

Submission Number: 51

Response ID: 1399991

First Name: Katia

Last Name: De Lu

Kat88 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)

I am concerned that Christchurch's east gets split up into various different constituencies. The people in the east of Christchurch are a distinct community of interest, particularly with regard to many key ECan issues. For example, their homes are more at risk of flooding from climate change, and their lower socio-economic status means they have greater need for quality, affordable public transport. Disenfranchising this community by breaking it up and lumping them in with various unrelated communities denies this community effective representation.

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)

As noted above, the lack of a Christchurch East constituency disenfranchises an important community of interest. Also, the Christchurch Central constituency is completely nonsensical; putting Fendalton - one of Christchurch's wealthiest and most privileged communities in the same constituency as Linwood - one of Christchurch's most socio-economically disadvantaged - is clearly not going to yield fair outcomes in terms of representation. These two communities have little or nothing in common, and in many cases (e.g. public transport) are likely to have opposing views.

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)

I am deeply concerned about the huge over-representation of North Canterbury and the huge under-representation of South Canterbury. It's simply not fair that the former should receive 2 councillors for their population of 75,800, while the latter - with a population that's not much smaller at 61,320 - only gets 1, especially when other constituencies with 2 councillors have populations around 100,000. No community - urban or rural - should have significantly more or less representation than any other. The +/- 10% rule exists for a good reason.

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

1. Revise the Christchurch constituencies so that Christchurch East gets fair representation as a community of interest. 2. Revise the Canterbury constituencies to ensure that no constituency (urban or rural) is dramatically over- or under- represented. Perhaps consider something like the 2 Canterbury constituency model in points 36, 37, and 38 of the proposal document, which appeared much more proportional.

Public Hearings

Please tick those that apply

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