

**From:** John Sanders  
**To:** [Mailroom Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** Representation Review Appeals and Objections  
**Date:** Saturday, 29 September 2018 6:15:23 PM  
**Attachments:** [Ecan Representation Review Submission\\_2909.doc](#)

---

Good afternoon

Attached is a submission from Water Rights Trust regarding the Representation Review.

Thanks and regards

John Sanders  
Secretary  
Water Rights Trust



## WATER RIGHTS TRUST

61 Major Hornbrook Road  
Mt Pleasant  
Christchurch 8081

### **Objection to ECan Representation Review decision of 23 August 2018.**

**Submitted by the “Water Rights Trust”**

#### **Preamble:**

The Water Rights Trust was incorporated on 25 November 2002 to work to protect, maintain and restore Canterbury’s rivers, streams, wetlands and aquifers. Its objectives include the following:

1. To restore, maintain, protect, and enhance rivers, stream resources, wetlands, and aquifers in Canterbury, and also in other parts of New Zealand as our trustees may decide, whether on its own account or in conjunction with any other person or persons, for appreciation and recreational enjoyment by present and future generations.
2. To encourage and provide opportunities for interest groups, mana whenua, persons, corporate bodies, and statutory agencies within Canterbury, and also in other parts of New Zealand as the Board may decide, to take an active interest in promoting the objects of the Trust.
3. To inform and educate persons who have been or are affected by the abstraction, degradation, alteration, change, restoration, maintenance, protection, and enhancement of rivers, stream resources, wetlands and aquifers.
4. To promote the recognition and support of the Trust’s objectives by government, local authorities, other statutory or incorporated bodies, regional and national organisations, and the community.

#### **Our Objection:**

The Trust’s objection is based on the principle that democracy means that individuals have fair representation on governing bodies. The recent decision by ECan to increase the number of councillors to 14, means that some regions are under-represented and others over-represented by more than what could be considered fair. The Local Electoral Act 2001 requires that electoral representation (councillor to resident ratio) within a ward should be within +/- 10% of other wards. The consequences of the 23 August decision mean that two of the Christchurch wards are under-represented: by

15% (North East) and 18% (Central), whilst two of the other Canterbury wards are over-represented: by 13% (North Canterbury) and 30% (South Canterbury). The remaining 3 wards are within the recommended 10% rule. This means that each Christchurch resident's vote is worth about 0.8 of (or 20% less than) the votes of other Canterbury residents. This is not fair representation and another solution should be found such as either increasing the representation within Christchurch or rearranging the non-Christchurch wards so that there is no need for an extra councillor as proposed by ECan.



John Sanders (Secretary)

Email address      [j.b.sanders@xtra.co.nz](mailto:j.b.sanders@xtra.co.nz)