

Submitter Number: 17
Response ID: 1392160
First Name: Peter
Last Name: McIlraith

Peter just submitted the survey 'Representation Review Submission' with the responses below.

Submission on Proposal to the Environment Canterbury Representation Review 2018

Please note that this form is only for submissions on the Proposal to the Environment Canterbury Representation Review 2018.

Public Information

All information contained in a submission under section 19M of the Local Electoral Act 2001, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. It is therefore important you let us know if your form includes any information you consider should not be disclosed.

1. The proposal is for 7 constituencies. Do you consider that the number of constituencies provides effective representation for communities of interest?

No

Please provide your comments below (optional)

Ecan has gained much traction in the field of combining civil society; in fact the contribution to the objectives of the CWMS by civil groups is the jewel in the crown of this strategy. However this has to be matched with the concept of protecting the periphery from the center with respect to access to representation. Should the proposed method be adopted the system will be forever flooded. There are ample examples where strict adherence to population based representation is modified in the interest of fair, achievable, and practicable representation. One representative for the whole of South Canterbury plus part of Nt. Otago is clearly not fair, achievable, or practicable. South Canterbury need two Representatives to give any feeling of support to civil society.

2. Do you consider the proposed names of each constituency and the boundaries of each constituency are clear and appropriate for representation purposes?

Yes

Please provide any comments below (optional)

No Answer

3. Do you consider that the number of councillors proposed to be elected from each constituency is appropriate to provide fair representation for electors in each constituency?

No

Please provide any comments below (optional)

Ecan has gained much traction in the field of combining civil society; in fact the contribution to the objectives of the CWMS by civil groups is the jewel in the crown of this strategy. However this has to be matched with the concept of protecting the periphery from the center with respect to access to representation. Should the proposed method be adopted the system will be forever flooded. There are ample examples where strict adherence to population based representation is modified in the interest of fair, achievable, and practicable representation. One representative for the whole of South Canterbury plus part of Nt. Otago is clearly not fair, achievable, or practicable. South Canterbury need two Representatives to give any feeling of support to civil society.

4. If you have any suggestions for changes to the proposal, please provide them below.

The big picture is that, there was nothing wrong with the quality of the councilor's pre the sacking episode. There was much wrong with the then structure. The concept of bunching together the regional need of such a large area with unique natural environments, not to mention the social policy Ecan had statutory obligation to uphold. Unitary Councils, with a common science based center, but autonomous decision making capabilities is and was the optimal answer. However, I fare there is too much "vested Interest" for that to now prevail.

Public Hearings

Please tick those that apply

I do wish to be heard in support of my submission;
and I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing.