

**Submission Number:** 50

**Response ID:** 1399974

**First Name:** Matthew

**Last Name:** Baird

---

cheesionz 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)**

The current split of Christchurch is inadequate based on the actual communities of interest. For example, putting Fendalton with Linwood does not align with this goal. These people have very different needs from ECan including flood protection and public transport. Putting them together means all their needs will not be effectively heard. That said, the actual number of constituencies seems reasonable.

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

No

#### **Please provide any comments below (optional)**

No issue with the names. As noted above, the boundaries for certain constituencies does not seem appropriate. Also, North Canterbury has a growing proportion of urban, which might better be merged with north Christchurch in a different split.

#### **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)**

The ratio of North and South Canterbury seems very unfair (both in over representation and under representation).

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

Reconsider the simpler North/South Canterbury split (rather than North, Mid, South) as this seems to provide a far more even distribution of population in the rural/semi-rural options. Also, reconsider the groupings of wards in the Christchurch constituencies so they actually group communities of interest.

**Public Hearings**

**Please tick those that apply**

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission;