



---

# Wallacetown Community Board

## OPEN MINUTES

---

Minutes of a meeting of Wallacetown Community Board held in the Wallacetown Community Centre, Dunlop Street, Wallacetown on Thursday, 31 May 2018 at 7.04pm.

---

### PRESENT

<b>Chairperson</b>	Peter Laurie
<b>Deputy Chairperson</b>	Frank Shearing
<b>Members</b>	Tony Billyard
	Trina Eade
	Rae Wilson
	Councillor Gavin Macpherson

### IN ATTENDANCE

<b>Committee Advisor</b>	Fiona Dunlop
<b>Governance and Democracy Manager</b>	Clare Sullivan

---

**1 Apologies**

There were apologies from Treena Symons.

Moved Chairperson Laurie, seconded Member Wilson **and resolved:**

**That the Wallacetown Community Board accept the apology.**

**2 Leave of absence**

There were no requests for leave of absence.

**3 Conflict of Interest**

Councillor Macpherson declared a conflict of interest in relation to item 7.1 - Submission from the Wallacetown Community Board to the Southland District Council Initial Proposal for the Representation Review. He would not be taking part in discussion or debate on the matter.

**4 Public Forum**

Jane Barden and five members of the Wallacetown community were present. Ms Barden advised that she was against the initial proposal.

**5 Extraordinary/Urgent Items**

There were no Extraordinary/Urgent items.

**6 Confirmation of Minutes**

**Resolution**

Moved Member Wilson, seconded Member Billyard **and resolved:**

**That the Wallacetown Community Board confirms the minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2018 as a true and correct record of that meeting.**

**Reports**

(Councillor Macpherson withdrew from the meeting.)

**7.1 Submission from the Wallacetown Community Board to the Southland District Council Initial Proposal for the Representation Review**

**Record No: R/18/5/10701**

Chair Laurie took the Board through the draft submission to the Southland District Council Initial Proposal for the Representation Review.

The Board discussed the content of their submission and made some additions to the draft circulated with the agenda.

**Resolution**

Moved Member Wilson, seconded Member Eade **recommendation a, b with changes (as indicated) and a new c (as indicated) and resolved:**

**That the Wallacetown Community Board:**

- a) **Receives the report titled “Submission from the Wallacetown Community Board to the Southland District Council Initial Proposal for the Representation Review” dated 25 May 2018.**
- b) **Endorses the amended submission of the Wallacetown Community Board to the Southland District Council initial proposal for the Representation Review (appended to the minutes as appendix 1).**
- c) **Agree that representatives of the Board will speak on the Board’s behalf at the oral submissions on Monday 18 June 2018.**

The meeting concluded at 7.48pm.

CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD AT A MEETING OF THE WALLACETOWN COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON 31 MAY 2018.

**DATE:**.....

**CHAIRPERSON:**.....

---

## Submission to the Southland District Council Initial Proposal from the Wallacetown Community Board 2018

---

1. Do you think 12 councillors elected from five wards gives you fair and effective representation?

Yes and no. See the reasoning further on in this submission.

---

2. Do you think that Stewart Island Rakiura should be an island community of interest?

Very definitely Stewart Island Rakiura should be an island community of interest. There are issues that are unique to their environment, location and life style that are best known and dealt with by a local representation.

---

3. Do you think there should be eight community boards covering the whole of the District?

NO. This is not an item that should be discussed as a number. It is about what will work as an effective representation of each and every community.

Why limit the number of community Boards to only eight? We don't understand why the district is divided this way. Why is it not possible to have nine, ten or even eleven Community Boards; with smaller numbers of board members? This could have the effect of having more candidates in the local body elections creating more interest with the rate payers.

It's more about creating interest and providing a service than saving money.

---

4. Do you support this proposal which consists of 12 councillors elected from five wards and eight community boards covering the whole of the District? - tick box

Yes No Neither

1. By having both Ward and Community Boards representing everyone in the District you are effectively double representing all ratepayers. That in itself is a deception. Who is really representing their best interests?
2. Bigger is not necessarily better.

While cities like Christchurch have a number of Community Boards, they function very well as part of a well-defined whole with common needs as they are a totally urban area. We don't see that there is a comparison in the Southland District. The communities are quite diverse within the proposed Oreti Community Board. Not only are you combining residential communities; you are adding rural demands in there too. It is going to take elected members with special skills and more importantly the right attitudes to make it work. The workload of this proposal will

add to the pressures that fulltime workers are already under and we can see that elected members will not be a diverse group.

3. We propose that the Wallacetown Community Board area could be expanded to include the following localities: Branholme, Grove Bush, Lorneville, Mabel Bush, Makarewa, Makarewa Junction, Oporo, Rakahouka, Roslyn Bush, Ryal Bush, Taramoa, Tussock Creek, Wallacetown, west Plains, Wilson Crossing, Waianiwa and Wrights Bush as this is the approximate boundary of the Wallacetown Volunteer Fire Brigade.
4. The need to retain our identity and representation.

Everyone to whom we have spoken has been adamant that:

- a. Wallacetown should retain its own identity and govern its own affairs,

We have done a separate consultation within the Wallacetown area; the result of that consultation is that 99% of people want Wallacetown to remain as a separate stand-alone board.

- b. Wallacetown has to be guaranteed representation on the new Board by way of a subdivision.

5. Sweeping changes are seldom successful.

Large changes carry with them an overhead of uncertainty and unforeseen problems. The best progress is made by progressive steps where everyone has a buy-in. Sweeping changes like you are proposing are irreversible and don't have any guarantee of success or favourable adoption. You may be committing yourselves to a structure that is worse than what we have now.

6. Review the number of elected members on each Board

The representation review and the move to bulk funding has significantly reduced the work of the Community Boards (much to our dissatisfaction). Does there still need to be the same number of members on each board?

Six member boards could be reduced to four and eight member boards to six without affecting the board's functions or representation. It still gives room for an absence and achieving a quorum.

7. The significant difference in population, the number of residents and the number of residential areas in different Community Boards.
  - a. The proposed Oreti Community Board has a population of 8577 while the Northern Community Board has only 1740. That doesn't sound like fair distribution.
  - b. The number of residential areas is quite diverse from Community Board to Community Board depending on your definition of the number of residents or properties that make up a Community. In that regard the term Community is

misleading.

The proposed Oreti Community Board has 14 residential areas in its jurisdiction while the proposed Ardlussa Community Board has only 3. That is quite disproportionate and becomes even more disproportionate when the population is taken into consideration.

- c. The new proposal could possibly mean that the Wallacetown area could end up not being represented. All of the experience, information and history that the existing board has will be lost and there will be no continuity going forward. Therefore if this proposal goes ahead we urge this council guarantees that the Wallacetown area has a mandatory two seats on the new board, such as happened with the combining of the Edendale and Wyndham Boards.

8. Localised Projects.

Projects that are specific to an area within the proposed new Oreti Community Board boundary, which would mainly benefit that local area, would be paid for by the entire rating base. This we believe is an unfair ask and could very well cause divisions within the Community Board area.

9. Reserve Monies

From our consultation within the Wallacetown area, if the proposed new Oreti Community Board goes ahead the people are demanding that the current reserves be ring fenced for the present Wallacetown Community Board area.

The people of the Wallacetown Community Board area have had past experience with losing reserves from when the sewerage scheme was changed to be district wide funded, and do not want to experience a similar situation again.

