wards are fairer	9	
At-large does not reflect ratepayers	80	
Nuanced issues in different suburbs and villages should be represented via wards	9, 20, 36, 49, 71	
The city comprises significant communities of interest	59	
Wards ensure geographical distribution of councillors	59, 71	
Candidates may be better known in their own neighbourhood than across city	71	
Wards allow those of limited means to stand as candidates (cost-barrier when at-large)	59, 60	

Wards increase visibility of councillors	10, 78	
Wards heighten accountability	10, 41, 77, 78	
Wards heighten engagement	24, 77	
Wards may increase voter participation	24	
Purpose of local government is to represent localised interests	20	
Wards could be used for consultation	23	
Ward alternative proposed: Geographical wards for General Ward of 2 per geographical ward would be more equitable	33	<p>Use of 'equitable' unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STV does not work well for wards with less than 3 seats. Under STV it is preferable to have wards of 5-7, to gain the proportionality benefit from the system.</li> <li>• The Initial Proposal means that councillors in the General Ward (although more in total number) represent on average 25% more people than councillors in the Māori ward. However, to establish the submitter's proposal six General Ward communities of interest would need to be established, populations have shifted since 2006 (when PNCC last had 6 wards) and it could not be assumed that interests could be cut at borders that would correlate with 'fair' ratios of councillor to population.</li> <li>• Voters have the same number of votes, whether wards or at-large.</li> <li>• The number of candidates a voter can choose from cannot be determined by basis of election.</li> <li>• Whether wards or at-large, all councillors represent all residents under the Local Government Act Sch 7, 14(3).</li> </ul>
Ward alternative proposed: Geographical wards for General Ward of central, 4 suburban, 5 outer plus one Māori ward.	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish wards, first nine sufficiently distinct communities of interest would need to be established.</li> <li>• Single member wards were proposed in an appeal to the LGC in 2013; the LGC determined</li> </ul>









## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 6 October 2021

**TITLE:** Draft Support and Funding Policy - Approval for consultation

**PRESENTED BY:** Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager

**APPROVED BY:** David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

---

### RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. That the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021, included as an attachment to the memorandum titled 'Draft Support and Funding Policy – Approval for consultation' be approved for consultation.
  2. To delegate authority to the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor to approve minor amendments to the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 prior to publication.
- 

### 1. ISSUE

On Wednesday 8 September the Planning and Strategy Committee considered the Draft Support and Funding Policy. Changes arising from that meeting (and recorded in recommendations from the Committee) have now been incorporated into the proposed policy (see attachment) and are recommended for approval for public consultation.

### 2. BACKGROUND

The Planning and Strategy Committee recommended to Council some amendments to the Draft Support and Funding Policy, including adding significant new provisions for a funding mechanism for sector lead organisations, the deletion of some funding criteria, and a different rental framework for community occupancy than was proposed in the report. Since that meeting, staff discovered that a section of the draft was inadvertently omitted from the document attached to the Committee report. This omitted text primarily describes the decision-making and assessment processes.

Given these circumstances, and especially the general nature of the Committee recommendation about sector lead funding, it is appropriate to provide elected members with a further opportunity to see the proposed policy in its entirety. This proposed draft is attached.

- All new text resulting from the discussion and recommendations of the Strategy and Planning Committee is marked in red.

- The previously omitted text is marked in blue.

Staff note that while the simplified version of the status quo rental framework for community occupancy (recommended by the Committee) is now included in the proposed policy, there may still be some inconsistencies in practice. Staff are comfortable that these could be dealt with case by case as leases come up for renewal. The consultation will provide an opportunity to provide feedback on this framework.

The content of all proposed changes (including the omitted text) was well canvassed at the Strategy and Planning Committee meeting. Staff now, therefore, propose the Council adopt the Draft Policy for consultation.

### 3. NEXT STEPS

The consultation timeframe of the Draft Support and Funding Policy will depend on the Covid alert levels and the viability of achieving good engagement outcomes. At this stage staff anticipate consultation being open from early-October 2021 to early-November 2021. Hearing of submissions is planned for late November 2021 and a deliberations/adoption report will follow.

An engagement plan will be developed following the approval to consult on the draft policy. Staff anticipate a wide interest from the many stakeholders who may be affected by the policy, or who have a general interest in Council's policy on support and funding. Particular effort will be made to engage with:

- Current and potential recipients of funding and support programmes
- For-purpose groups whose community occupancy agreements with Council will be guided by the policy
- Rangitāne o Manawatū
- other strategic partners of Council, including sector lead agencies
- Interest and advocacy groups
- The wider Palmerston North community

### 4. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Council have delegated authority to decide? If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual	<b>Yes</b>
Are the decisions significant? If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	<b>No</b>
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	<b>No</b>
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	<b>No</b>



Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?		<b>Yes</b>
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?		<b>No</b>
The recommendations contribute to Goal 3: A Connected and Safe Community		
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Connected Communities		
The action is: Multiple actions – Review the Community Funding Policy (2018-2028 10-Year Plan), develop a policy for community rental assets, incorporate consideration of sector lead agencies in the policy review.		
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Consultation on the Support and Funding Policy will inform Council decision-making and contribute to its objective of providing transparent and responsive guidance for funding processes.	

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Draft Support and Funding Policy October 2021 [↓](#) 





























































## COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 6 October 2021

**TITLE:** Council Work Schedule

---

### RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. That the Council receive its Work Schedule dated October 2021.

### ATTACHMENTS

1. Work Schedule [↓](#) 









## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**TO:** Council

**MEETING DATE:** 6 October 2021

**TITLE:** Presentation of the Public Planning & Strategy Committee's Recommendations from its 8 September 2021 Meeting

---

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Planning & Strategy Committee meeting Public held on 8 September 2021. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 3.18.1)

**30-21 Annual Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996 Report**

Memorandum, presented by Kerry-Lee Probert, Head of Environmental Protection Services.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the report of the Dog Control Policy and Practices for the Palmerston North City Council pursuant to Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 for the period 2020/21, as attached to this memorandum titled 'Annual Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996 Report' presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 8 September 2021, be received.

**31-21 Draft Support and Funding Policy - Approval for Consultation**

Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the occupancy of Square Edge and Creative Sounds buildings be noted as Out of Scope.
2. To amend Part B, section 7, #6 'Community Development Small Grants fund' of the Draft Support and Funding Policy, in order to remove the following new exclusions:
  - Applicants who at the time of applying are, or will be, recipients of Council's strategic priority grant;
  - Applicants whose current assets minus current liabilities are more than two years running costs.

3. To signal intent within the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 to remove sector-lead organisations in the arts, social and environmental sectors from the contestable funding model and offer them funding contracts instead.
4. That the scope of the development contributions subsidy is expanded to include building and resource consents costs.
5. That option 2 (status quo) is consulted on for community rental framework for occupancy of Council property.
6. That the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor be authorised to approve minor amendments to the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 prior to publication.
7. That the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021, included as an attachment to the memorandum titled 'Draft Support and Funding Policy – Approval for Consultation' presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 8 September 2021, be approved for consultation, subject to the agreed amendments.

## CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE:

TITLE:

---

Set out below are the recommendations only from the **Error! No document variable supplied..** The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 3.18.1)

### **61-21 Results of Public Engagement - Extension of Paid Parking Hours**

Memorandum, presented by Michael Duindam, Acting City Planning Manager and Vinuka Nanayakkara, Senior Transport Planner.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the following existing paid parking hours are retained:
  - a. Thursday 8.30am-5.30pm
  - b. Friday 8.30pm-5.30pm
  - c. Saturday 11.00am-3.00pm
  - d. Sunday no paid parking hours

### **63-21 Treasury Report - 12 months ending 30 June 2021**

Memorandum, presented by Steve Paterson, Strategy Manager - Finance.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the performance of Council's treasury activity for the 12 months ending 30 June 2021 be noted.