



Submissions Analysis of Wellington Region Governance Review

12 August 2011

Draft Report

MARTIN^IJENKINS

Preface

This report has been prepared for the Wellington region's councils by Susan Shipley and Sonia Ogier from MartinJenkins (Martin, Jenkins & Associates Limited). It has been peer reviewed by Nick Davis.

Our goal is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisations we work with. We do this by providing strategic advice and operational support in the following areas:

- Strategy, Transformation & Performance
- Policy & Economics
- Evaluation & Research.

MartinJenkins was established in 1993 and is 100% New Zealand owned. It is governed by executive directors Doug Martin, Kevin Jenkins, Michael Mills, Nick Davis and Nick Hill, plus independent directors Peter Taylor (Chair) and Sir John Wells.

Contents

Introduction..... 3

Key findings 8

Appendix 1 Submissions process used by each council 20

Appendix 2 List of submitters by council 22

Tables

Table 1: Submissions received by each council 6

Table 2: Submitters’ views on whether or not change is needed to the status quo 11

Table 3: Preferred option for future governance arrangements 17

Introduction

Our brief

- 1 Last year the Wellington Mayoral Forum commissioned PriceWaterhouseCoopers to review the current local governance arrangements to establish whether they are optimal for the Wellington region and its communities into the future. The report analysed the present arrangements, highlighted a number of issues and opportunities, and identified six possible scenarios for the future.
- 2 Each of the region's nine councils (four city councils, four district councils and one regional council) held a consultation process on the PriceWaterhouseCoopers report and 165 written submissions were received from the public. MartinJenkins was commissioned by the Mayoral Forum to produce an analysis of those written submissions gathered from across the region.

Overview

- 3 This report summarises the key findings of an analysis of 165 written submissions from the public on the PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC) report on its review of Wellington region governance. It includes important background and contextual information about the submissions process. As the submissions from organisations are generally more in-depth than those received from individuals, the analysis framework was based on the 28 submissions received from organisations.
- 4 There was a different pattern of public response across the different councils' areas. There was a very low level of response to the invitations from the Hutt City Council, the Upper Hutt City Council and the Kapiti Coast District Council for public submissions. This means that there may be some big gaps in the overall picture provided by this analysis. The particular process followed by each council and the additional information provided may also have influenced the way that people responded. There is large variation in the depth and breadth of responses. This reflects the broad and open-ended invitation to the public to comment on the PWC report. As a result, there are significant limitations on the use of the data for statistical analysis and this report provides largely qualitative information. However, it does include indicative patterns of responses which provide insights into the concerns, issues and ideas conveyed in the public submissions.
- 5 The submissions from across the Wellington region show a widely held view that change should be determined by and within the region rather than by central government. However, there is no single vision for the Wellington region in the future and no shared view on what submitters want from their local and regional government.

- 6 The submissions analysis found that a majority of submissions (69% of those that state a view) express a preference for change in regional governance arrangements rather than the status quo. Submissions from several organisations identify opportunities for the region in embarking on a programme of change and want the Mayoral Forum to establish some momentum around it. However, many submitters (individuals and organisations) are concerned that the PWC report does not provide the evidence base for major change and want more information and analysis of the various structural options before they come to a view. So the discussion of submitters' preferred options for change in this report is indicative only.
- 7 All submissions were analysed from the viewpoint of whether the submission supports the retention of the status quo or one of the other Options in the PWC report. Most submitters indicate that they see the need for change in governance arrangements but they record a fairly even spread of preferred options for future governance arrangements (using the six Options in the PWC report).
- 8 This report looks at the stated reasons for the need for change to regional governance arrangements and the benefits that might be expected from that change, according to the submissions. These include:
- Stronger regional leadership
 - Better management of relationship with central government
 - Better regional decision making (transport, water in all its forms, natural disaster response) and strategies that deliver results
 - A single regulatory authority (or one set of regulations) to reduce compliance costs and make interacting with councils easier for business and developers
 - Improved efficiency – economies of scale, reduced duplication, increased focus on services provided and improved financial management
 - Improved capability - more technical expertise, enhanced strategic management.
- 9 Submitters who support retention of the status quo seriously challenge some of the reasons for change generally cited. The efficiency benefits of amalgamations are particularly contentious, and for many, that issue forms the major basis of their rejection of the findings of the PWC report. Supporters of the status quo are not necessarily arguing a case for 'no change' at all but they are not in favour of structural change at this time.
- 10 Some commonly held views are evident in the submissions. **Wairarapa and Wellington** are seen by people across the region as distinctly different, predominantly rural and urban areas respectively, separated by geography and lifestyle – they are understood as different communities of interest. This leads most submitters to the view that Wellington and Wairarapa's local government should remain separate to a

large degree. Wairarapa submitters are most in favour of a change to the status quo in local governance arrangements, compared to the other council areas.

- 11 **Business people and business organisations** across the region can see opportunities for reducing compliance costs and increasing the ease of doing business, by councils either agreeing one set of planning regulations or combining into fewer authorities.
- 12 **Residents'** submissions reflect a concern that any local government changes will lead to a review of the current rates system and of local service provision. Many are concerned about the possibility of higher rates and/or reduced services and want to see some analysis of the potential impacts of the change options before any decisions are made.
- 13 Finally, both opponents and supporters of structural change submit that 'local democracy' must be maintained - and assisted to flourish under any new governance arrangements. Many submissions make the case that effective local democracy and community participation are more important than economic and financial considerations when evaluating any proposals for change.

Submissions process

- 14 The Mayoral Forum published the PWC report on Wellington Regional Governance and invited feedback from the public, through various media.
- 15 The process for consulting on the findings of the PWC report varied. Some councils advertised the consultation on their websites and some in local newspapers. Some Councils also presented additional information and analysis. Some held public meetings in which speakers gave their views on the Options presented in the PWC report and others simply relied on a paper-based submissions process. Appendix 1 has a table that sets out the details.
- 16 165 unique submissions were received in total. At least 15 of these submissions were sent to multiple councils but they are counted only once in Table 1, against the local council (in many cases, a duplicate was sent to the Greater Wellington Regional Council).

Table 1: Submissions received by each council

	Individuals	Organisations	Total	Percentage of total
Wairarapa district councils (3)	25	4	29	18%
Wellington City Council	8	3	11	7%
Porirua City Council	47	5	52	32%
Greater Wellington Regional Council	43	13	66	40%
Upper Hutt City Council	2	2	4	2%
Hutt City Council	2	-	2	1%
Kapiti Coast District Council	-	1	1	>1%
Total	127	28	165	100%

- 17 Significantly, there were very different levels of response across the different councils' areas. The highest number of submissions was to the Greater Wellington Regional Council (66), followed by Porirua City Council (52) and the three Wairarapa district councils (29). Wellington City Council received 11 submissions. Upper Hutt City, Hutt City and Kapiti District Councils received fewer than five submissions each. The vast majority of submissions were made by individuals and 28 were from organisations. The latter included 15 community organisations, six business organisations, the Public Service Association, three political organisations/representatives and three service providers. A complete list of submitters by council is included as Appendix 2.
- 18 The particular process followed by each council and the additional information provided may have influenced the way that people responded. For example, some submitters focus exclusively on their choice of the structural Options set out in the PWC report while others debate the scope of the governance review and argue that it is premature to be deciding on any options and structures.

- 19 The submissions received are from interested individuals and organisations that decided to respond to the councils' invitation, and are not based on a statistically representative sample of the population in the Wellington region. As might be expected, they provide a wide range of perspectives on Wellington governance issues and on the need for any change to local government structures. There is large variation in the depth and breadth of responses. This reflects the broad and open-ended invitation to the public to comment on the PWC report.
- 20 In these circumstances, there are substantial limitations on our ability to draw any statistically-based conclusions from the submissions received. The constraints on the use of the data we have gathered from the public submissions are acknowledged. While we have carefully categorised the submitters' views and main concerns as objectively as possible, this does not provide a reliable basis for any quantitative analysis beyond a count of responses on key points. Therefore this submissions report largely provides qualitative information, indicative of the range of submitters' views on major concerns and issues raised by the PWC report.

Key findings

- 21 Many submitters welcomed the opportunity to be involved in the debate about the future governance of the Wellington region and commented on the importance of 'getting it right'. There is a widely held view that change should be determined by and within the region rather than by central government. However, there is no single vision for the Wellington region and no shared view on what submitters want from their local and regional government.
- 22 The majority of submissions (69% of those that state a view) express a preference for change in regional governance arrangements rather than the status quo.¹ Submissions from several organisations identify opportunities for the region in embarking on a programme of change and want the Mayoral Forum to establish some momentum around it. However, many submitters (individuals and organisations) are concerned that the PWC report does not provide the evidence base for major change and want more information and analysis - particularly of the costs and benefits of the various options - before they come to a view. Many also make the point that a commitment must be made by all the councils to engage in further consultation with the public in the region before any decisions are made.
- 23 An overview of all the submissions indicates that the scope and focus of the current debate is unclear and many people are confused about what is being proposed. Their comments and concerns cover governance frameworks and principles, local government structures and accountability, rates systems and delivery of services, and many other things. Some are clearly reacting to a perceived imminent threat of the imposition of a super-city model like Auckland's. Others take the view that there is no point in changing anything unless it can be demonstrated to be more cost-effective than the status quo.
- 24 The Options described in the PWC report and expanded on in the GWRC papers provide a focus for the discussion for some submitters but they are not seen necessarily as discrete options, and some options may have been misunderstood. Because there is no common view on the drivers of change, or agreement on the principles and criteria against which the Options might be evaluated, many submitters found it difficult to decide on a preferred Option. This means that the discussion of the submitters' preferred options for change in this report is indicative only. Many submissions emphasised that much more information is required and thorough consultation with the community must take place before any options are ready to be put to a decision.

¹ It is noted that the status quo also includes opportunities for change, while retaining current structures.

25 An understanding of all aspects of the issues around 'community of interest' is a key part of any decision about proposals for change to governance arrangements. The submissions show that people have very different expectations about what it means to live in the Wellington region or in a part of it. Individual residents have different expectations of local government and value different things about living in their local area. Discussions about local government reorganisation go to the heart of people's sense of place and of 'belonging'. This presents an important diversity of views and frameworks which are inherently difficult to capture in a descriptive report such as this.

26 Despite all of the above factors, some commonly held views are evident in the submissions:

Wairarapa and Wellington are seen by people across the region as distinctly different, predominantly rural and urban areas respectively, separated by geography and lifestyle – they are understood as different communities of interest. This leads most submitters to the view that Wellington and Wairarapa's local government should remain separate to a large degree. (It is also generally acknowledged that Wellington and Wairarapa are economically bound together and that regional transport links are joint in nature).

Wairarapa – most Wairarapa submissions (84%) state that there is a need for change. Around half of Wairarapa submitters are in favour of combining their three district councils, whether as an end point or as an intermediate stage in the evolution of local government. Submitters that want to keep the status quo express support for greater collaboration between existing councils.

Porirua – many submitters express concerns about losing their local identity in a larger regional entity which would be dominated by Wellington city. Some submissions also make suggestions for mitigating this, such as the retention of the Village Planning programme and its integration into regional planning.

Business people and business organisations across the region can see opportunities for reducing compliance costs and increasing the ease of doing business, by councils either agreeing one set of planning regulations or combining into fewer authorities.

Residents anticipate that any local government changes will lead to a review of the current rates system and of local service provision. Many are concerned about the possibility of higher rates and/or reduced services and want to see some analysis of the potential impacts of the change options before any decisions are made.

Local democracy – there is also a lot of concern expressed by both opponents and supporters of change that 'local democracy' must be maintained - and assisted to flourish under any new governance arrangements. Many submissions make the case

that effective local democracy and community participation are more important than economic and financial considerations when evaluating proposals for change.

The need for change

- 27 Many submissions are critical of the PWC report on a number of grounds but in particular for applying an economic or efficiency focus to questions of regional governance. Several challenged the PWC report's assertion that larger authorities and organisations are more efficient and therefore could potentially achieve savings and be more cost effective. Many submitters make the point that 'bigger is not necessarily better'. Many also take the view that the political representation and community engagement functions of local government are more important considerations than organisational efficiency.
- 28 For some, the PWC report provides a convincing case for the need for change. However, many submitters are concerned that the report does not provide enough information, evidence or analysis of the options to enable an informed debate to happen. For these submitters, people need access to:
- A clear case for the need for change which is evidenced-based and independent.
 - An agreed set of criteria to assess options against (suggestions made include Local Government Act, GWRC principles of governance, PSA guideline developed for Auckland, HPSTED², ecologic principles for collaborative governance).
 - Options that clearly articulate how issues will be addressed and therefore what outcomes should be expected. This should be backed up by evidence-based analysis including costs and benefits analysis.
 - Other options should be presented that are not based on structural change (e.g. boundary changes). And all options need to be further detailed (e.g. they should include proposed electoral processes and voting mechanisms – these are intertwined issues).
- 29 There is some confusion among submitters about the reasons for proposing changes to Wellington regional governance now, and who is driving the change. There is some concern that PWC did not consult with residents as part of their consultation with stakeholders in the development of the report. There is a fear that a short-term perspective is being taken when there is a need to think long-term about the governance of the Wellington region. This led some submitters to choose the status quo option and advocate that more time be taken to consider the longer term issues before embarking on major change. Others believe that if they don't choose to

² Regional Public Health recommends using HPSTED, a framework with 14 dimensions that link environmental design and community health and wellbeing.

support a structural change option now, they may miss the opportunity to have some say in the future (which is going to happen regardless). So people's perceptions of where we are in the change process and why, and whether the focus is firmly on the long term benefits of change or on reacting to short term pressures, may have had an impact on their submissions and choice of Options at this time.

- 30 All 165 written submissions were examined with respect to whether they see a need for change to governance arrangements for the Wellington region or not. Of those, 145 give information which is able to be categorised and are distributed as follows:

Table 2: Submitters' views on whether or not change is needed to the status quo

Yes, there is a need for change to the status quo	100	(69%)
No, there is no need to change the status quo	26	(18%)
Undecided but not opposed to change	8	(5.5%)
No indication given	11	(7.5%)
TOTAL	145	(100%)

- 31 Wairarapa submitters are most in favour of a change to the status quo (21 out of 25 submitters or 84%) and Porirua submitters least in favour of change (26 out of 43 submitters or 60%). Submitters to the Greater Wellington Regional Council (37 out of 56 or 66%) were close to the average across all councils. Based on only 10 submissions to Wellington City Council, submitters are 80% in favour of change to the status quo. The other councils received fewer than five submissions each.

Reasons for the need for change

- 32 These are typical points made by submitters who see a need for change to the status quo:
- Local government is too fragmented - an amalgamation of the three district councils would strengthen the Wairarapa
 - A structure that brings the Wairarapa councils together will be more efficient and improve the capability available
 - It is imperative to move away from the status quo which is too expensive and lacking coordinated leadership to carry the region forward

- A new model needs to be efficient and effective, provide an overall plan for the region and have a coherent structure
- Businesses operating across the Wellington region currently face compliance costs associated with the need to understand and deal with different district plans, standards and other regulations
- Different councils won't agree unless there is overall governance by one organisation
- We would benefit from greater cooperation and coordination at a regional level but not at the expense of local democracy
- We don't have the skills and expertise within the Wairarapa to bring irrigation projects to fruition. Such projects will need to be owned and led on a regional basis.

33 Many submitters who support change to regional governance arrangements cite the expected benefits from change. The benefits identified can be summarised as:

- Stronger regional leadership
- Better management of relationship with central government
- Better regional decision making and strategies that deliver results
- Better regional planning (transport, water in all it's forms, natural disaster response)
- A single regulatory authority (or one set of regulations) to reduce compliance costs and make interacting with councils easier for business and developers
- Improved efficiency – economies of scale, reduced duplication, increased focus on services provided and improved financial management
- Improved capability - more technical expertise, enhanced strategic management.

34 The need for **stronger regional leadership** lies at the heart of the issues facing the region, according to many submissions. The current GWRC is seen as lacking the mandate and powers to provide that leadership and a stronger regional voice is required. This also manifests itself in a sub-optimal **management of the region's relationship with central government**.

- The GWRC falls too short of ensuring that decisions taken at the territorial local authority level are compatible with regional strategies and programmes. The region is managed by nine authorities and the principle of subsidiarity does not apply (40)
- Wellington needs a strong unified voice to develop, e.g. transport infrastructure developments currently serve local interests rather than the whole (144)

- The Wellington region could be better positioned to influence central government – and other leadership models could be explored (19)
- The region needs to agree transport priorities so that it can convince third parties to change the funding parameters (40)
- Need to forge a strong Wellington identity and voice to keep up with Auckland and Christchurch when it is rebuilt. (47) (50) (61) (91)

35 **Better regional decision-making** is required for **better regional planning** and the need to develop regional strategies that deliver results, according to submissions that favour a change to current governance arrangements. For example:

- Better quality decision-making is needed for the region – this is a key issue. Currently too many sub-optimal decisions from a regional perspective because of territorial battles (39)
- Too much fragmentation means infighting and inferior judgements. A single unitary authority would be able to take the broader view and be more objective, making better decisions (91)
- Should explore and agree the role and priority of the Wellington CBD in relation to other CBDs in the regional and in the context of wider regional economic development (45)
- Agree with the PWC report that there is inherent planning dysfunctionality in the current legislative framework. (40) (106)
- Support a hierarchy (national, regional, local) of mandatory policies and plans which set binding minimum standards for the next, lower level (30)
- A spatial planning approach and decision-making are supported (19) (45)
- Integrate Village Planning with the process of spatial planning across the region (64)
- Issues affect people across city/council boundaries – we should look for solutions that would give the greatest benefit to the most people, in the most efficient way. It affects water, land management, economic development, environmental protection, road transport and sports facilities (42)
- Need to think collectively about services for the whole region – take an overall view of development needs and get away from councils being competitive which leads to ‘nice to have’ rather than essentials (100)
- Local land planning often doesn’t reflect regional interests (30)
- Water would benefit from more effective regional planning. GWRC and other TLAs are not participating in Capacity which runs water services for Wellington and Hutt. This should be a regional activity (40)

- All regulatory roles should sit together and be managed by one body in an integrated way – because of the inter-twined nature of managing: water, land use, transport and biosecurity. For example, coastal management depends on land and water management. (141)
- 36 **One set of regulations for business** - whether after some local council amalgamations or with the establishment of a unitary authority, it would be beneficial to minimise or eliminate variations in rules and regulations, and to harmonise procedures between councils.
- Fragmented government means that businesses must deal with a variety of authorities (40)
 - A single regulatory authority could harmonise regulations, standards and procedures to make a simpler, more efficient system for developers and others (72)
 - We need to encourage new enterprise and discourage existing businesses from moving off-shore so we need to reduce these types of compliance costs (118)
 - A single council would provide a single set of rules and point of contact for businesses – a one-stop shop making it much easier to do business. (39)
- 37 **More efficient and effective regional governance** arrangements will likely lead to improvements in service delivery, asset management and financial management, according to many submitters.
- Rationalisation of local government in Wellington is essential to achieve efficiency gains, allow better planning and give us a chance to compete with the new Auckland (31)
 - It's reasonable to expect some economies of scale by some form of amalgamation (45)
 - Combine areas of operations and administration where appropriate, removing duplications (98) (100) (110) (111) (160)
 - Combine services and have fewer Mayors and Councils (64)
 - Need a structure (like a super city) that would keep costs in line with services and be able to manage a fairer distribution of resources than local councils can (112)
 - Need better regional management of the three waters that increases efficiency, builds resilience and substantially reduces energy inputs and costs. (142)
- 38 **Improved capability** available to councils and council operations by amalgamating authorities. This would also support economic development in the region.
- A single Wairarapa council would be able to attract good quality staff (including specific skill areas) and improve staff capability (13) (15)

- Option 5 would provide opportunities to employ more specialist staff across the region. (65)

No need for change to the status quo

- 39 There are some typical points made by submitters who do not see the need for change to the status quo:
- Keep local councils to deal with local issues
 - The current system works well and effectively reflects the needs, values and desires of its residents
 - The status quo includes the opportunity to transfer some infrastructure responsibilities to the GWRC and to amalgamate some operations if that would be beneficial
 - Structural change is not going to fix any of the issues that the region faces
 - The case for change hasn't been made – the PWC analysis is insufficient and not specific to the needs of Wellington.
- 40 Submitters who support retention of the status quo seriously challenge some of the reasons for change generally cited by its supporters. The efficiency benefits of amalgamations are particularly contentious and for many, that issue forms the major basis of their rejection of the PWC report. Proponents of change also acknowledge that efficiencies and savings are by no means guaranteed. Some submitters hold the view that the status quo can be adapted and improved without the costs and disruption of major change. The following points made in submissions illustrate that supporters of the status quo are not necessarily arguing a case for 'no change' in local council management – but in some cases, they still need to be convinced.
- Keep the status quo and improve accountability to the public for outcomes – make management responsibilities more transparent (26)
 - Keep the status quo and get the finances in order and secure efficiencies (76)
 - The PWC report assumes that bigger is better and does not reflect the views of residents associations, ratepayers and consumers of council services... Efficiency and effectiveness are not necessarily achieved through shared services and just because most may see 'a necessity for change' does not mean that any set of changes will be better overall. (30)
- 41 Some submitters are in favour of other non-structural ways of making changes which will provide benefits to the Wellington region (e.g. boundary changes, alignment of regulations and procedures).

The need for effective local representation

- 42 Effective local representation is a major theme in submissions from both those who support change to governance arrangements and those who are opposed to change.
- 43 Many submissions make the point that statistics show that the Wellington region is over-governed at present and that a simplified structure could deliver better results. However, others say that effective local representation is their most important concern and must be at the centre of any proposals to restructure local government. These views are not necessarily mutually exclusive but do reflect some key tensions in the development of proposals for change.
- 44 There is a fear of disempowerment running through some of the individual submissions. Access to local councillors and officials is highly valued by many people who see that as their route to a remedy for particular problems. Local councils are seen by others as an essential element in giving a voice to community concerns, and the prime mechanism for community engagement and participation in decision-making. A few submitters challenge this view, saying that effective community engagement does not necessarily equate with local representation – particularly as the internet and social media are increasingly available to all.
- 45 Several submissions are concerned that Iwi need to be appropriately represented in any new regional governance arrangements and that the Treaty of Waitangi is acknowledged. It is also important that Maori participate early in the process of change. However, other submitters don't support particular Maori representation on future councils.
- 46 Wairarapa submissions in particular make the point that rural areas would find it harder to be heard in a bigger, unitary authority and suggest that rural representation be built in to any new local government structures.
- 47 Four submissions expressed strong negative views about either the current Community Boards in South Wairarapa or in principle, objected to a second layer of community governance structure. However, others were interested in exploring the concept further, either as an adjunct to larger regional council structures, or as a potentially new basis for sustainable communities.
- 48 It should be noted that, in sharp contrast to those submitters who put effective local representation at the forefront of their concerns, there are also several individual submissions that assess local government structures against a single criterion: efficient and effective service delivery. One submitter puts it succinctly:
- People don't really care who provides the services as long as there is a good level of service. So the shape of local government is less important than its ability to provide efficient and effective services. (50)

Structural options

- 49 Most submitters (69%) indicate that they see the need for change in governance arrangements but they record a fairly even spread of preferred options for future governance arrangements (using the six Options in the PWC report).

All submissions were analysed from the viewpoint of whether the submission supports the retention of the status quo or one of the other Options in the PWC report. The results are set out in Table 3 below. Note that the count is of the Preferred Option of submitters, although a few put some caveats on their support for that option. A small number of others wanted to combine aspects of the different options and these have been categorised as far as possible in the Option first mentioned (most submitters in this instance nominated Option 3 with another). It also seems likely that there was some blurring of Option 3 and Option 4, taking into account submitters' comments.

Table 3: Preferred option for future governance arrangements

	Number and % of submissions in favour	
Option 1 Status quo	27	(17%)
Option 2 Strengthen regional council	17	(11%)
Option 3 Local clusters/amalgamation	19	(12%)
Option 4 Two tiers	30	(19%)
Option 5 Two unitary authorities	19	(12%)
Option 6 Single unitary authority	19	(12%)
No preferred option yet	19	(12%)
None of the options	8	(5%)
TOTAL	158	(100%)

- 50 Note that Federated Farmers recorded three different preferred options for change on behalf of its members: Options 3, 4 and 5. Their submission is not counted in Table 3.
- 51 It should also be noted that 15 submissions explicitly recorded their opposition to Option 6 a single unitary authority for the Wellington region (the 'super-city model').
- 52 Wairarapa has a greater proportion of its submitters in favour of Option 3 than the average across all councils (in some cases, combined with Option 2 or Option 4). There is evidence of some interest in Option 5 which would involve a sub-regional unitary authority for the Wairarapa but others doubt that it would be financially viable. No Wairarapa submissions mention a preference for Option 6 in the short term.
- 53 Porirua submissions broadly follow the average pattern of responses set out in Table 3. Submissions to the GWRC are slightly more likely than the average to favour Option 2, Option 4 or Option 6.

Specific ideas that could be developed further

- 54 Several submissions were in favour of establishing a new spatial planning framework that would go beyond traditional land use planning and integrate land use, urban planning transport and infrastructure. Under a unitary authority it would be an important tool to start addressing the social, economic, environmental and cultural dimensions of wellbeing.
- A spatial plan with statutory backing would provide the certainty and timeliness necessary to foster the conditions for improved profitability for businesses and job opportunities for workers (40)
 - Spatial planning is a positive response to declining global and regional capacity to use fossil fuels. (142)
- 55 Some submissions by organisations and individuals wanted to create a much stronger future focus for the vision for the Wellington region and consequently, for the analysis of local governance requirements and possible structures.
- Decision-making is based on advice that looks at past trends and short-term predictions. There is a need to look for futures thinking advice. The recent changes in the world's finances, climate change and peak oil suggest that the past is not a good predictor for the future. (165)
- 56 Several submitters advocated a review of the effectiveness of existing unitary authorities such as Gisborne and Nelson-Tasman, in order to inform the next stage of discussion.

- 57 Porirua City has a Village Planning programme which could be investigated and perhaps used as part of a two-tier local government structure or a unitary authority.
- 58 A research organisation suggests that a charter could be agreed between community groups and councils to establish a framework for meaningful relationships.
- 59 More use of Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) in the future could facilitate planning and implementation of solutions to complex problems.
- All public transport and bulk water supply should be given to a CCO, owned by the councils, to run – they will have the expertise necessary to deliver a quality service. (126)

A service provider (NZBUS) relates its own recent experience:

- Dealing with a CCO in Auckland has resulted in rapid and efficient planning and implementation – the speed of this is unprecedented and the transport bottlenecks will be more quickly overcome as a result. CCOs seem to be more insulated from the influence of politics and hence better able to look to the overall good rather than to local considerations (e.g. dairy owner influencing community board to keep parking outside their shop which is on a major arterial road). (122)

However, there are opposing views among submitters:

- There should be no CCOs – this looks like empire building. Proper commitment by elected representatives should negate any need for them. (156)
- 60 Many submissions discussed the importance of improving communications between local government and the public, and thereby improving community engagement in decision-making. Technology could be used to much greater advantage than at present and increase access whichever structural solution is ultimately adopted. There is the potential for communications technology to transform the public's relationship with local governance in future.

Appendix 1 Submissions process used by each council

	Advertised	Additional material	Public Meeting	Submission format	Submissions period
Wairarapa district councils: Masterton, Carterton and South Wairarapa	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GWRC paper on Options Smarter Government Smarter Communities. 	Three councils joint hearing 11 Aug 2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Oral (11/ 8) [are these just requests?]. 	4 weeks? Period closed 30 Jun 2011.
Wellington City Council	Website	X	Regular Council Strategy and Policy meeting 17 Feb 2011.	Written.	26 Nov 2010 – 11 Feb 2011.
Porirua City Council	✓	<p>Summary of six Options in PWC report</p> <p>Regional Governance Review webpage information</p> <p>Active promotion of the submissions process through communications to stakeholders.</p>	Community Forum with six speakers 23 June 2011.	Written – with forms available to complete.	Period closed 30 June 2011.
Wellington Regional Council	✓	<p>GWRC paper on Options</p> <p>Principles of good governance</p> <p>Summary assessment of the options v Auckland's Royal Commission criteria.</p>	X	Written.	Period closed 30 Jun 2011.

	Advertised	Additional material	Public Meeting	Submission format	Submissions period
Upper Hutt	Website.	Brief summary of Options.	X	Written.	Six weeks to 30 June 2011.
Hutt City Council	✓	X	X	Written.	4 May 2011 - 30 Jun 2011.
Kapiti Coast District Council	Website with online form provided.	X	X	Written.	8 Dec 2010 – 11 Feb 2011.

Appendix 2 List of submitters by council

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
Wairarapa	1	EB Watkins	Individual
	2	Brent Goodwin	Individual
	3	Bridget Canning	Individual
	4	Jamie, Georgie and Philippa Falloon	Individuals
	5	Michael Bott and Wairarapa Labour	Individual on behalf of Wairarapa Labour
	6	Mike Grace and Stephanie Turner	Individuals
	7	Frank Cody	Individual
	8	Liz Waddington	Individual
	9	Gerald Tait	Individual
	10	Alan Sadler	Individual
	11	Ron and Sue Southey	Individuals
	12	Wairarapa Development Group [Governance Review]**	Business representatives
	13	R J Dunlop	Individual
	14	Nigel Boniface	Individual
	15	Anders and Emily Crofoot	Individuals

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	16	Federated Farmers	Business representatives
	17	Neil and Greg Montgomerie-Crowe	Individuals
	18/135	Emily Greenberg	Individual
	19	Matt Adams	Individual
	20	S V Barton	Individual
	21/132	Perry Cameron	Individual
	22	Wairarapa Chamber of Commerce	Business representatives
	23	Rex McKay	Individual
	24	Minty Hunter	Individual
	25	Michael Hewison	Individual
	26	Alan Roy	Individual
	27	Nancy Sutthoff	Individual
	28	David Johnson	Individual
	28 B	Roddy McKenzie	Individual
	Total	29	

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
Wellington	29	Miles Athea	Individual
	30/35/167	Michael Taylor	Individual
	31	Charles Finny	Individual
	32	Curtis Nixon	Individual
	33	Francis Hyland	Individual
	34	Gordana Vukomanovic	Individual
	36	Ngaire Oliver	Individual
	37/97/180	PSA	Unions
	38	Roland Oliver	Individual
	39/162	Wellington Chamber of Commerce	Business representatives
	40/103	Wellington Civic Trust	Community representatives
	Total	11	
Porirua	41	John Seddon JP	Individual
	42	Pukerua Bay Residents' Association	Community representatives
	43/152	Rob Partridge	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	44	Canopy Connections	Business representatives
	45	Porirua Chamber of Commerce	Business representatives
	46	George Seconi	Individual
	47	Jenny Brash	Individual
	48	Brian McKeon	Individual
	49/131	NZ Social and civic policy institute	Research organisation
	50	Jim Dearsly	Individual
	51	Karen Apperley	Individual
	52	Beryl Hawthorne	Individual
	53	Frederick McMahon	Individual
	54	Dr Judith Whitcombe	Individual
	55	Barbara Blanchard	Individual
	56	Margaret Faulkner	Individual
	57	Kay M Paget	Individual
	58	Christine J Jacobson	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	59	David A Heather	Individual
	60	Te Runanga	Iwi
	61	Derek M Shepherd	Individual
	62	Gordon J Robinson	Individual
	63	Katherine M Smith	Individual
	64	Robyn Moore and Julian Meadow	Individuals
	65	Pip Piper	Individual
	66	Cannons Creek Residents Association	Community representatives
	67	Mary Galliven	Individual
	68	Shirley I Cherrie	Individual
	69	Jenny Williamson	Individual
	70	Bruce Twidle	Individual
	71	Michael Ansteih	Individual
	72	A R Branson	Individual
	73	Dr John Wren and Robyn-Jane Wren	Individuals

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	74	Kilian V de Lacy	Individual
	75	David Bradford	Individual
	76	Maurice J Field	Individual
	77	Donald Borrie	Individual
	78	Arthur Graves	Individual
	79	Peter Davies	Individual
	80	Jenny McLeod	Individual
	81	Garry Ferguson	Individual
	82	Ray	Individual
	83	Megan Sarty	Individual
	84	Greg Hall	Individual
	85/100	Bryan Helm	Individual
	86	Egon Gutke	Individual
	87	John Watson	Individual
	88	Brian Mosen	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	89	Graeme Ebbett	Individual
	90	Russell Morrison	Individual
	91	M J Williams	Individual
	92	Clive Millanta	Individual
	Total	52	
Greater Wellington Regional Council	93	Gillian Hunt	Individual
	94	Marian Emma Brooks	Individual
	96	OneWellington	Community representatives
	98	Janet Macdonald	Individual
	99	Possibilitiez	Community representatives
	102	Phil Hayward	Individual
	104	Dr John Munro	Individual
	105	Edwin Crampton	Individual
	107	Wayne Perkins	Individual
	108	Dorothy Baker	Individual
	109	Stuart Taylor	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	110	Alwyn Parry	Individual
	111	Solveig Mikkelsen	Individual
	112	Elizabeth Tremayne	Individual
	113	Crimestoppers	Service provider
	114	Linda Mead	Individual
	115	Lance Wiggins	Individual
	116	John Dalziell	Individual
	117	Phil Malpas	Individual
	118	Roger Walker	Individual
	119	Sandy Ryan	Individual
	120	Peter Petterson	Individual
	122	NZBUS	Service Provider
	123	The City is Ours	Community representative
	124	Simeon Copsey	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	125	Pam Hanna	Individual
	126	Max and Saria Shierlaw	Individual
	127	Barry Kelliher	Individual
	128	Rosamund Averton	Individual
	129	Ben Zwartz	Individual
	130	Phil and Jenny Dickson	Individual
	133	John Carruthers	Individual
	134	Nigel Tapitklis	Individual
	136	Jason Markham	Individual
	137	Mary & Maurice Brown	Individual
	138	Miramar / Maupuia Progressive Association	Community representatives
	139	Wellington Residents' Coalition	Community representatives
	140	Green Party	Elected representatives
	141	Paula Warren	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	142	Liz Springford	Individual
	143	Phys Phillips	Individual
	144	Philip Harland	Individual
	145	Frank Cook	Individual
	146	Dr Margaret Gordon	Individual
	147	Maria Gobbi	Individual
	148	Rob Tomkies	Individual
	149	Alan Jamieson	Individual
	150	Colin Clench	Individual
	151	Petone Community Board	Elected representatives
	153	Alison Hoffman	Individual
	154	Mark Gobbi	Individual
	155	A J Barton	Individual
	156	Albie Gaskin	Individual
	157	Allan and Sarah	Individual
	158	Gervasio Lavo	Individual

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
	159	Ray and Karen Stewart	Individual
	160	Nancy Buckley	Individual
	161	Tracey Weir	Individual
	163	Chris Parkin	Individual
	164	Regional Public Health	Service provider
	168	Kahungunu Wairarapa	Iwi
	169	Bernard Harris	Individual
	170	Normandale Residents Association	Community representatives
	171	Dr Marie O'Sullivan	Individual
	172	Tom LeGrice	Individual
	173	Victoria University	Research organisation
	Total	66	
Upper Hutt	174	Helene Ritchie	Elected representative
	175	Lynne McLellan	Individual
	176	Roz Brown	Individual
	177/ 178/ 165/ 166	Transition Town Upper Hutt	Community representatives
	Total	4	

Council	Number	Submitter	Category
Kapiti	179/ 106	Grey Power	Community representatives
	Total	1	
Hutt City	181/121	Barbara Branch	Individual
	182/95	Alan Waller	Individual
	Total	2	