

Some ideas on local government reform in Wellington - neighbourhood decisions with pan-regional strategy

This paper is an initiative by a group of Wellington regional councillors to start a conversation in the Wellington region about our local government effectiveness and any potential changes that could be made to improve it.

1. Introduction

In October 2007 the Government set up a Royal Commission to investigate local government arrangements for the Auckland region. This initiative subsequently led to decisions by the incoming Government in May 2009 which saw amalgamation of eight Auckland Councils into one unitary authority and 21 local boards prior to the 2010 local government election.

Much of the case for reform put by the Royal Commission could apply equally to other parts of New Zealand. The critical and additional difference is that the new Auckland Council now exists – approximately a third of the population covered by one council, with one voice and sitting at one table with the Government and the private sector. Seventy seven governing entities cover the rest of New Zealand.

In 2010 the Wellington Mayoral Forum commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC) to report on issues and options for the Wellington region. The report put a case for change and outlined six possible options, including status quo. Subsequently, the Mayoral Forum also commissioned Martin Jenkins to draft material that could be used if necessary for a public consultation. In addition, in May 2011 the Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government (ACELG) published a report analysing the impact of consolidation in local government, primarily in Australia but also referencing some New Zealand experience. This proposal draws on all the above four reports, which are referenced in Appendix 2 of this paper.

In the Wellington region the total population is less than half a million people and there are eight Territorial Authorities (TAs) and a Regional Council. Population estimates from Statistics New Zealand at 30 June 2010 were:

- Carterton 7500
- South Wairarapa 9300
- Masterton 23,400
- Upper Hutt 41,100
- Kapiti 49,400
- Porirua 52,100
- Lower Hutt 102,700
- Wellington 197,700
- Greater Wellington Region 483,200.

2. Reasons for reform

It is useful to start with a look at changes in the circumstances of Auckland and Canterbury. Auckland has one council for the region and 21 community boards. In Canterbury, the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority - a government agency - has a significant role. Both these changes have resulted in central government (agencies and ministers) having a major and more focused relationship with these two regions.

Increasing anecdotal evidence from different sources indicates that the new Auckland arrangements at a strategic level are giving the region greater traction in its relationships with both public and private sector organisations, by virtue of critical mass and a “single voice”. The Auckland region is now better positioned than any other in the country in understanding and synthesising disparate goals, and in achieving a unified outcome.

For local government over the whole country, this emerging situation demonstrates the real benefits of a local government with the capacity to engage in high-level, strategic planning and decisions, and regional delivery.

Notwithstanding the Auckland situation, there are intrinsic reasons why Wellington should seriously consider some reforms in local government.

A region alive to opportunities and solutions

In addition to the effects of the global financial crisis being felt throughout the country, there are other current trends impacting more specifically on the Wellington region. A particular challenge is another cycle of central government downsizing, this time with particular focus on back office functions that tend to be located in Wellington. It also continues to be a challenge to retain private businesses in our region.

On the other hand, the Wellington region has specific strengths that provide opportunities. These include its concentration of intellectual capital, the quality of life it offers its residents and a thriving - but not always highly visible - science and innovation “ecosystem” that sits alongside government and financial services, and that has been described as jigsaw pieces that need to be connected.

These types of issues - whether they be damage control or seizing opportunities - require the sort of region-wide leadership and unity of purpose that is not within the scope of any current Wellington local government entity.

Wellington City Council is well resourced and has a strong record of looking after city interests. This has been valuable to the region because the city is the economic hub, providing employment for tens of thousands of people round the region and, in turn, being provided with the support of those people who commute in each day. However, WCC has neither the political nor the legal mandate to consider wider regional interests or issues beyond its own boundaries. Even though it is the biggest city in the region, it is still relatively small and is likely to struggle to deal with future issues.

One example is the attraction of events. Wellington City has rightly considered itself the events capital but now Auckland has a single, well-funded agency promoting tourism, events and economic development and has laid down the gauntlet in terms of events attraction.

Another example is the recently-announced Wynyard Quarter Innovation Precinct currently being investigated jointly by Auckland City and the Government.

These sorts of initiatives are all about putting the jigsaw pieces together – and they require a high-level strategic overview and a political mandate to deliver.

Planning

Related to this is the more formal element of planning, which contributes to the framework that enables economic and social initiatives. The Wellington region is a series of relatively small cities and towns that have a high degree of interdependence in terms of economic and social flows, but

which all operate as independent legal and planning entities. In contrast, Auckland City now has a legal mandate to undertake spatial planning. This is simply not possible in the Wellington region.

PLANNING

Current situation

- One Regional Policy Statement (developed by GW) that directs all councils what they must put in their Plans
- Six District Plans – one each for Kapiti, Porirua, Wellington, Lower Hutt, Upper Hutt and one combined Plan for the three Wairarapa councils.
- Five Regional Plans developed by the Regional Council but currently being amalgamated into one.
- A Regional Land Transport Strategy developed by Regional Transport Committee, comprising all councils and chaired/serviced by the Regional Council.
- The Wellington Regional Strategy developed jointly by all councils and overseen by WRS committee comprising all Councils and some others, with independent chair. Currently under review.
- A multiplicity of district/city growth strategies and ad hoc neighbourhood planning

Issues

- No integrated regional spatial planning framework and no entity with statutory mandate to deliver a Spatial Plan
- Multiple approaches to planning create:
 - Generally, gaps and overlaps in planning, and duplicated processes
 - Specifically, gaps between infrastructure planning and land use decisions
 - Lost opportunities
 - Uncertainty for users and increased scope for litigation, including between the regional council and TAs.

A better planning framework for Wellington would be:

- A single regional entity, mandated to develop and deliver a regional spatial plan that would provide overall framework for medium to long-term development, land use and infrastructure development, taking account of social needs, population trends and economic impacts.
- A single, integrated regional/district plan with consistent policies and approaches.
- Neighbourhood planning at local level, utilising best practice models and driven by local people (Appendix 4).

Infrastructure/resilience

The earthquakes in Canterbury and scientific records of increase in the rate of sea level rise also highlight the need to develop greater community and infrastructure resilience and to create strengthened capacity to respond to natural disasters on a regional scale. These are important issues for the Wellington region with its high seismic vulnerability and significant settlement and infrastructure at sea level.

And on a more mundane level, Wellington region has opportunities to run its infrastructure so as to optimise capacity and capability and enhance outcomes for the community.

Water is a prime example:

Current situation

- Masterton, Carterton, South Wairarapa and Kapiti all run their own water supplies independently using in-house staff, outsourced contractors/consultants, or a combination of both.
- Greater Wellington delivers bulk water to Upper Hutt, Lower Hutt, Wellington and Porirua through an in-house business unit.
- Wellington and Lower Hutt own a CCO (Capacity) that uses a combination of in-house staff and contractors/consultants to deliver their reticulated supply (i.e. to households and businesses). Capacity also delivers under contract to Upper Hutt.
- Porirua runs its own retail supply with in-house staff.

Issues

- Regional Council and Kapiti both planning supply sources and Regional Council also looking at a series of reservoirs in the region for emergency supply post-earthquake.
- Water supply grading - there are over 20 council owned, registered, water treatment plants in the region. Outside of the 4 GW plants and the Masterton plant all other supplies are either ungraded or graded D or E which indicates a high level of risk.
- All councils in the region have similar water supply issues. Each council has staff attempting to deal with these issues, often with limited funds and using the same consulting companies to solve the same problems.

Wellington would benefit from one unified water supply unit for the whole region - centralised operational control with a high level of expertise, but maintenance work carried out locally. The following benefits would accrue:

- Improved strategic capacity with a regional approach and better long term planning
- Greater cost effectiveness with economies of scale, reduced duplication and more focus on services, including:
 - Reduced and more predictable contractor and consultant costs by having greater in-house expertise and by coordinating capital projects to avoiding large fluctuations in (regional) workload
 - Reduced material costs through greater buying power and transfer of technology for improving energy and chemical efficiency
 - Reduced workload for DHB Drinking Water Assessors through dealing with one supplier with a consistent approach
- Reduced risk to public health through better management of water treatment and distribution infrastructure
- Improved long term seismic resilience, with ability to plan for effective post-event delivery
- Enhanced capability by bringing together and better utilising significant expertise currently spread round region (in instead of competing in the labour market for skills that are increasingly scarce)

3. Collaboration v consolidation

The ACELG report referenced in the introduction looked at four different forms of consolidation along a continuum of structural change:

- Regional Collaboration
- Shared Services
- Boundary Change
- Amalgamation.

These forms of consolidation are also, for all practical purposes, the options for local government in New Zealand.

Over the past four years the Wellington Mayoral Forum has undertaken a range of initiatives to explore further joint activity on the basis of “collaboration and shared services”. These initiatives have had little or only marginal success in fostering collective, cross-council decision making over the whole region, with the exception of some recent changes in the Civil Defence and Emergency Management area which are currently underway.

The proposal in this paper is that a more fundamental look at Wellington local government arrangements would position the Wellington region to more effectively meet current and future challenges.

As a generality, arguments in favour of local government consolidation revolve round enhanced strategic capacity. Arguments can be seen in detail in the Royal Commission report, the PWC report and the ACELG report on Consolidation in Local Government, referenced in S.1 above.

The ACELG report summarised the attributes of the different forms of consolidation in relation to four factors: *Potential Diminution of Local Democracy*, *Service Improvement & Innovation*, *Strategic Capacity* (including what the report describes as “economies of scope”) and *Efficiency & Economies of Scale*.

The conclusion was that the amalgamation option had the strongest link to delivering the outcome in every category except *Potential Diminution of Local Democracy*. In respect of this issue, the report said the amalgamation option had a distinct risk but that it could be managed.

There is little evidence to support the proposition that consolidation results in significant cost savings and therefore lower council rates. Rather, evidence suggests that the major gains are derived from more effective decision making and more clarity of outcome and action. In the long term, these factors in themselves should result in better value for money for ratepayers and users.

The protection and preservation of community democracy are critical issues highlighted by the ACELG report as a risk for consolidation. This issue has also generated much public debate around the Auckland reforms.

Case studies demonstrate that while consolidation achieves strategic effectiveness though economies of scale/scope and also more innovative and efficient delivery, any change must ensure that local people remain in charge of their own community issues.

Existing TAs and their elected representatives are “hard wired” into their local communities. This relationship is an essential ingredient for good local decision making on local issues and there are many demonstrable examples of how well it works in our region. Therefore it must be a major element of any future changes.

In summary, the reasons in favour of some change in the Wellington region’s local government arrangements are:

- Although we have multiple excellent examples of sound and effective local decision-making and delivery, we are unable to achieve either economies of scope or economies of scale with the size of local authorities.
- With nine sovereign authorities, we are struggling to deal effectively with major regional challenges such as infrastructure development and planning, or with issues that required strong and focused leadership.

- When the councils do work together collaboratively, it is a costly and, more importantly, time consuming process, often with a scaled-down response.

The status quo may have served the region well in the past, but with the speed of change escalating both nationally and globally, the region needs more responsive, efficient and comprehensive decision making from leadership that is mandated to integrate issues and find appropriate solutions.

The challenge is to achieve the two objectives of integrated, strategic decision making where appropriate, and local, community-based decision making where appropriate. Regardless of the form, effective community engagement is essential at all levels of local government. This is a given in any model.

Since good practice requires form to follow function, the future form of local government in the Wellington region should be determined by an examination of functions. Any judgement then needs to be based on issues such as scale, optimisation of resources, capability, integrated planning and having decisions made as close as possible to the community that they affect.

4. Principles

The Royal Commission developed four guiding principles for decisions around local government reform in Auckland. These could just as easily be applied to Wellington:

- Common identity and purpose including coordination of key services and infrastructure and the fostering of integrated planning and decision-making.
- Effectiveness including delivering maximum value within available resources and allowing services to be delivered locally where appropriate.
- Transparency and accountability in that roles must be clear (decision making regional or local).
- Responsiveness including respect for and accommodation of diversity and responsiveness to needs and preferences of different groups and local communities.

Equally relevant is the set of characteristics of good local governance developed by consultants MartinJenkins (Appendix 3). According to the MartinJenkins report, good local governance should be:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| • Strategic | • Representative and responsive |
| • Make decisions at the right place | • Transparent and accountable |
| • Integrated and coordinated | • Financially sustainable |
| • Resilient and adaptive | • Effective and efficient |

5. Functions

Based on these principles and the issues discussed above and in other documents referenced in Appendix 2, the following questions might be useful in examining which activities are appropriately delivered at a local level and which at regional level:

- Is the activity an important component of a complex or interconnected system or set of systems that should be subject to an integrated planning and/or delivery process?

Yes = regional

No = local

- How does the activity relate to community and decision making? (i.e. is it primarily relevant to a localised community or the wider regional community or both?)

Localised = local

Wider or both = regional

- What is the scale of the activity? (i.e. is it a major activity across the region and/or is there potential to combine within the region to achieve economies of scale?)

Major with potential to combine = regional

Smaller scale = local

- How does the activity relate to capability and expertise (i.e. should the necessary expertise span across all local authorities or is it specific to a particular place?)

Spans across = regional

Place specific = local

This proposal is to move to a new entity at the regional level covering all activities that fulfil the regional criteria outlined above. The remaining activities could stay with local councils that largely reflect the current TAs. Attachment 1 gives a possible division of functions, based on but not identical to the Royal Commission review. It is intended to be an indication of how the split could be made.

6. Proposal

Essentially all local decision making would be retained by the local elected representatives, who would have a key role in what the Royal Commission described as “place shaping” in their local areas through local plans and decisions. Local councils would also contribute significantly to wider regional plans and policies and would have delegated regulatory authority – for example to determine local resource consents.

On the other hand, there would be regional decision making for regional and cross boundary issues, major infrastructure, networks and planning (including spatial plans, environmental plans and transport).

There is a group of functions that could be delivered at either regional or local level.

7. Form

When Auckland local government was restructured, all institutional arrangements current at the time were abandoned. Rather than copying this so-called “super city” model, this proposal is to build on the existing structure and to transition to the new model in a way that minimises disruption, strengthens the cohesion and strategic capacity of the region, but protects local decision making on local issues.

The proposal is for a new entity - a unitary council (for the purposes of this paper called the Wellington Council) would be the rating and planning entity for the region and which would deliver the regional functions identified in Attachment 1.

The Greater Wellington Regional Council would be abolished and current TAs would be reconstituted as local councils (described as Community Councils in this proposal), delivering community functions and funded by the Wellington Council.

In developing the model, there would be an opportunity to rationalise some of the current TA boundaries, without starting completely afresh. For example, it may be considered worthwhile by the community to amalgamate the three Wairarapa TAs and possibly the two Hutt Valley TAs.

On the other hand, it may also be considered desirable to maintain current boundaries or, in some cases, to create even smaller Community Councils. One example of the latter might be Wellington City Council (WCC), the largest TA in the region with a population close to 200,000. WCC also contains the regional CBD, which is the centre of economic activity for the whole region. It is essential that any new model gives due attention to the economic health of the CBD. Decisions by businesses to locate or remain there are intimately connected with the dynamics of the city and its urban design and there is a need for special focus on preserving these attributes.

It might therefore be worthwhile exploring, for example, the creation of more than one Community Council in the current WCC area. For example, division into three would see a north-western Council, clustering round the hubs of Karori and Johnsonville, a central city Council, (approximately within the town belt) and a south-eastern Council, clustering round the hubs of Newtown and Kilbirnie.

This proposal does not advocate exact population equity amongst Community Councils. Experience shows that good representation relies less on a strict arithmetical formula than it does on the capability of elected people and organisations, as well as local people's knowledge of Councils and boundaries that roughly reflect identifiable communities.

Current community boards are voluntary mechanisms and not every council in the region uses them. This proposal would allow the Community Councils to elect to have community boards if they wished to delegate some responsibilities. Well functioning neighbourhood groups, whether they be Community Councils or other organisations, would give any new structure a firm grounding in local communities and ensure avenues for community voices to be heard and, where appropriate, for communities to make decisions about their own places.

Community Councils would largely continue to utilise the existing TA premises (offices, service centres etc). Given the seismic status of many Council Head Office premises in the Wellington region, this re-organisation would also provide an opportunity for cost-effective building replacements or upgrades.

8. Governance

There are currently 87 councillors and 8 Mayors across the 8 TAs in the region and 13 regional councillors elected to GW, with one elected by the councillors as Chair.

Under this proposal, Wellington Council members would be elected by wards with boundaries coinciding with the community councils. By way of example, if it were decided that Wellington Council membership would be one elected representative for approximately 50,000 of population, the numbers might be:

- Wairarapa, Porirua and Kapiti – one each (currently Porirua combined with Tawa has 2)
- Hutt Valley 3
- Wellington 4 (currently 5)

The leader of the Wellington Council would be elected at large, giving a total of 11 members. If the councillor/population ratio were halved, ward representation would double and the Wellington Council would have 20 councillors, plus the leader elected at large.

The extent of the powers and responsibilities held by the leader of the Wellington Council would need to be determined. This proposal is that the office would hold more executive power than do current Mayors but that such powers would not need to be as extensive as those held by the Mayor of Auckland.

Community Council membership would also be ward based and would approximately reflect population and identifiable communities where possible. It could be that the decision is to have a smaller ratio of elected members to population on the Wellington Council and higher ratio on the Community Councils.

This proposal is for the leader of each Community Council to be elected by its members. There are then two options – either that person would continue as a ward representative but also act as leader, or the next-highest polling candidate for that ward would take that person’s seat, freeing up the leader to provide overall direction for the district..

9. Funding

Under this model there would be only one rating entity – the Wellington Council. Community Councils would be funded through rolling three-year agreements with the Wellington Council, which would be subject to public consultation, as would the Wellington Council’s plans etc.

At present there are a number of different targeted rates in the region but the majority of TAs and the Regional Council rate on capital value.

The Wellington City Council has historically had a rating differential between its residential and CBD commercial properties. This provides the city with an income that is not inconsequential and “keeping the money in Wellington” has been noted as an issue by Wellingtonians when discussing any future form of local government in the region. Any funding formula could be based on an agreement that maintains an agreed percentage of all rates to be spent in the area in which they are raised (i.e. targeted rates). Targeted rates are already used extensively by local government entities (for example the regional stadium rate is targeted by distance form the venue) and the concept would be familiar to most ratepayers.

10. Administration

This proposal is for a single, unified administration, headed by a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for the region. All corporate services and major functional activities would be delivered centrally, through senior managers engaged by the Wellington Council.

Each Community Council would require staff to deliver the local services for which they are responsible. It is also envisaged that there would be a General Manager for each Community Council to ensure the co-ordinated delivery of both local and regional services. These GMs and the local staff would all be employed by the Wellington Council.

11. Maori representation

Maori representation in Auckland has been a significant political issue. This is essentially an issue for the tangata whenua and local community to decide and should not be a decision of central government, unless that decision were a policy being applied to all councils across the country. There are many models that allow for tangata whenua representation and these need to be explored in detail. Therefore it is proposed that the issue of Maori representation be determined by the new Wellington Council in consultation with the mana whenua iwi of the region and the wider community.

12. Council controlled organisations

Currently there are a number of Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs)¹ amongst Councils in the region though the activities they cover are not as extensive as for the new Auckland Council.

The CCO mechanism should be used sparingly, especially when the activity is funded by public money and/or the service being delivered is a monopoly. CCOs do create another layer of cost and bureaucracy and remove the decision making from elected representatives who are accountable to the public. Wellington has a number of examples of direct council delivery of services via business units (with or without a separate balance sheet) that have standout records of tight fiscal management and excellent delivery.

It is proposed that the new Wellington Council decide which areas require CCO delivery. All existing CCOs would continue to exist on day one and would have the same transition timetable as council functions.

13. Transition process and possible timing

This proposal does not suggest where the actual decision to change the model would be made (possibilities are: central government, local government or community or a combination of these) but, rather, suggests a process.

A detailed critical path for transition will need to be developed. This proposal suggests that a major external transition authority would not be necessary under this scenario (unlike Auckland) and the changes could be overseen by people elected to governance roles. Assuming there would be a reasonable degree of crossover from current elected representatives to those in the new model, this approach, together with the timing suggested below, would enable much institutional memory to be retained. It may also be a more cost-effective transition than that which occurred in Auckland.

The next local body election is not till the end of 2013. If a decision to change were made in 2012, this could be followed by community consultation on details and legislation by (at the latest) mid 2013. This legislation would be able to draw on the Auckland legislation where appropriate. It would provide for the setting up of a new Wellington Council and for the abolition of all existing councils in the region at the time of the 2013 local government election. TAs would be re-constituted as Community Councils within the new Wellington Council. The Greater Wellington Regional Council would not be reconstituted. All its activities and staff would be automatically transferred to the new Wellington Council and would be rationalised as part of the development of the new Council (i.e. some of its activities may be passed to Community Councils others would remain with the new council).

The new Wellington Council would be elected at the 2013 local government election. Over a period of time, delivery of the “regional” activities of the former TAs would be progressively transferred to the Wellington Council, with the new Community Councils retaining local delivery functions.

There would need to be a time limit for the transition. An obvious option would be to target 30 June in the year of the following election – i.e. 30 June 2016 – as the deadline for completion of the full transition, including integration of rates.

¹ CCOs are business units run at arm's length from councils with their own board of directors - in which one or more local authorities control 50 per cent or more of the votes, or have the right to appoint 50 per cent or more of the directors (or trustees).

A transition unit within the Wellington Council would be required but arguably it would be less expensive and more aligned with continued delivery than has been the case in Auckland.

Two critical early issues would be the appointment of a CEO and the decision on the management structure of the new Wellington Council. This proposal is for a CEO short list to be developed prior to the 2013 local government election and for the new Wellington Council to make a final selection immediately after the election. The new CEO would be expected to be available virtually immediately and candidates would need to be aware of this. The new CEO would work on structure for proposal to the new Wellington Council.

14. Oversight

Clearly this process scenario would require a considerable amount of preliminary thinking and community consultation. It is proposed that this work, which would be required prior to the 2013 local body election, could be overseen by a governance group drawn from current Mayors/Chair and CEOs in the region, together with central government appointees. A small secretariat would be required for this but as outlined above the bulk of the actual transition activity would occur following the election.

15. Benefits of this model and process

There are several benefits of this model as an alternative to abandoning all current arrangements and starting from “ground zero”.

- The model creates critical mass and expertise in the areas that require an integrated, strategic approach (planning, infrastructure, networks etc).
- Local decision making on community issues is retained, as is the existing physical presence in communities, without setting up a completely new network of community councils or boards. Citizens would still know where to go for assistance or advice.
- Institutional memory and delivery momentum are retained at both levels during the transition process.
- Transition costs would be able to be held.
- The process provides time to learn more from the current Auckland situation.

Appendix One – Examples of distribution of functions between regional and local entities. In a number of these examples, overall policy might be determined by the regional entity but operations would be run locally²

Activity	Local function	Regional function	Either or both (depends on size of activity, location, scope)
Air quality control (environmental and health)		X	
Animal control, impounding, welfare	X		
Art galleries			X
Arts and culture			X
Asset and liability management			X
Regional Investments		X	
Beach control	X		
Beautification	X		
Biosecurity		X	
Broadband		X	
Brothels – control of location and signage	X		
Building consents processing, advice, and compliance			X
Business support		X	
By-laws (wide variety) and enforcement			X
Cemeteries			X
Citizen and customer contact			X
Citizens Advice Bureaux	X		
Citizenship services	X		
Civil defence emergency management		X	
Climate change		X	
Coastal environment dev. control		X	
Coastal planning and management		X	
Community centres,			X

² The table is based on (but not identical to) table 3.2 in the Royal Commission Report on Auckland Governance.

Activity	Local function	Regional function	Either or both (depends on size of activity, location, scope)
halls, and facilities			
Community development, partnerships, services, and support	X		
Community grants and levies	X		
Community notice boards	X		
Community planning	X		
Corporate services		X	
Council-controlled organisations		X	
Crematorium			X
Crime prevention		X	
Cultural heritage conservation			X
Democracy services		X	
District planning		X	
District promotion			X
Dog control	X		
Economic development		X	
Education and employment advocacy		X	
Entertainment and cultural venues			X
Environmental health control			X
Environmental monitoring		X	
Events promotion			X
Farming in parks		X	
Film facilitation		X	
Fire protection			X
Flood protection		X	
Food premises licensing	X		
Forests		X	
Gambling and gaming machine policy		X	
Gardens	X		

Activity	Local function	Regional function	Either or both (depends on size of activity, location, scope)
Graffiti control and removal	X		
Grants			X
Harbourmaster		X	
Hazard register		X	
Hazardous substances controls		X	
Hazards management		X	
Health – advocacy and programmes		X	
Holiday parks			X
Land development		X	
Land drainage		X	
Land information memoranda (LIMs)		X	
Land management		X	
Land use planning		X	
Landfills		X	
Libraries		X	
Liquor licensing	X		
Māori relations			X
Marina operations	X		
Migrant settlement facilitation		X	
Museums		X	
Natural heritage conservation		X	
Noise control	X		
Parking control	X		
Parking places		X	
Parks and reserves		X	
Passenger transport policy and facilities		X	
Pensioner housing		X	
Planning		X	
Playgrounds			X
Pollution response		X	
Pounds	X		

Activity	Local function	Regional function	Either or both (depends on size of activity, location, scope)
Property information memoranda (PIMs)		X	
Property management		X	
Public information			X
Public transport planning		X	
Quarries		X	
Rating		X	
Recreation and sport programmes		X	
Recreation centres	X		
Recycling		X	
Refuse transfer stations		X	
Regional and district leadership		X	
Regional growth planning		X	
Regional parks		X	
Regional planning		X	
Regional social development strategy		X	
Resource consents processing and monitoring			X
Revenue collection & management		X	
Road asset management		X	
Road construction		X	
Road maintenance		X	
Road safety		X	
Safety in public places			X
Shareholdings and investments		X	
Sister city programmes		X	
Sports grounds and venues			X
Stormwater management		X	
Street furniture and trees	X		
Swimming pools			X

Activity	Local function	Regional function	Either or both (depends on size of activity, location, scope)
Toilets – public	X		
Tourist facilities and information	X		
Town centre and business precincts promotion	X		
Transport network management		X	
Transport policy and planning		X	
Treasury and debt management		X	
Urban and rural design		X	
Vehicle testing station	X		
Visitor services			X
Walking and cycling strategy		X	
Walkways			X
War memorials	X		
Waste management		X	
Wastewater		X	
Water quality monitoring		X	
Water supply		X	
Wharf management		X	
Zoo		X	
Port		X	
Council owned housing		X	

Appendix 2 – Key Reports

- *Royal Commission on Auckland Governance*, Hon Peter Salmon, Dame Margaret Bazley, David Shand, March 2009.
- *Wellington Regional Councils Governance Review*, PricewaterhouseCoopers, October 2010.
- *Consolidation in Local Government: A Fresh Look*, Australian Centre of Excellence for Local Government, Local Government Association of South Australia, Local Government New Zealand, May 2011.
- *Wellington Region Governance – draft material for consultation*, MartinJenkins, September 2011.

Appendix 3 - Characteristics of good local governance (MartinJenkins)

Characteristics and criteria developed by MartinJenkins – to use when evaluating the suitability of the current governance arrangements and potential changes to them:

- **Strategic:** capable of generating a shared vision for the region, and developing and delivering on regional and local strategies and plans to make it happen in a reasonable timeframe
- **Make decisions at the right place:** provide for region-wide decisions to be taken regionally and local decisions to be taken locally
- **Integrated and co-ordinated:** enable an integrated approach to key regional networks, infrastructure, assets, amenities, and services; making the most of the scarce resources and capabilities available across the region
- **Resilient and adaptive:** Are able to accommodate changing circumstances, including unexpected and high impact events, and are resilient into the future
- **Representative and responsive:** represents and can be used by diverse communities to serve their own needs and aspirations; provides individual citizens with opportunities to access decision makers and to influence decisions on the issues that matter to them
- **Transparent and accountable:** are transparent and provide clear accountabilities for delivering outcomes, using public funds, and stewardship of public assets
- **Financially sustainable:** cost-efficient, financially viable and have adequate and appropriate funding tools to support activities
- **Effective and efficient:** deliver the core local government services to citizens effectively and efficiently

Appendix 4 – Neighbourhood Planning – how does it work?

The essence of local democracy in the Wellington region must be preserved in any union of the Local Government structure. In the two tier model proposed, the concept of community councils is a vital element of maintaining local decision making on those functions or facilities that relate uniquely to that geographic area.

However, even cities and districts tend to be a collection of very diverse settlements and “villages”, each with its own aspirations and character. Most people identify strongly with their local community, with their sense of place influenced and enhanced by their lifestyle experience in that community. Thus many people will say to others in the region “I live in Wainuiomata, Raumati or Island Bay” rather than “Hutt City, Kapiti or Wellington City”.

Discovering and cementing the strength of village-based identity and leadership is critical and will improve Wellington region residents’ connection to and influence of local community decision making. Local input into decision making can in fact be enhanced in a new model of local government in the Wellington region by providing a facilitative framework and resources to enable it to happen.

Across the region there are a number of examples of focussed and effective local planning. One of them is Porirua City which, over the last seven years, has been successful in enabling distinct communities to progress their local community identities as they see fit.

The Council recognised that these villages were the main connectors to the experience of local lifestyle, as well as the connection that residents feel to the larger city entity. Porirua City Council decided that it was vital that villages were enhanced and protected and, most importantly, that residents could have influence over changes.

With council support, a village representative group (made up of residents associations, community groups and interested people) gathers ideas from the wider community about what important aspects they value about their neighbourhood and how their experience of living there could be improved. This work is done through street meetings, surveys, questionnaires and feedback from community events.

It all comes together in a village plan that sets out the community vision for its neighbourhood. That plan is made up of projects and a timeline that is then presented to the council for approval and appropriate funding.

As projects are undertaken, a partnership agreement is drawn up between the community, the council and outside agencies that sets out timelines, responsibilities and expectations. Residents drive the process with the council, volunteering project management, labour and generally donating their time, energy and skills.

A good example of this approach is Waitangirua in Eastern Porirua - one of the most economically deprived communities in the Wellington region. A rambling, unkempt 1970s shopping mall that was once full of life but had become largely empty, was the focus. It was fronted by an enormous carpark that separated the road from the Mall and that had, over time, severed a connection between community spaces.

The community wanted a solution to this and to build a shared asset that reflected the cultural diversity of the area and something that all the community had a stake in creating.

Over 400 local residents were engaged in planning and developing the new \$1M Waitangirua Park.

The most impressive community space in Porirua City was developed so families could enjoy a multitude of activities: basketball, barbeques, and playgrounds with a real sense of place, developed by the community for its own enjoyment.

A year later, its pristine condition is testament to the fact the community designed and built it themselves. The 'lift' it has given Waitangirua is huge. It's theirs; it's a centrepiece and place they can come together.

Porirua's successful village planning – which has been recognised internationally - provides a model for the rest of the region to guarantee community participation and influence over what happens in their own unique communities.