

Submission Number: 42
Response ID: C18C/104832
First Name: Jim
Last Name: Hopkins

The Secretary
Representation Review
c/o Environment Canterbury
P.O. Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Jim Hopkins
16 Tamar Street
South Hill
Oamaru 9400
email: jimhop46@gmail.com
Ph: 03 434 9410 or 021 114 3189

SUBMISSION TO THE REPRESENTATION REVIEW - CANTERBURY

This is a personal submission which seeks to advance some particular and personal proposals for consideration, in addition to expressing support for the submission jointly made by the southern Canterbury Councils (Waimate, Waitaki, Mackenzie and Timaru) in which a reasoned and reasonable case is made for adding a second councillor to represent this vital area of the province.

Should those considering the options available for as future Environment Canterbury representation make no other change to the proposal currently promulgated, I would urge them to support the exchange sought by the southern Councils and, for what it's worth - which I acknowledge is statistically minor - invite you to add the value of my support to the original proposal.is submission model in the is the case following submission.

But I would also go further and invite those reviewing Ecan representation to consider at least one other option which I would better reflects the national interest and is also less likely to result in the kind of internal stalemates and inertia that characterised Ecan's operations until legislation replaced elected members with appointed commissioners.

It is worth noting that this change coincided with the Canterbury Mayoral proposals regarding water management and was a key reason why the Mayoral Forum's water proposals were able to be successfully implemented, for the benefit not only of the entire region and its communities but also New Zealand Inc. My view is that Ecan as an appointed entity did much more to enhance the economic productivity and environmental quality of the region than its elected counterpart ever had, largely because of the stalemate created by the almost equal number of urban and rural elected members and the apparently irresolvable differences of opinion between them.

These were not good for Canterbury or for New Zealand and some of the rather belligerent correspondence in papers like The Press hailing the new proposals as a rightful opportunity for the city to reassert itself and ensure its interests are paramount do not auger well for then future.

I believe the new representation model should recognise that the interconnected and mutually dependent nature of rural and urban Canterbury cannot be measured, captured or fairly expressed by numbers alone.

In my opinion, an electoral system based on the current Ecan Zone Committees established to ensure and enhance water quality rationing mechanisms would be the best basis for the next iteration of the

Council. I note that the Act allows variations from the + or - 10% rule if effective representation “so requires” and I submit that you should require it.

With the (unexpectedly early) deadline of 4pm approaching I would simply conclude by stating that I wish to speak to my submission and will present more argument in support of this membership proposal at that time.

Yours sincerely
Jim Hopkins

The Secretary
Representation Review
c/o Environment Canterbury
P.O. Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Jim Hopkins
16 Tamar Street
South Hill
Oamaru 9400
email: jimhop46@gmail.com
Ph: 03 434 9410 or 021 114 3189

SUBMISSION TO THE REPRESENTATION REVIEW - CANTERBURY

This is a personal submission which seeks to advance some particular and personal proposals for consideration, in addition to expressing support for the submission jointly made by the southern Canterbury Councils (Waimate, Waitaki, Mackenzie and Timaru) in which a reasoned and reasonable case is made for adding a second councillor to represent this vital area of the province.

Should those considering the options available for as future Environment Canterbury representation make no other change to the proposal currently promulgated, I would urge them to support the exchange sought by the southern Councils and, for what it's worth - which I acknowledge is statistically minor - invite you to add the value of my support to the original proposal. This submission model is the case following submission.

But I would also go further and invite those reviewing Ecan representation to consider at least one other option which I would better reflects the national interest and is also less likely to result in the kind of internal stalemates and inertia that characterised Ecan's operations until legislation replaced elected members with appointed commissioners.

It is worth noting that this change coincided with the Canterbury Mayoral proposals regarding water management and was a key reason why the Mayoral Forum's water proposals were able to be successfully implemented, for the benefit not only of the entire region and its communities but also New

Zealand Inc. My view is that Ecan as an appointed entity did much more to enhance the economic productivity and environmental quality of the region than its elected counterpart ever had, largely because of the stalemate created by the almost equal number of urban and rural elected members and the apparently irresolvable differences of opinion between them.

These were not good for Canterbury or for New Zealand and some of the rather belligerent correspondence in papers like The Press hailing the new proposals as a rightful opportunity for the city to reassert itself and ensure its interests are paramount do not auger well for the future.

I believe the new representation model should recognise that the interconnected and mutually dependent nature of rural and urban Canterbury cannot be measured, captured or fairly expressed by numbers alone.

In my opinion, an electoral system based on the current Ecan Zone Committees established to ensure and enhance water quality rationing mechanisms would be the best basis for the next iteration of the Council. I note that the Act allows variations from the + or - 10% rule if effective representation "so requires" and I submit that you should require it.

With the (unexpectedly early) deadline of 4pm approaching I would simply conclude by stating that I wish to speak to my submission and will present more argument in support of this membership proposal at that time.

Yours sincerely
Jim Hopkins

From: jim hopkins
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: Message from Jim Hopkins
Date: Monday, 30 July 2018 4:35:23 PM

To Whom It May Concern - Just before 4pm this afternoon I emailed you a submission to the Representation Review currently being conducted by the Regional Council. On occasions when I have submitted to parliamentary Select Committees, there has been an acknowledgement that the submission has been received. If it is your policy to do likewise, I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of my submission.
Regards - Jim Hopkins