

SCHEDULE D

Table showing the nature of the objections and counter-objections received and the decision of the Commission in each case.

| <i>Electoral District and Nature of Objection</i> [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing] | | <i>Decision of Commission</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N01 | | |
| N01-001 | <p>Northland</p> <p>Objection J Hall</p> <p>Objects to the omission of the Kermadec Islands from all proposed electorates. As part of New Zealand they should have representation.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the Kermadec Islands in the Northland electorate.</p> | <p>Disallowed. The islands are uninhabited except for Raoul Island. The Electoral Act 1993 and the Electoral Regulations 1996 make provision for persons stationed on Raoul Island to enrol and vote in the electorate where they usually reside.</p> |
| N03 | | |
| N03-001 | <p>Rodney</p> <p>Objection R Craig and 72 others</p> <p>Petition objecting to the area serviced by Haigh Access Road and East Coast Road being within the Rodney electorate when it has links with Albany and East Coast Bays. This area is within the East Coast Bays area for local body elections.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the meshblock that covers Haigh Access Road and East Coast Road into the East Coast Bays electorate.</p> | <p>Allowed</p> |
| N04 | | |
| N04-001 | <p>Helensville</p> <p>Objection J Reidy</p> <p>Objects to the vast size of the proposed Helensville electorate. The inclusion of Woodlands Park, Laingholm, Parau and Huia would see these areas isolated from contact with their MP. These communities have strong links to other New Lynn suburbs.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the area to the west of New Lynn within the New Lynn electorate. Extra population for Helensville should be taken from north of Helensville. New Lynn could lose some of New Windsor to Mt Roskill, which in turn could lose population to Mt Albert.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-002 | <p>Objection M Fitter</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Whatipu, Huia, Cornwallis, Parau and Laingholm in the Helensville electorate because they are all connected by Huia Road and it is a significant distance from Helensville town.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep these areas in the New Lynn electorate.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N04-003 | b | Objection Similar to N04-002 | R Claytoin Similar to N04-002 | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N04-002 | | |
| N04-004 | b | Objection Objects to Laingholm, Titirangi, Bethells Beach and Karekare being included in the same electorate as Helensville and Coatesville. Wants to retain a west coast bush living identity for the electorate. | J Schwarz | Disallowed |
| N04-005 | b | Objection Objects to Laingholm being included in the Helensville electorate. Its community of interest and connections (community, schooling, work, shopping etc.) are with Titirangi and New Lynn. | D Blomfield | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Laingholm in New Lynn. | | |
| N04-006 | b | Objection Similar to N04-005 | G Booth | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> New Lynn be extended from Titirangi, including the harbour side villages of Laingholm, Parau and Huia. | | |
| N04-007 | b | Objection Objects to the inclusion of Laingholm in Helensville as it will erode the spirit of west Auckland and the electorate will not provide local representation for this community. | G A Wood | Disallowed |
| N04-008 | b | Objection Objects to the inclusion of Laingholm in Helensville because of its distance from Helensville town. | T Ashton | Disallowed |
| N04-009 | b | Objection Objects to the suburb of Laingholm being included in the Helensville electorate. | G Thavat | Disallowed |
| N04-010 | b, n, h | Objection Objects to the inclusion of Piha and Whatipu in the Helensville electorate because of their distance from Helensville town and their different communities of interest. Also objects to the loss of the name Waitakere. | J Conlon | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the name 'Waitakere'. | | |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | |
|---------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| N04-011 | b | <p>Objection B Chase</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the areas of Piha, Whatapu, Waima and Cornwallis as these areas have nothing in common with Helensville.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Do not change the Waitakere and New Lynn boundaries.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-012 | b | <p>Objection S Hogguer</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Laingholm and Huia in the Helensville electorate as these areas are entirely different from Helensville and their interests would not be fairly represented by the boundary change.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-013 | b | <p>Objection W Mackenzie</p> <p>Objects to Whatipu, Little Huia, Huia, Cornwallis, Parau, Laingholm, Woodlands Park, Waima and parts of Waatarua being included in the Helensville electorate. The physical distance and separation of the Waitakere Ranges will be a barrier for representation. There is also no community of interest with these native bush areas and the farming areas around Helensville.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain these areas in New Lynn.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-014 | b | <p>Objection J Ashcroft</p> <p>Similar to N04-013</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-015 | b | <p>Objection J Newton</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Whatipu, Huia, Cornwallis, Parau, Laingholm, Woodlands Park and Waima in Helensville. These areas have different needs from Helensville and Coatesville. Does not support increasing the size of the electorate and does not think it will be possible to represent the diverse interests of the proposed area.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-016 | b | <p>Objection L Tanguay</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Huia and Laingholm in Helensville. The beaches close to Titirangi are part of the New Lynn community. These areas have no connection or community of interest with Helensville.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Huia and Laingholm should be in New Lynn.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N04-017 | b | <p>Objection J Henderson</p> <p>Objects to the suburbs south and west of Titirangi being included in Helensville as they are not connected with Helensville and are related to Titirangi.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the suburbs of Waima, Woodlands Park, Parau, Waatarua, Laingholm, Huia, Karekare, Piha and Te Henga in the same electorate as Titirangi. To compensate, the area around Konini could be removed from New Lynn.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | |
|---------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N04-018 | b, n, h | <p>Objection Waitakere Ranges Local Board</p> <p>Objects to the amalgamation of the rural, coastal and bush communities of the Waitakere Ranges into the Helensville electorate. The proposed electorate is not well supported by facilities of communication or a community of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the name 'Waitakere' for the electorate. Adjust the boundaries to reflect the connections between west Auckland's rural and urban communities.</p> | Disallowed |
| N04-019 | b | <p>Objection A J Turner</p> <p>Objects to the erosion of the west Auckland bush reserve and suburban identity by including west Auckland in the Helensville electorate with Coatesville, Dairy Flat and Helensville, which are farming communities.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The proposed solution needs to recognise west Auckland's immediate suburban neighbours currently in the New Lynn electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N04-020 | b | <p>Objection Laingholm District Citizens Association</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the South Waitakere Ranges heritage area in the Helensville electorate because of the distance to the town of Helensville and because there is no connection or community of interest with the Helensville area. This area's connections are with New Lynn.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep this area in New Lynn.</p> | Disallowed |
| N04-021 | b, n | <p>Objection M O'Halloran</p> <p>Objects to the Waitakere Ranges and surrounding area being included in Helensville as this is a unique bush environment and has no connection with the Helensville area.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the name 'Waitakere'. The Waitakere electorate should include Waiaatarua, Oratia, Parau, Laingholm, Titirangi, Piha, Woodlands Park, Waitakere and Bethells Beach.</p> | Disallowed |
| N04-022 | b, n | <p>Objection R Reid</p> <p>Similar to N04-021</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Same as N04-021</p> | Disallowed |
| N04-023 | b | <p>Objection A Vartzbed</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of the Waitakere Ranges in a larger electorate made up of lowlands and non bush areas like Helensville.</p> | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N04-024 | b, n | Objection G Ertel Objects to Waitakere and Waikatarua becoming part of Helensville and the loss of the community's identity and name. | Disallowed |
| N04-025 | b, n, h | Objection P Chainey Objects to the loss of the Waitakere electorate and considers the proposal for such a large electorate, spanning both Waitemata and Kaipara Harbours as unworkable. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the name 'Waitakere'. The boundary of Waitakere to cover the 35,000 acres of the foothills plus the coast down to Huia and Titirangi. | Disallowed |
| N04-026 | b | Objection R Eade Objects to the proposed boundary as would like the size of the electorate to be smaller to ensure Titirangi retains its voice in the electorate. | Disallowed |
| N04-027 | b, h | Objection L Cooper Objects to the inclusion of Swanson in the Helensville electorate as it is closely integrated with urban west Auckland and shares facilities and services with the neighbouring Ranui community in Te Atatū. Objects to the placement of Massey High, Massey Primary School and St Paul's School within the Helensville electorate when the communities they serve are mostly covered by the Upper Harbour electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Swanson should be placed in the same urban electorate as the Ranui and Henderson suburbs. Move Massey High, Massey Primary School and St Paul's School into the Upper Harbour electorate so they can be represented by an MP from the same community as the students. | Allowed |
| N04-028 | b, n | Objection Dr M Harvey Objects to the size of the proposed Helensville electorate as it will be too large and have to represent rural, bush and suburban communities. Also objects to the name Helensville which ignores regional Māori names (such as Titirangi). <i>Suggested solution:</i> The southern boundary for Helensville should lie at the northern edge of the Waitakere Ranges and Te Henga. The remainder of the proposed electorate and part of New Lynn to form a new Waitakere electorate. | Disallowed |
| N04-029 | b | Objection K Martinez Objects to the proposed Helensville electorate boundary. | Disallowed |
| N04-030 | b | Objection L Finlay Objects to the proposed boundary of the Helensville electorate because of the geographical inaccessibility of Helensville. The MP best placed to represent the Titirangi community is the local New Lynn MP. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N04-031 | n | Objection M Hill Objects to the loss of the name Waitakere from the electorate that contains the ranges due to its geographical, cultural and historical significance. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'Waitakere' to represent the electorate. Possibly as 'Waitakere-Helensville'. | Disallowed |
| N04-032 | n | Objection G P Curach Objects to the loss of the name 'Waitakere' as the most iconic name for west Auckland. | Disallowed |
| N04-033 | n | Objection M Olivier Objects to the name Helensville as it is a small town and does not reflect the large geographical area covered by the electorate. The name 'Waitakere' has more cultural and historical significance than 'Helensville'. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Waitakere'. | Disallowed |
| N04-034 | n | Objection P Hosking Similar to N04-033 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N04-033 | Disallowed |
| N04-035 | b, n | Objection P Legel Objects to the name of the electorate. The name 'Waitakere' has historic association with west Auckland. The boundaries should better reflect the connections between the area's rural and urban communities. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Waitakere'. Alternatively, name it 'West Auckland'. | Disallowed |
| N04-036 | b | Objection C I Webb Objects to the separation of the Albany Village from the rest of the suburb, dividing a community of interest. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the Albany Village with the remainder of the suburb in the East Coast Bays electorate. | Allowed |
| N04-037 | b | Objection A Drongool Objects to Woodlands Park area being included in the Helensville electorate as New Lynn is the closest main shopping area and no association with Helensville. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Woodlands Park in the New Lynn electorate or Kelston. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|------------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N04-601 | b, n, h | Counter-objection M Bridges Relates to objections N04-001, N04-002, N04-003, N04-033 Does not agree with the objections that suggest Laingholm, Huia and Woodlands Park be included in New Lynn. Considers these areas primarily associate with the Waitakere Ranges and the west coast beaches. Does not agree the electorate name should be changed as it is an established electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Laingholm, Huia and Woodlands Park to be included in the same electorate as the Waitakere Ranges. Retain the name 'Helensville' for the electorate. | Allowed |
| N04-602 | b, h | Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objections N04-018, N04-027 and similar objections Considers the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission to be a demonstrably better delineation between urban and rural communities than the objectors' suggestions. | Allowed |
| N05 | | East Coast Bays | |
| N05-001 | n | Objection C Spanhake Objects to the name East Coast Bays as it does not adequately describe the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Albany'. | Disallowed |
| N08 | | Upper Harbour | |
| N08-001 | b | Objection A Smithson Considers the new electorate disadvantages the area of Glenfield with representation likely to focus on other areas. Also concerned the socio economic needs will vary between the east and west of the electorate. | Disallowed |
| N08-002 | b, h | Objection Massey and Birdwood Settlers Association Inc Objects to the division of the Massey area as there is a strong community of interest centred around Massey, West Harbour, Hobsonville, Ranui, Whenuapai and Herald Island. These areas are mostly covered by one residents and ratepayers group founded in 1925. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Instead of an Upper Harbour electorate, create a more North Shore based electorate using the old Massey ward boundaries. This would have an effect on proposed Te Atatū, Kelston and Helensville electorates, which would need to be altered and could also be based on old ward boundaries. Greenhithe bridge would be a natural geographical electorate boundary. | Disallowed |

| | | | | | |
|------------|------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| N08-003 | b | Objection | J Hall | <p>Objects to the boundaries of the proposed Upper Harbour electorate as it contains two distinct communities of interest separated by the Waitamata Harbour.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Redraw the proposed Upper Harbour electorate to create revised boundaries for Helensville and Waitakere. Include the western area of Upper Harbour in a Waitakere electorate using the harbour and riverhead as a guide for the Helensville electorate. Helensville electorate to include eastern areas of the proposed Upper Harbour electorate - keeping the current boundary between East Coast Bays and Helensville intact, except for movement at the south-eastern edge to meet the required population quota.</p> | Disallowed |
| N08-004 | b | Objection | J Machen | <p>Objects to the electoral bias of the communities grouped together for the proposed Upper Harbour electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N08-005 | b | Objection | A Cann | <p>Objects to the proposed Upper Harbour electorate and its size relative to other Auckland electorates.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Split the proposed Upper Harbour electorate into two separate electorates.</p> | Disallowed |
| N08-601 | b | Counter-objection | New Zealand Labour Party | <p>Relates to objections N08-002 and N08-003</p> <p>Supports the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission for the Upper Harbour electorate on the basis the urban/non-urban distinction has been well drawn.</p> | Allowed as it relates to objections N08-002 and N08-003. |
| N09 | | Te Atatū | | | |
| N09-001 | b, h | Objection | M Bridges | <p>Objects to the split of the McLaren Park area between two electorates, placing much of it in the Te Atatū electorate when the social services within the community have significant ties to organisations in the Kelston electorate (such as Vision West and Moani Waititi Marae). This area's community of interest is with Glen Eden.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary from Seymour Road to either Bruce McLaren Road or Forest Hill Road.</p> | Allowed |

| | | | |
|------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N09-002 | b, h | Objection Z Vitasovich Objects to the inclusion of McLaren Park in the Te Atatū electorate when it has links to Sunnyvale and Glen Eden, both of which are now in the Kelston electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Extend the Kelston electorate further north-west from the Oratia Stream to include the McLaren Park / Henderson South area in Kelston. Use either Henderson Valley industrial area of Henderson Valley Road and Opanuku Stream as the boundary. Consider changing the electorate name to 'West Edenvale' or 'Glen Eden-Sunnyvale'. | Allowed in part as to the boundary. Disallowed as to the name. |
| N09-601 | b, h | Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objections N04-027, N09-001, N09-002 and N10-001 to N10-008 Considers the Representation Commission's proposed boundaries for the Te Atatū electorate better meet the statutory criteria than the various objectors' suggested solutions. | Disallowed |
| N09-602 | n | Counter-objection G Seymour Relates to objection N09-002 Objects to the proposal to change the name of the electorate to 'West Edenvale' or 'Glen Eden-Sunnyvale': Objects to the loss of an established Māori name. 'Te Atatū' is a local established name and is geographically correct. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'Te Atatū' for the electorate. | Allowed |
| N10 | | | |
| N10-001 | b, h | Objection L Cooper Objects to the exclusion of part of Te Atatu South (around Tirimoana School) from the Te Atatū electorate as it divides a community of interest. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary to the Glendene roundabout to keep the Te Atatu community intact. | Allowed |
| N10-002 | b, h | Objection C Geddes Similar to N10-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary from McLeod Road south to Tirimoana Road. From the first corner in Tirimoana Road the boundary to project to the estuary. | Allowed |
| N10-003 | b | Objection R Clark Objects to the exclusion of the Tirimoana area from the Te Atatū electorate, dividing it from transport, schools and other community links with Te Atatu. | Allowed |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| N10-004 | b, h | Objection Similar to N10-001 | I Tvrdeich | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary from McLeod Road southward to Tirimoana Road continuing down to Whau River. | | |
| N10-005 | b | Objection Similar to N10-001 | L Stillich | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the entire suburb of Te Atatu within the Te Atatū electorate, with a suggested border of Tirimoana Road and Valron Road. Move the McLaren Park and Henderson Valley areas to Kelston to compensate. | | |
| N10-006 | b | Objection Similar to N10-001 | N R Withers | Allowed as to the north side of Tirimoana Road. |
| N10-007 | b | Objection Similar to N10-001 | C Wood | Allowed |
| N10-008 | b | Objection Similar to N10-001 | D R Silk | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Te Atatu within the Te Atatū electorate. Have Kelston grow west to compensate. | | |
| N10-009 | b | Objection Objects to the proposed Kelston electorate and its size relative to other Auckland electorates. | A Cann | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Split the proposed Kelston electorate into two separate electorates. | | |
| N10-010 | n | Objection Objects to the name of the proposed Kelston electorate as it is not representative of all the suburbs in the electorate. | K Moncur | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Waitakere East'. | | |
| N10-011 | b, h | Objection Objects to the inclusion of Waterview within the proposed Kelston electorate. | M J Watson | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Mt Albert electorate to include Waterview and the rest of the Albert-Eden Ward and the southern part of the Motu Manawa Marine Reserve south of the SH16 causeway down to Heron Park and Oakley Creek. | | |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N10-012 | b, h | Objection B McKay, North Western Community Association Objects to the movement of the Waterview community from Mt Albert to the proposed Kelston electorate. This breaks up a long link between the Waterview area and the neighbouring suburbs of Point Chevalier and Mt Albert. Waterview has a much weaker link with Avondale and the Kelston electorate due to the greater distance involved. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the current electorate boundaries as they match well with the Local Board areas of the Auckland City Council. | Disallowed |
| N10-013 | b, n | Objection K Levi Objects to the inclusion of Avondale and Waterview within the proposed Kelston electorate and the new electorate name. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Avondale and Waterview in New Lynn. | Disallowed |
| N10-014 | b | Objection Whau Local Board Objects to the use of the railway line as a boundary, splitting New Lynn into two electorates. The undergrounding of the western rail line has been completed to ensure a cohesive New Lynn community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the entire suburb of New Lynn in the New Lynn electorate using West Coast Road, Great North Road, Rata Street and Ash Street as the boundary. | Allowed |
| N10-015 | b | Objection Linda Objects to the inclusion of Arawa Street and other areas of New Lynn in the proposed Kelston electorate. The New Lynn electorate offices are based in New Lynn town and Kelston is a significant distance from the community of New Lynn. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the New Lynn community together within the New Lynn electorate. | Disallowed |
| N10-016 | b | Objection R Graham Objects to the inclusion of the Manhattan Heights area of Glendene within the proposed Kelston electorate as it shares community links with the Henderson area. The electorate boundaries also break up the Glendene retail area between two electorates. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the area bounded by Great North Road, Kirby Street, Glendene Avenue, Tirimoana Avenue and Te Atatu Road in the Te Atatū electorate instead of the Kelston electorate. | Allowed in part |

| | | | |
|------------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N10-601 | n, h | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N10-010 Objects to the suggested name 'Waitakere East' as the name is of no relevance to parts of the electorate and could cause confusion with the Waitakere Local Board, which represents different local government areas. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Kelston' or 'Whau', the name of the river in the area. | Allowed |
| N10-602 | b, h | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N10-013 Notes Waterview is currently in Mt Albert. Waterview should not be included in the New Lynn electorate, as this would exceed New Lynn's electoral population threshold. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Avondale town centre in Kelston. Move the New Lynn boundary from the rail line to Rata Street, up the Whau River and along Portage Road. Retain Waterview in the existing Mt Albert electorate. | Allowed in part |
| N11 | | New Lynn | |
| N11-001 | n | Objection C Spanhake Objects to the electorate name as it does not adequately describe the area covered by the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Blockhouse Bay'. Alternatively 'Titirangi'. | Disallowed |
| N11-002 | b | Objection B Tuiopotutu Objects to the exclusion of the White Swan area from Mt Roskill, an area with which it is closely linked. The community is centred around May Road Primary School and Christ the King Church. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the White Swan area in Mt Roskill. | Allowed in part |
| N11-003 | b, h | Objection A Ryan and 109 others Petition objecting to the inclusion of the White Swan area in the New Lynn electorate. The area is linked with Mt Roskill with shopping and schools. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use Richardson Road and White Swan Road as the boundary. | Allowed in part |

| | | | |
|---------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| N11-004 | b | <p>Objection G Taylor and 73 others</p> <p>Petition objecting to the proposed boundary including properties between the southwestern motorway and Richardson Road in the New Lynn electorate. Their community of interest lies with Wesley and Mt Roskill (school and shopping areas).</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Use Richardson Road as the boundary.</p> | <p>Allowed</p> |
| N11-005 | b, h | <p>Objection New Zealand Labour Party</p> <p>Objects to the New Lynn / Kelston boundary running along the railway line as it splits the New Lynn community. The undergrounding of the railway line was designed to create a cohesive New Lynn community. The New Lynn and Avondale communities are closely linked and should remain in one electorate, and the Whau Local Board of the Auckland Council would be best served by having only one MP to liaise with.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Place the boundary along West Coast Road, Great North Road and Rata Street - following the main traffic thoroughfare.</p> | <p>Allowed</p> |
| N11-006 | b, n | <p>Objection B Morgan</p> <p>Objects to the exclusion of the New Lynn town centre from the proposed New Lynn electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the name to one that is central to the electorate such as 'Blockhouse Bay', 'Green Bay' or 'New Windsor' or one that describes its geographic position, such as 'Southern Harbour' or 'Auckland Southwest'. If the name is not changed propose moving the northern boundary up to Great North Road using Portage Road as a joining boundary to include the New Lynn town within the electorate.</p> | <p>Allowed in part as to the boundary.</p> |
| N11-601 | n | <p>Counter-objection B Smith</p> <p>Relates to objections N11-001 and N11-006</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the name of the electorate to 'Whau' which is the name of a stream that passes through the area and also the name of the local board.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N11-602 | n | <p>Counter-objection M Bridges</p> <p>Relates to objections N11-001 and N11-006</p> <p>Objects to the suggestions the name of the electorate be changed to 'New Windsor' or 'Blockhouse Bay'. Considers a Māori name should be used.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Whau' or 'Titirangi'. Whau is also the local board name.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| N11-603 | n | Counter-objection J Bridges Relates to objection N11-006 Similar to N11-602 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Whau'. | Disallowed |
| N11-604 | b, n, h | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N11-006 Objects to the suggestion the name of the electorate be changed to 'Green Bay', 'New Windsor' or 'Blockhouse Bay'. Objects to the suggested boundary if the name is not changed. Considers a slight amendment to the suggested boundary. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'New Lynn' for the electorate. Move the New Lynn boundary from the rail line to Rata Street, up the Whau River, to Great North Road and onto Portage Road. | Allowed as to the name. |
| N11-605 | n | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N11-001 Objects to suggestion the name of the electorate be changed to 'Blockhouse Bay' or 'Titirangi'. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'New Lynn' for the electorate as it is the largest town centre within the boundary of the proposed electorate. | Allowed |
| N12 | | | |
| N12-001 | b | Objection R Thomson Objects to the movement of Grey Lynn and Westmere to the proposed Mt Albert electorate. These communities share interests with Central Auckland, not Mt Albert. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing electorate boundaries. | Disallowed |
| N12-002 | b | Objection P Bieder Similar to N12-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N12-001 | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N12-003 | b, h | Objection G Dunster Objects to the exclusion of Grey Lynn from the Auckland Central electorate. The suburb has no common links with Mt Albert and the western connected communities in the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use the north-western motorway as a boundary between the two electorates. | Disallowed |
| N12-004 | b | Objection S Carey Objects to the proposal to split the Grey Lynn community and placing part within the Mt Albert electorate, which shares no common links with Grey Lynn. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use the north-western motorway as the divide between Auckland Central and Mt Albert. | Disallowed |
| N12-005 | b | Objection T Hickman Objects to the proposed split of Grey Lynn between two electorates. This split will cause problems with coordinating planning and assistance within the community and with local projects. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the entire Grey Lynn suburb within the same electorate. | Disallowed |
| N12-006 | b | Objection M Allred Objects to the inclusion of Grey Lynn in the Mt Albert electorate, which is a distinctly different community and will be detrimental to the Grey Lynn community spirit. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Return the suburb of Grey Lynn to the Auckland Central electorate. | Disallowed |
| N12-007 | b | Objection J McBride Similar to N12-006 | Disallowed |
| N12-008 | b | Objection A Field Similar to N12-006 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move Eden Terrace from Auckland Central to Epsom. | Disallowed |
| N12-009 | b, h | Objection C and P Patterson Similar to N12-006 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure all of Grey Lynn remains in one electorate. | Disallowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N12-010 | b, h | Objection Similar to N12-006 | Grey Lynn Residents Association | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Focus on moving the eastern boundary of the electorate, an area already split between two electorates and with less affinity with Central Auckland. | | |
| N12-011 | b, h | Objection Believes greater consideration could be given to communities of interest and local government boundaries, primarily with regard to the communities of Mt. Albert. | Hon C Fletcher, Councillor - Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward | Noted |
| N12-012 | b | Objection Objects to the proposed boundary between Mt Albert and Auckland Central, splitting the central Auckland community. The western edge of the central city between Freemans Bay and Westmere have a shared history. | A Gifford | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move Point Chevalier out of Mt Albert. The boundary to follow Motions Creek from the motorway to the harbour. Kingsland to move into Mt Albert. The eastern boundary could be Queen Street with any surplus population going to Epsom. | | |
| N12-013 | b, h | Objection Objects to the inclusion of the western side of Grey Lynn in Mt Albert. Grey Lynn is a cohesive community and the proposed boundary will split this community. | Grey Lynn Residents Association | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> For the Commission to look at alternatives. One possibility being Auckland Central losing population on its eastern boundary. | | |
| N12-014 | b, h | Objection Objects to the splitting of Grey Lynn, a cohesive community, between two electorates. | New Zealand Labour Party | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have the boundary follow Richmond Road from Cox's Creek to Surrey Crescent, down the Bullock Track to the North Western Motorway. Instead move the Eden Terrace area into Mt Albert. | | |
| N12-015 | b, h | Objection Objects to the proposed electorate changes for Auckland Central as it does not preserve the community of interest between sections of Grey Lynn. The communities of Point Chevalier, Westmere, Herne Bay and St Mary's Bay all constitute a community of interest. | S McArlay | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the suburbs of Point Chevalier, Westmere, Herne Bay and St Mary's Bay into the Mt Albert electorate. Leave the entirety of Grey Lynn in Auckland Central. | | |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing]

Decision of Commission

| | | | | |
|---------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| N12-016 | b | Objection M Hine Similar to N12-014 | | Disallowed |
| N12-017 | b | Objection K Smith Similar to N12-014 | | Disallowed |
| N12-601 | b, h | Counter-objection T Coffey Relates to objections N12-001 to N12-017 Does not consider Grey Lynn to be a logical part of the Auckland Central electorate. Considers Auckland city centre to form a stand-alone community of interest and indicators show the city centre will continue to increase in residential density to 2018 and beyond. Notes St Marys Bay, Herne Bay, Ponsonby, Freemans Bay, Newton and Eden Terrace are the areas neighbouring the CBD with shared communities of interest. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Auckland Central 'CBD-centric' and set the electoral population as low as possible to avoid the need to radically redraw the boundaries in 2018. Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission for Mt Albert. | | Disallowed |
| N12-602 | b | Counter-objection M Cooper Relates to objections N12-001 to N12-017 Generally supports the boundaries for Auckland Central proposed by the Representation Commission. Supports the concern raised by a number of objectors that the Grey Lynn community of interest should not be split across two electorates. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include all of Grey Lynn within Mt Albert, which would place it with Kingsland, a suburb with which the community has much in common. Consequential changes may include moving the Eden Terrace community into Epsom and including Parnell in Auckland Central. | | Allowed |
| N12-603 | b | Counter-objection D Horton Relates to objections N12-001 to N12-007 Similar to N12-602 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include all of Grey Lynn in Mt Albert, with similar suburbs such as Kingsland. Include Parnell in Auckland Central. | | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

Allowed in part

N12-604 **b** **Counter-objection** **L Holden**
 Relates to objections N12-001 to N12-007
 Considers Grey Lynn to be a community of interest but recognises on the numbers it is not possible to have all of Grey Lynn in Auckland Central. Notes Grey Lynn has more in common with Kingsland or Mt Eden and recommends the boundary for Auckland Central be based on the CBD's community of interest. To compensate, suggests Auckland Central's eastern boundary be expanded to include Parnell.

Suggested solution: The boundary should follow Richmond Road up to Ponsonby Road and then follow the North Western Motorway.

Allowed

N12-605 **b** **Counter-objection** **S Anderson**
 Relates to objections N12-001 to N12-007
 Considers Grey Lynn to have more in common with other residential suburbs such as Mt Albert. Notes Parnell and Ponsonby are central suburbs which share character and issues with the CBD.

Suggested solution: Include Eden Terrace and Grey Lynn in the Mt Albert electorate.

Allowed

N12-606 **b, h** **Counter-objection** **J Long**
 Relates to objections N12-001 to N12-005
 Considers Grey Lynn, Westmere and Pt Chevalier all form a similar community of interest.

Suggested solution: Include Westmere, Grey Lynn and Pt Chevalier in Mt Albert.

Allowed

N12-607 **b** **Counter-objection** **M V oyce**
 Relates to objection N12-001
 Suggests Grey Lynn should be placed with Kingsland as the two areas are of a similar size and have common issues.

Suggested solution: The boundary between Mt Albert and Auckland Central should run from Richmond Road, turn to the motorway and back to the CBD.

Allowed

N12-608 **b** **Counter-objection** **B Milson**
 Relates to objection N12-006
 Similar to N12-602

Suggested solution: Grey Lynn to be included in Mt Albert and Eden Terrace and Parnell to be included in Auckland Central with the boundary to follow Richmond Road up to Ponsonby Road, then follow the North Western Motorway.

| | | | |
|---------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N12-609 | b | Counter-objection G Moyle Relates to objection N12-006 Considers Westmere, Grey Lynn, Arch Hill and Eden Terrace should be included in Mt Albert as they share communities of interest. Cox's Bay, Ponsonby, Herne Bay, Freemans Bay and the CBD and possibly Parnell should be included in Auckland Central. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The boundary between Mt Albert and Auckland Central to run from Cox's Bay Park to Richmond Road, to Ponsonby Road and to the North Western Motorway. | Allowed |
| N12-610 | b, h | Counter-objection A Barrowclough Relates to objection N12-006 and others Considers Grey Lynn a suburban community, whereas Auckland CBD has clear identifying characteristics that are unlike neighbouring suburban communities and should be recognised as a community of interest. Also suggests recognition needs to be given to the under reporting of residents in Auckland CBD in the 2006 and 2013 Census. | Allowed |
| N12-611 | b, h | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N12-014 Objects to the suggestion of moving Eden Terrace into the Mt Albert electorate and considers priority should be given to keeping suburbs such as Waterview in Mt Albert as it has a strong community of interest with the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary as suggested but retain Eden Terrace in Auckland Central. Retain Waterview in Mt Albert. | Disallowed |
| N12-612 | b | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N12-015 Objects to the suggestion of moving Pt Chevalier out of Mt Albert as it has a community of interest with the Mt Albert area. It is also represented by the Albert Eden Local Board. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Pt Chevalier in Mt Albert. | Allowed |
| N12-613 | b, h | Counter-objection S McArley Relates to objection N12-010, N12-012, N12-013 and N12-014 Generally supports these objections but objects to the suggestion that Eden Terrace, Newton or Arch Hill be moved from Auckland Central as these areas form a community of interest with Ponsonby, Grey Lynn and the central city and should be retained in Auckland Central. Also objects to the suggestion to adjust the eastern boundary of the Auckland Central electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Set out in objection N12-015 – the suburbs of Pt Chevalier, Westmere, Herne Bay and St Marys Bay be included in Mt Albert. | Allowed in part |

| | | | | |
|------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| N13 | | Mt Roskill | | |
| N13-001 | b | Objection E Solomon and 387 others Form submission from residents of Epsom who object to their homes transferring to the Mt Roskill electorate. They have no connection or community of interest with Mt Roskill and want to remain in the Epsom electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Landscape Road and Selwyn Road should remain the boundary between Mt Roskill and Epsom. | | Allowed |
| N13-002 | b | Objection M N Neutze and 208 others Form submission from residents objecting to their addresses being taken out of the Epsom electorate and dividing a traditional Epsom community. Their community and connections are with Epsom and not Mt Roskill. They wish to be represented by the MP for Epsom. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing Landscape Road and Selwyn Road boundary. Some of the objectors suggest other boundary changes between Epsom and Tāmaki and to a smaller extent with Maungakiekie and possibly Mt Albert will balance electoral populations with less community disruption. | | Allowed |
| N13-002A | b, h | Objection I Ham Similar to N13-002 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Landscape Road and Selwyn Road should remain the boundary between Mt Roskill and Epsom. The electoral quota needs to increase or there should be some other change to address the impact of increased population on boundary changes. | | Allowed |
| N13-002B | b | Objection M Laurensen Similar to N13-002 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Landscape Road and Selwyn Road as the boundary with Epsom. Move the eastern boundary of Epsom westward to Orakei Road. Extend Mt Roskill eastward to include Onehunga mall area and extend Maungakiekie northwards into Tāmaki along Pt England Road, Merton Road and Ngahue Drive to achieve the necessary quota for each electorate. | | Allowed |
| N13-002C | b | Objection V Chan Similar to N13-002 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Landscape Road and Selwyn Road as the boundary with Epsom. Transfer the suburb of Grafton to Auckland Central. Move the Tāmaki / Epsom boundary from Kelvin Road west to Upland Road. | | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-003 | b, n, h | Objection Dr B Ogilvie Objects to parts of south Epsom being included in the Mt Roskill electorate. The natural and historical divide between the two suburbs lies with Landscape Road and Selwyn Road. The suburb of Epsom has a unique character and should be represented by one MP who understands this character. <i>Suggested solution:</i> That the southern boundary for the Epsom electorate remain at Landscape Road and Selwyn Road. Alternatively, rename the electorate 'Epsom-Roskill'. | Allowed |
| N13-004 | b, n, h | Objection Dr C Ogilvie Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing boundaries or change the Epsom electorate name. | Allowed |
| N13-005 | b | Objection R Troy Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the suburb of Epsom in the Epsom electorate. Instead change the boundary around Parnell and the city fringe. | Allowed |
| N13-006 | b | Objection D and S Cavenett Similar to N13-003 | Allowed |
| N13-007 | b | Objection T Geuther Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Remove the area around Meadowbank from the Epsom electorate instead. | Allowed |
| N13-008 | b | Objection C Small Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Landscape Road as the southern boundary. | Allowed |
| N13-009 | b, h | Objection T M Astley Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the Landscape Road boundary. | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| N13-010 | b | Objection G Shearman Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> The Mt Roskill boundary should be moved west. Owairaka is more affiliated with Mt Roskill. | Allowed |
| N13-011 | b | Objection A Dale Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have the boundary changes for Epsom limited to Tamaki and Mt Albert areas. | Allowed |
| N13-012 | b, h | Objection A Adams Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have the southern boundary remain at Landscape Road and Selwyn Road. Change the north-western boundary to Park Road and Mountain Road to exclude Grafton and Eden Terrace. Ensure One Tree Hill remains in one single suburb. | Allowed |
| N13-013 | b | Objection M Lee Similar to N13-003 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Alter boundaries in other electorates and leave Epsom as it is. | Disallowed in respect of Rostrevor Avenue. |
| N13-014 | b, h | Objection M Spiro Objects to the inclusion of parts of south Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate as the community of interest lies with Epsom. The Auckland Council plans limit the growth in the Epsom area and this area should remain as one cohesive community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |
| N13-015 | b, h | Objection C B Wildermoth Objects to the inclusion of parts of south Epsom in Mt Roskill as this area has no historic links with Mt Roskill. Community links are with Epsom and the proposed change would mean Epsom is under-represented. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries, particularly the parts adjacent to and leading to One Tree Hill. | Allowed |
| N13-016 | b, h | Objection G Bryant Similar to N13-014 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-017 | b | Objection J Wilkins Similar to N13-014 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Epsom and Mt Eden within the Epsom electorate. Remuera and Parnell to become another electorate. | Allowed |
| N13-018 | b | Objection M van Dijk Similar to N13-014 | Allowed |
| N13-019 | b | Objection T Bennett Objects to St Leonards Road being removed from the Epsom electorate. The community is connected by the north face geography and its heritage zoning means future population growth is limited. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adjust the areas south of Landscape Road. | Allowed |
| N13-020 | b | Objection E Laurensen Objects to the inclusion of a distinct community of interest and historically significant parts of Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate. Considers Mt Roskill as distinctive from Epsom. <i>Suggested solution:</i> If Epsom's electoral population has to be adjusted, boundary changes with Tāmaki, Mt Albert or Maungakiekie would better reflect the community of interest of Epsom. | Allowed |
| N13-021 | b | Objection Epsom & Eden District Historical Society Inc Similar to N13-020 | Allowed |
| N13-022 | b | Objection M Seselj Objects to the inclusion of parts of south Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate. The community is focused north towards Epsom where schooling, extra-curricular activities, and community groups are based. | Allowed |
| N13-023 | b | Objection A and S Redmond Objects to the boundary with Epsom. | Allowed |
| N13-024 | b, h | Objection H Wenley, Greenwoods Corner Community Group Objects to the Greenwoods Corner community being moved from the Epsom electorate to Mt Roskill. The area's community of interest lies with the Epsom electorate rather than Mount Roskill. | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing] ***Decision of Commission***

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-025 | b, h | Objection A Millar Similar to N13-024 | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have the southern boundary remain as Selwyn Road. | | | |
| N13-026 | b | Objection E Malloy Similar to N13-024 | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure Greenwoods Corner remains in the Epsom electorate. | | | |
| N13-027 | b | Objection K Malloy Similar to N13-024 | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-026 | | | |
| N13-028 | b | Objection R McMillan Similar to N13-024 | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the eastern boundary at Kelvin Road westward. | | | |
| N13-029 | b | Objection C D Parks Similar to N13-024 | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-028 | | | |
| N13-030 | b | Objection B Young Objects to the inclusion of parts of south Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate. The community affiliations and interests of the residents in this area lie with Epsom. | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include streets leading up to and including the corner of Mt Eden Road and Mt Albert Road; Mt Albert Road and Pah Road; Mt Albert and the Royal Oak roundabout. | | | |
| N13-031 | b | Objection B McGrath Similar to N13-030 | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-032 | b | Objection A Black Similar to N13-030 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the boundary in another area of the electorate. | Allowed |
| N13-033 | b | Objection P McCall Similar to N13-030 | Allowed |
| N13-034 | b | Objection A Younger Similar to N13-030 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move population instead from Balmoral, an area with connections to Mt Roskill schools. | Allowed |
| N13-035 | b | Objection Y Xie Similar to N13-030 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |
| N13-036 | b, h | Objection J Dobson Similar to N13-030 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the area between Watling Avenue and Landscape Road in Epsom. The area by Greenwood Corner could be moved into Mt Roskill or Maungakiekie and the north eastern area of the proposed Epsom electorate should be moved into Tāmaki. | Allowed |
| N13-037 | b | Objection G Thomson Similar to N13-030 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Balance electoral numbers by altering boundaries with Tāmaki. | Allowed |
| N13-038 | b | Objection J Lothian Similar to N13-030 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Boundary changes with Tāmaki, Maungakiekie or perhaps Mt Albert could have less disruption. | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-039 | b | Objection N Malhotra Objects to the inclusion of parts of south Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate. This will negatively affect both schooling options and house prices in the area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |
| N13-040 | b | Objection P Long Objects to the inclusion of part of Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate. The area's connections and the facilities used are with Epsom, Mt Eden and Newmarket and it shares the same issues with these areas, not Mt Roskill. Would like to be represented by an MP who knows about the local area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the boundary as Landscape Road. Keep the New Windsor area in Mt Roskill or move a smaller number of excess New Windsor dwellings into New Lynn. | Allowed |
| N13-041 | b, h | Objection A Long Similar to N13-040 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-40 | Allowed |
| N13-042 | b, h | Objection M Spiro Similar to N13-039 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the boundary as Selwyn Road and St Leonards Road. | Allowed |
| N13-043 | b, h | Objection K Williams Similar to N13-039 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |
| N13-044 | b | Objection K Peacock Similar to N13-039 | Allowed |
| N13-045 | b, h | Objection P D and R M Lane Similar to N13-039 | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing] ***Decision of Commission***

N13-046 b **Objection** **S White**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

Suggested solution: Change the boundary on the eastern edge of the electorate.

N13-047 b, h **Objection** **Dr P Lowe**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

N13-048 b **Objection** **G and K Ragg**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

Suggested solution: Change the boundary around Oranga.

N13-049 b **Objection** **S Mitchell**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

N13-050 b, h **Objection** **K Patel**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

N13-051 b **Objection** **E Young**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

Suggested solution: Look at boundary changes on the eastern edge and towards Tāmaki, Maungakiekie and Mt Albert.

N13-052 b **Objection** **E Chuk**
Similar to N13-002 **Allowed**

Suggested solution: Alter the building of apartments in certain areas to ensure population stays relative.

N13-053 b **Objection** **S Bishop**
Similar to N13-039 **Allowed**

N13-054 b, h **Objection** **D Sharp**
Objects to Landscape Road being moved from the Epsom electorate as their communications and community of interest are with Epsom. **Allowed**

Suggested solution: Keep 2 to 52 Landscape Road in Epsom. Review the Epsom boundaries in the north or east.

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*] **Decision of Commission**

| | | | |
|---------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-055 | b, n, h | Objection G McKeown Objects to the area below Watling Street and Onslow Avenue being excluded from the Epsom electorate. The area to be excluded is a long standing part of Epsom, and topographical features show the area faces towards their community of interest - Epsom. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The area north of Landscape Road should remain in the Epsom electorate. Also consider a name change for Epsom and Tāmaki such as 'Epsom-Hobson' or 'Tāmaki-Orakei'. | Allowed |
| N13-056 | b | Objection L Malhotra Objects to the inclusion of parts of south Epsom in the Mt Roskill electorate. It will negatively affect schooling options for residents of the area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |
| N13-057 | b, h | Objection J Grigg and J Workman Similar to N13-056 | Allowed |
| N13-058 | b | Objection M and R Busch Similar to N13-056 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Landscape Road and Selwyn Road are the traditional boundary lines for Mt Roskill and should remain the boundary. | Allowed |
| N13-059 | b | Objection S Troy Similar to N13-056 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move areas of the central city and Parnell to Auckland Central rather than move the boundary in Epsom. | Allowed |
| N13-060 | b | Objection B Smith, Greenwoods Corner Group Similar to N13-024 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing Epsom boundary. | Allowed |
| N13-061 | b | Objection B Lowe Similar to N13-056 | Allowed |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N13-062 | b | Objection Similar to N13-056 | K J Tunncliffe | Allowed |
| N13-063 | b | Objection Similar to N13-056 | E J Glass | Allowed |
| N13-064 | b | Objection Objects to the area of south Epsom moving to the Mt Roskill electorate as the community is not connected to that area. The two electorates are diverse and culturally different from each other. Topographical features also link this area with Epsom. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Consider moving the boundaries in other areas of the Epsom electorate. | R Harden | Allowed |
| N13-065 | b | Objection Objects to the movement of parts of the Epsom electorate to Mt Roskill as it is a cohesive community that shares similar concerns and population trends are hard to predict. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | D Nalden | Allowed |
| N13-066 | b, h | Objection The area of Epsom contained by Mt Eden Road, Landscape Road, St Andrews Road and Watling Street is an integral part of the Epsom community. The area has no community of interest with Mt Roskill, and their concerns will get overlooked by a representative from Mt Roskill. The main transport corridors are down Mt Eden Road, through Epsom, which also provides a natural barrier between Epsom and Mt Roskill. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The block contained by Mt Eden Road, Landscape Road, St Andrews Road and Watling Street remain in the Epsom electorate. | L A McGregor, Epsom Residents Group | Allowed in part |
| N13-067 | b, h | Objection Similar to N13-066 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing Landscape Road and Selwyn Road boundary. Also include the north facing section of St Andrews Road between Landscape Road and Selwyn Roads to the Atalanga property in Epsom. | South Epsom Planning Group (Inc) | Allowed in part |
| N13-068 | b, h | Objection Petition objecting to the area adjacent to One Tree Hill moving to the Mt Roskill electorate as the community is not connected to that area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> That Manukau Road serve as the boundary between Epsom and Mt Roskill. | C Wildermoth and 37 others | Allowed |

| | | Objection | J Grant | | Decision |
|---------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| N13-069 | b, h | Objection Objects to the area around Selwyn Road moving from the Maungakiekie electorate to Mt Roskill. The area is connected to Epsom, however does have some links to Maungakiekie. The area has no links to Mt Roskill. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the area into the Epsom electorate. Alternatively, keep the area in the Maungakiekie electorate. | J Grant | | Disallowed |
| N13-070 | b | Objection Similar to N13-069 | N Stewart | | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-069 | | | |
| N13-071 | b | Objection Similar to N13-069 | A Bell | | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-069 | | | |
| N13-072 | b | Objection Objects to the south Epsom area being moved into the proposed Mt Roskill electorate. | H K Scott | | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the area bounded by Manukau Road, Lewin Road and Golf Road in the Epsom electorate. | | | |
| N13-073 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | J D Neutze | | Allowed |
| N13-074 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | C Gavin | | Allowed |
| N13-075 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | S F Lau | | Allowed |
| N13-076 | b, h | Objection Similar to N13-072 | T Walker | | Allowed |
| N13-077 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | C Walker | | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing]

Decision of Commission

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| N13-078 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | H Charman | Allowed |
| N13-079 | b, h | Objection Similar to N13-072 | A Thorp | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the boundary in Meadowbank instead of Epsom. | | | | |
| N13-080 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | J Mowbray | Allowed |
| N13-081 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | E Charlebois | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Look at boundary changes on the eastern edge. | | | | |
| N13-082 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | J Brown | Allowed |
| N13-083 | b, h | Objection Similar to N13-072 | P Cammell | Allowed |
| N13-084 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | L Charlebois | Allowed |
| N13-085 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | A Fong | Allowed |
| N13-086 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | K Loo | Allowed |
| N13-087 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | R Fong | Allowed |
| N13-088 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | G and C Wilkinson | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing] ***Decision of Commission***

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| N13-089 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | M Turnbull | Allowed |
| N13-090 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | R I Johnston | Allowed |
| N13-091 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | W Colville | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundary. | | | | |
| N13-092 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | P and A Trotman | Allowed |
| N13-093 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | G Burt | Allowed |
| N13-094 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | G Burt | Allowed |
| N13-095 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | C Turner | Allowed |
| N13-096 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | K Nodder | Allowed |
| N13-097 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | G Berry Smith | Allowed |
| N13-098 | b | Objection Similar to N13-072 | G and T Fernandez | Allowed |

Suggested solution: Retain the existing boundary.

| | | | |
|---------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N13-099 | b | Objection C Cordes Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Alter the boundaries in neighbouring electorates and keep the existing Epsom boundaries. | |
| N13-100 | b | Objection C McKee Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change other boundaries within the electorate. | |
| N13-101 | b | Objection M White Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the boundary in the eastern areas of the electorate. | |
| N13-102 | b | Objection A Hugli Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-103 | b | Objection M Seiler Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-104 | b | Objection J Mark Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-105 | b, h | Objection J Hsu Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-106 | b | Objection W and A Willoughby Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-107 | b | Objection P Wallace Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move Mt Roskill further west instead of into Epsom. | |
| N13-108 | b | Objection S Fidler Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N13-109 | b | Objection S Mahoney Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Changes to the boundary should be in areas where the population has grown, such as infill housing and apartments. | |
| N13-110 | b | Objection P Harrison Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-111 | b | Objection K Kurtovich Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-112 | b, h | Objection J Chamley Similar to N13-072 | Allowed |
| N13-113 | b, h | Objection Royal Oak Intermediate School Objects to the proposed boundary splitting the Maungakiekie electorate from its intermediate school in the Mt Roskill electorate. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use Queenstown Road and Pah Road as the boundary - ensuring Royal Oak Intermediate and its community remain in the Maungakiekie electorate and have only one MP to work with. | |
| N13-114 | b, h | Objection H Stuart, Chairperson of Royal Oak Intermediate School Board of Trustees Objects to splitting Royal Oak Intermediate from the electorate and the school community. The contributing schools are mostly found in Maungakiekie and the shared school community would prefer to lobby and communicate with one MP. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary to follow Beachcroft Road, Queenstown Road, Pah Road, Greenfield Road and Manukau Road to the Cornwall Park perimeter and current boundaries. To compensate move the north-western boundary for Mt Roskill to the corner of Balmoral Road and Sandringham Road and the north-eastern boundary to the corner of Greenland West Road and Cornwell Park. | |
| N13-115 | b, h | Objection Onehunga High School Objects to placing Royal Oak Intermediate and Onehunga High School in the Mt Roskill electorate when their community lies with Onehunga and the Maungakiekie electorate. The proposal would leave Maungakiekie without an intermediate school and place the schools in an electorate that they have no history or connection with. | Allowed in part |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use the Auckland Council local ward boundaries as a guide for the electorate boundaries. Follow Queenstown Road to Pah Road and then Mt Albert Road. | |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N13-116 | b, h | <p>Objection N Turnbull, Onehunga Primary School Board of Trustees</p> <p>Objects to splitting Onehunga High School from the electorate that the school community is linked to. The schools in the area have a shared community. Onehunga is a village community that should remain intact in the electoral boundaries.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-114</p> | Allowed in part |
| N13-117 | b, h | <p>Objection Onehunga Bowling Club</p> <p>Objects to the Onehunga Bowling Club being moved into the Mt Roskill electorate. The bowling club is a feature of Onehunga and the local community is Onehunga. The club has no links with or members from Mt Roskill and should have one elected representative to cover the community.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-115</p> | Allowed in part |
| N13-118 | b, h | <p>Objection J Livingstone</p> <p>Objects to One Tree Hill and Onehunga moving to the Mt Roskill electorate. The communities share no common features and are entirely separate from each other.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure Onehunga and One Tree Hill remain in Maungakiekie.</p> | Disallowed |
| N13-119 | b, h | <p>Objection J Jackson</p> <p>Objects to splitting the Onehunga and One Tree Hill communities in two. They constitute a community of interest. Likewise, the changes are isolating the local schools in a separate electorate from the community they serve.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Have the Maungakiekie electorate boundary along Queenstown Road to the corner of Pah Road and Mt Albert Road in line with the local ward boundaries.</p> | Allowed in part |
| N13-120 | b, h | <p>Objection A Easterbrook</p> <p>Similar to N13-119</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N13-119</p> | Allowed in part |
| N13-121 | b | <p>Objection J Vaughan</p> <p>Objects to Royal Oak and Mt Roskill being in the same electorate as they have different communities of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Maintain the existing boundaries.</p> | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N13-122 | b | Objection R Kerr Objects to the Maungakiekie-Mt Roskill boundary cutting Onehunga in half. This move cuts schools off from their local areas. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Onehunga in the Maungakiekie electorate and do not move the electorate south. | Disallowed |
| N13-123 | b | Objection J Balzer Objects to Trafalgar Street being moved to Mt Roskill. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use either Monte Cecilia Park or Hillsborough Road as the eastern border for Mt Roskill. | Disallowed |
| N13-124 | b | Objection J Guo Objects to the proposed changes to move parts of Maungakiekie into Mt Roskill. The current electorate boundaries group communities with similar opinions and an established culture. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing Maungakiekie boundaries. | Disallowed |
| N13-125 | b, n, h | Objection M E Burke Objects to splitting the Onehunga and Royal Oak communities between two electorates as it will provide less effective representation for the community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing electorate boundaries around Royal Oak and Onehunga. Alternatively rename the Mt Roskill electorate to a more representative name such as 'Three Kings' or 'Waikowai'. | Disallowed |
| N13-126 | b | Objection T Siueva Similar to N13-125 <i>Suggested solution:</i> The Mt Roskill boundary to start at the corner of Pah Road and Carr Road and continue to the suburbs of Hillsborough, Three Kings and Mt Roskill. | Disallowed |
| N13-127 | b, h | Objection R Nauthria Similar to N13-125 | Allowed in respect of an area south of Trafalgar Street and east of Queenstown Road. |
| N13-128 | n | Objection C Spanhake Objects to the name 'Mt Roskill' for the electorate as the boundary changes have changed the electorate's focus. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the name to 'Three Kings'. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| N13-601 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party</p> <p>Relates to objections N13-012, N13-059 and N13-064 and N13-113 to N13-127</p> <p>Supports the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission for the Mt Roskill electorate. Objects to suggested solutions that would change the existing boundary between Auckland Central and Epsom as this boundary is very strong and long standing. Supports placing all of the Royal Oak area in the Mt Roskill electorate.</p> | <p>Allowed in part</p> |
| N13-602 | b, n | <p>Counter-objection New Zealand National Party, Northern Region</p> <p>Relates to objections N13-001 and N13-002</p> <p>Encourages the Representation Commission to consider these objections in the context of misinformation circulated in the Epsom area about the implications of boundary changes for school zones and house prices. Suggests, given the proximity of the area to the existing Mt Roskill boundary, population pressures on Epsom and Auckland as a whole and the demographic diversity of central Auckland electorates that these concerns may be more adequately recognised with a name change of the Mt Roskill electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt or slightly adjust the Mt Roskill boundary proposed by the Representation Commission. Change the name of the electorate to ‘Waikowhai’.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N13-603 | b, n, h | <p>Counter-objection G McKeown</p> <p>Relates to objections N12-001, N12-013, N13-003, N13-004, N13-041, N13-042, N13-052, N13-055, N13-125, N13-128 and N15-001</p> <p>Supports Grey Lynn not being split between electorates but does not agree it should be retained in Auckland Central. Objects to the suggestion Auckland Central should lose population on the eastern boundary.</p> <p>Does not support suggestions a small number of houses be moved from Epsom to Mt Roskill.</p> <p>Does not support the suggested electorate names.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundary between Epsom and Mt Roskill, with the inclusion of a small number of properties on the south side of Landscape Road in Epsom.</p> <p>Retain areas around White Swan and Richardson Roads in Mt Roskill.</p> <p>Include the Oranga area and the Stonefields area in Maungakiekie. Modify the Mt Albert/Auckland Central boundary to retain all of Grey Lynn in one electorate.</p> <p>Retain the name ‘Epsom’ for the electorate if the existing boundary between Epsom and Mt Roskill is adopted.</p> | <p>Substantially allowed</p> |
| N13-604 | b, n, h | <p>Counter-objection L McGregor</p> <p>Relates to objections N13-003, N13-004, N13-039 and N15-001</p> <p>Objects to suggested names for the Mt Roskill and Epsom electorates. Objects to the suggestion the boundary should be placed along St Leonards Road, which would isolate an integral part of Epsom from its community of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Set out in objection N13-066.</p> | <p>Allowed in part</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N13-605 | n, h | Counter-objection J Jackson Relates to objection N13-128 Considers the name 'Mt Roskill' does not reflect the communities in the proposed electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Waikowhai'. | Disallowed |
| N15 | | | |
| N15-001 | n | Objction C Spanhake Objects to the name Epsom as the electorate no longer centres around the community of Epsom. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Remuera'. | Disallowed |
| N15-601 | n | Counter-objection M J Watson Relates to objection N15-001 Objects to the suggestion the electorate be named 'Remuera' as the electorate is currently named 'Epsom' and the boundary change is not significant. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'Epsom' for the electorate. | Allowed |
| N16 | | | |
| N16-001 | b, h | Objction Dr I Mathias Objects to the inclusion of the Stonefields development in the Tāmaki electorate as the communities of Tamaki are centred around Glen Innes. The Stonefields development is more closely aligned with Mt Wellington, part of the Maungakiekie electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Stonefields in the Maungakiekie electorate. | Disallowed |
| N16-002 | b, h | Objction M Ritchie Objects to Stonefields being in the Tāmaki electorate as it shares no common links with suburbs in that area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Same as N16-001 | Disallowed |
| N16-003 | b, h | Objction D Gribben Objects to splitting the Stonefields area from the Mt Wellington suburb as it has links to the historical pa site on Mt Wellington. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Same as N16-001 | Disallowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | | |
|---------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| N16-004 | b, h | Objection | M Beckett | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the exclusion of the Mt Wellington quarry from the Maungakiekie electorate as it is a geographical feature on the Mt Wellington suburb. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the quarry as part of Maungakiekie. Consider moving the Penrose South business sector out of the electorate. | | |
| N16-005 | b | Objection | J Roberts | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the inclusion of Stonefields in the Tāmaki electorate. The community of interest for the development lies within the Maungakiekie electorate. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use College Road as the boundary. | | |
| N16-006 | b | Objection | A White | Allowed in part |
| | | Objects to the proposal to split the Ellerslie community with the proposed boundary. The Stonefields area, including Lunn Avenue, has much in common with the Ellerslie area and should have the same MP. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move Stonefields and Lunn Avenue into Maungakiekie. | | |
| N16-601 | b | Counter-objection | P J Mostert | Allowed |
| | | Relates to objection N16-001 | | |
| | | Considers the Stonefields development to be more closely centred on the Tāmaki electorate or the St Johns area rather than Maungakiekie. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Stonefields in the Tāmaki electorate. | | |
| N16-602 | b | Counter-objection | K Wall | Allowed |
| | | Relates to objection N16-001 | | |
| | | Objects to the suggested changes to the Tāmaki electorate. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | | |
| N16-603 | b | Counter-objection | J Hoskins | Allowed |
| | | Relates to objection N16-001 | | |
| | | Considers the Stonefields community is associated with Eastern Bays, Glendowie and Glen Innes and their community of interest to be with the Tāmaki electorate. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | | |

| | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N16-604 | b | Counter-objection G Yanhua Relates to objection N16-001 Notes Stonefields school zone belongs in the Tāmaki electorate and considers Stonefields to be more closely linked to the Tāmaki area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-605 | b | Counter-objection M Zhang Relates to objection N16-001 Similar to N16-004 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-606 | b | Counter-objection G Myles Relates to objection N16-001 Objects to the suggestion Stonefields is closely aligned with Mt Wellington as it is a new suburb and the majority of residents have strong affiliations to the Tāmaki electorate, including schools, shops and social activities in the area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-607 | b, h | Counter-objection B Dungan Relates to objections N16-001 and N16-006 Objects to the suggestions Stonefields is more closely aligned with Mt Wellington. Considers the Stonefields residents to be more closely aligned with the Eastern Suburbs and the Tāmaki MP and the Orakei Local Board meet the needs of Stonefields residents. | Allowed |
| N16-608 | b | Counter-objection S Heap Relates to objections N16-001 and N16-002 Considers the Stonefields residents to be more closely aligned with the Eastern Suburbs than Mt Wellington. The area is in the Orakei Ward and the school catchment is in the St Johns area. Considers they have a greater affinity with Tāmaki. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-609 | b | Counter-objection J Dring Relates to objections N16-001 and N16-002 Considers the Stonefields residents to be more closely aligned to the Eastern Suburbs. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*] **Decision of Commission**

| | | | |
|---------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N16-610 | b | Counter-objection J Harris Relates to objections N16-001 and N16-002 Does not consider Stonefields to be affiliated with Glen Innes. Feels strongly affiliated with the Eastern Suburbs and shops at Eastridge and Newmarket. Notes secondary school students attend Selwyn College and their friends are in the Eastern Suburbs. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-611 | b | Counter-objection Dr R J Ellis Relates to objections N16-001 and N16-002 Objects to the suggestion Stonefields be included in Maungakiekie. As a resident of Stonefields, business and recreational activities are in Lunn Avenue, Meadowbank, East Ridge, Mission Bay and St Heliers. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-612 | b | Counter-objection T Brown Relates to objections N16-001 and N16-002 Similar to N16-608 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-613 | b | Counter-objection T Wilson Relates to objection N16-002 Similar to N16-608 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-614 | b | Counter-objection L Wall Relates to objection N16-002 Similar to N16-602 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-615 | b | Counter-objection F Wall Relates to objection N16-002 Similar to N16-602 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N16-616 | b | Counter-objection E Nagle Relates to objection N16-002 Objects to the suggestion Stonefields be included in Maungakiekie. Residents of Stonefields use Meadowbank, Remuera, and St Johns for shops, facilities and public transport. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-617 | b | Counter-objection J Nagle Relates to objection N16-005 Similar to N16-616 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-618 | b | Counter-objection F Wilson Relates to objection N16-003 Objects to the suggestion Stonefields be included in Maungakiekie because of links to the historical pa site on Mt Wellington. Does not consider this to be a relevant criteria for the determination of electoral boundaries. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-619 | b | Counter-objection A Guo Relates to objections N16-001, N16-006, N17-001 and N17-006 Objects to the suggestion Stonefields be included in Maungakiekie. Considers Stonefields' community of interest, demographics and transport links are with the suburbs to the north including Remuera and St Johns. Notes the old quarry is a physical boundary to the south and Stonefields is a newly built suburb and part of the Orakei Council Ward. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-620 | b | Counter-objection Ms Han Relates to objections N16-001, N16-006, N17-001 and N17-006 Similar to N16-619 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| N16-621 | b | Counter-objection G Myles and 102 others Relates to objections N16-001 to N16-006 and N17-001 to N17-006 Petition objection to the suggested change to include Stonefields in the Maungakiekie electorate. Notes Stonefields is in the Tāmaki electorate and the Orakei Local Board area and Stonefields community of interest is with the Eastern Bays such as Meadowbank and St Johns. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N16-601 | Allowed |
| N16-622 | b | Counter-objection C Davis Relates to objections N16-001 to N16-006 and N17-001 to N17-005 Similar to N16-619 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Stonefields to remain in the Tāmaki electorate. All of Lunn Avenue could be in the Maungakiekie electorate so the road would not be split. | Allowed |
| N16-623 | b, h | Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objections N16-001 to N16-006 and N17-002 to N17-009, N17-011 and N17-017 Supports the Representation Commission’s proposed boundary between Tāmaki and Maungakiekie, keeping Stonefields in Tāmaki and Mt Wellington in Maungakiekie. Objects to the suggested boundaries to include the suburbs of Pannure, Pt England and Glen Innes for reasons that include appropriate use of long standing local government boundaries and apparent misunderstanding of the statutory criteria by some objectors. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission for Tāmaki. | Substantially allowed |
| N16-624 | b, h | Counter-objection J Jackson Relates to objections N16-001 and others Notes the 2007 electoral boundary changes divided the area of Pt England and Glen Innes and split the suburbs of Tamaki and Pannure from the Tāmaki electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary for the Tāmaki electorate southward to unite Tamaki School and Tamaki College in one electorate. Suggests Ruapotaka Primary school should also be included in the Tāmaki electorate. | Disallowed |

| | | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N17 | Maungakiekie | Allowed |
| N17-001 | <p>b Objection M Crooks</p> <p>Objects to the boundary between Maungakiekie and Tāmaki using the busy thoroughfare of Lunn Avenue (between Marua Road and Ngahue Drive). By splitting the road between two representatives neither will advocate on behalf of commuters and residents regarding traffic issues.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary to follow the back boundaries of properties in the area between Lunn Ave and Marua Road. Alternatively, move the boundary to follow the edge of the old quarry face.</p> | Allowed |
| N17-002 | <p>b Objection V Hayes</p> <p>Supports the proposed boundaries for Ellerslie, however the Stonefields area could be moved back into the Maungakiekie electorate as it has been in the past.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the Stonefields subdivision into Maungakiekie.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-003 | <p>b Objection S White</p> <p>Supports the proposed electorate boundary changes in Ellerslie. Would also like Stonefields, an area linked to Ellerslie through shared facilities such as childcare and businesses, included in Maungakiekie.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Bring Stonefields into the Maungakiekie electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-004 | <p>b Objection C Moffat</p> <p>Objects to the division of the Ellerslie community in the proposed boundaries.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Use the Ellerslie Racecourse as the electorate boundary. Include Stonefields in the electorate and return all of Tamaki to the Tāmaki electorate. Use Manukau Road as the western electorate boundary.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-005 | <p>b Objection D Krum, Councillor - Auckland Council</p> <p>Supports the unification of Ellerslie in one electorate to ensure cohesive representation. The Ellerslie community defines itself south of Lunn Avenue, which is represented in the proposed boundaries.</p> <p>Objects to the exclusion of Stonefields from Maungakiekie as it has more in common and community links with Ellerslie and Mt Wellington.</p> <p>Objects to Tamaki and Panmure being included in Maungakiekie, as their communities are closely aligned with Glen Innes and should be in the Tāmaki electorate.</p> <p>The whole area of Onehunga and Royal Oak has a strong affinity for and around One Tree Hill. This area should remain in a single cohesive electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Stonefields in the Maungakiekie electorate. Use the Auckland Council Ward boundaries (Queenstown Road and Pah Road) as the western boundary for Maungakiekie.</p> | Disallowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*] **Decision of Commission**

| | | | | |
|---------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| N17-006 | b, h | Objection Objects to the inclusion of Penrose, Westfield and Southdown in the Maungakiekie electorate as they are not connected to the community. Having Ellerslie unified in the electorate is a good step, but Onehunga should not be excluded from the electorate as it has similar issues and concerns, likewise Stonefields. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Onehunga and/or Stonefields and remove Southdown, Penrose and Westfield from the electorate. | Ellerslie Residents Association Inc | Disallowed |
| N17-007 | b | Objection Objects to the Maungakiekie - Tāmaki border splitting Panmure and parts of Point England. They are linked to Tāmaki and should be represented by an MP from that area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have Glen Innes, Point England and Panmure united in the Tāmaki electorate. | J Hunt | Disallowed |
| N17-008 | b | Objection Objects to the split of Panmure away from the similar communities of Point England and Glen Innes. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Stonefields with Mt Wellington and move the boundary south to Lagoon Drive. | J Copeland | Disallowed |
| N17-009 | b | Objection Objects to the splitting of Tamaki, Panmure, Mt Wellington and Westfield in the proposed electorate boundaries. They are a naturally aligning community and should remain together. | M Zhao | Substantially allowed |
| N17-010 | b, h | Objection Objects to the division of the Panmure township between multiple electorates. The town has a long standing history in the Auckland City and its integrity should remain intact. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure that Panmure is placed entirely in a single electorate, and not divided between multiple electorates. | K Sharp | Allowed |
| N17-011 | b, h | Objection Objects to the split of Tamaki from the Tāmaki electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> That the boundaries for Point England / Tamaki in the Maungakiekie electorate be moved south to Lagoon Drive, as they were prior to 2007, to better accommodate the communities of interest of Glen Innes, Point England, Tamaki and Panmure. | A Ngaro, MP | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N17-012 | b | Objection J Davies Similar to N17-011 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-011 | Disallowed |
| N17-013 | b, h | Objection New Zealand Labour Party Objects to the boundary proposed between Maungakiekie and Tāmaki electorates running along Point England Road as this splits one quarter of Point England from the rest of the suburb, including the local school, reserve and shopping area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary north to the Omaru Creek, moving the northern side of Point England Road into the Maungakiekie electorate. Starting at the mouth of the Omaru Creek at the Tamaki River, run along the creek, pass between Maybury Street and Taniwha Street / Rowena Crescent, before re-joining the current boundary at the beginning of Maybury Street. | Allowed in part |
| N17-014 | b | Objection R Northey Same as N17-013 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Same as N17-013 | Allowed in part |
| N17-015 | b, h | Objection Point England School Objects to splitting the Tamaki community between two electorates. Point England School and Tamaki College and their families will be split. It will also make Tamaki redevelopment more difficult to organise. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure the Tāmaki electorate includes all of the suburbs of Glen Innes, Point England and Panmure. | Disallowed |
| N17-016 | b, h | Objection S Solomon Objects to proposed boundaries splitting Panmure and Tamaki as single representation is needed for this area's social and economic issues. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing boundaries. | Disallowed |
| N17-017 | b | Objection G Turner Objects to the continued split in the suburbs of Glen Innes, Point England, Tamaki and Panmure. The suburbs are all covered by the urban redevelopment programme. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure Glen Innes, Point England, Tamaki and Panmure are reunited in a single Tāmaki electorate. | Disallowed |

Disallowed

Objection **G Thompson**
Objects to splitting the Tamaki community between two electorates. It is a cohesive community with common interests.

Disallowed

Objection **United Future NZ Party, Auckland Branch**
Objects to the exclusion of the area east of Onehunga Mall and Grand Drive from the Maungakiekie electorate. This area is an integral part of the One Tree Hill suburb and the proposed boundary splits this community of interest.
Objects to the inclusion of the Westfield area in Maungakiekie, which has closer links to Otahuhu than to Mt Wellington.

Suggested solution: Retain the area east of Onehunga Mall and Grand Drive (south of Bollard Avenue, west of Moana Avenue and north of Mt Smart Road) in Maungakiekie. Instead, exclude the area of Manukau East south of the Main Trunk Railway line (Westfield to Sylvia Park) and west of the Southern Motorway.

Disallowed

Objection **Onehunga Business Association**
Objects to the removal of the western areas of the Maungakiekie electorate and the growth of the electorate to the south-east. The area has been compromised with representation in the Auckland Council, and these changes will further split a community in two - threatening the effectiveness of representation.

Disallowed

Objection **E Puni**
Objects to the inclusion of northern Otahuhu in the Maungakiekie electorate. This community is more affiliated with the community of Manukau and the proposed boundary splits the community in two. Students at schools such as Panama Road School, Otahuhu Intermediate, Mt Richmond School and Otahuhu School will live in separate electorates from their school.

Suggested solution: Return the boundary to the current boundary agreed upon in 2007.

Disallowed

Objection **S Solomon**
Objects to the movement of the Maungakiekie electorate boundaries as the electorate is very diverse and vibrant and changing the boundaries could affect its economic growth.

Suggested solution: Keep the existing boundaries.

Disallowed

Objection **M Merila**
Objects to the Maungakiekie boundaries.

Disallowed

Objection **C Spanhake**
Objects to the electorate name as it does not represent the entire electorate.

Suggested solution: Name the electorate 'Mt Wellington'.

| | | | |
|---------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N17-601 | b | <p>Counter-objection S Heap Relates to objection N17-002 Objects to the suggestion the Stonefields area should be moved back into Maungakiekie. Stonefields is a new suburb and has only ever been in Tāmaki.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Stonefields in the Tāmaki electorate.</p> | Allowed |
| N17-602 | b | <p>Counter-objection A Mostert Relates to objection N17-002 Similar to N17-601</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-601</p> | Allowed |
| N17-603 | b | <p>Counter-objection J Dring Relates to objection N17-002 Similar to N17-601</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-601</p> | Allowed |
| N17-604 | b | <p>Counter-objection J Harris Relates to objections N17-002 and N17-003 Objects to the suggestion the Stonefields area should be moved back into Maungakiekie. Stonefields is a new suburb and was a quarry in the past. The area is not linked to Ellerslie. Stonefields has links with the Eastern Suburbs.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-601</p> | Allowed |
| N17-605 | b | <p>Counter-objection J Hoskins Relates to objection N17-003 Similar to N17-604</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-601</p> | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| N17-606 | b | <p>Counter-objection R Tataurangi Relates to objection N17-004 Objects to the proposed solution for objection N17-004 that appears to support the removal of the Royal Oak community from Maungakiekie to enable the inclusion of the Stonefields area. Royal Oak’s community of interest and connections are with Maungakiekie.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Royal Oak in the Maungakiekie electorate. Use Queenstown Road, Pah Road and Mt Albert Road to the west of the intersection with Pah Road as the boundary for the south western end of the electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-607 | b | <p>Counter-objection S Gladding Relates to objections N17-004, N17-005, N17-007, N17-011, N17-013, N17-017 and N17-019 Objects to the suggestion Panmure and Mt Wellington be split into different electorates. Supports the minor change to include Maybury Street in Maungakiekie. Objects to the suggestion Stonefields be included in Maungakiekie. Considers Pt England, Panmure and Mt Wellington to have a shared community of interest. Does not consider Stonefields to have a connection with Panmure and Mt Wellington.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Panmure, Mt Wellington and Pt England in Maungakiekie, with the boundary extending to the reserve north of Maybury Street. Retain Stonefields in Tāmaki. If possible, include Glen Innes in Maungakiekie.</p> | Allowed |
| N17-608 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection Panmure Business Association Relates to objection N17-005 Objects to the suggestion Panmure be included in the Tāmaki electorate. Considers the communities of Glen Innes, Pt England and Panmure are closely aligned and should be represented in one electorate and that Mt Wellington should remain aligned to Panmure. Notes these suburbs are part of the same local government ward.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Glen Innes, Pt England, Panmure and Mt Wellington to remain together in one electorate.</p> | Allowed in part |
| N17-609 | b | <p>Counter-objection B Dungan Relates to objection N17-005 Objects to the suggestion the Stonefields area be included in Maungakiekie. Notes the Stonefields local board and schools are in Tāmaki.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-601</p> | Allowed |
| N17-610 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection L Matthews, Mt Wellington/Panmure RSA Relates to objection N17-005 Similar to N17-608</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Panmure, Pt England and Mt Wellington to remain in Maungakiekie. Stonefields to remain in Tāmaki.</p> | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N17-611 | b, h | Counter-objection Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Relates to objections N16-001 to N16-005, N17-002, N17-003, N17-005 N17-006, N17-007, N17-019 and N17-021 Suggests Glen Innes be joined with the suburbs of Pt England, Tamaki and Panmure. Objects that they should be placed in the Tāmaki electorate as this would separate them from Mt Wellington with which there is a historical connection. The programming of community centres, recreation centres, libraries and community development is determined by the Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board, which further links Glen Innes to this area. Objects to the suggestion Stonefields be included in Maungakiekie as its connections are to Meadowbank and Remuera. Supports the proposal to move the Maungakiekie electorate to the south to include the community of Riverside, which reflects the current local government boundaries. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The Maungakiekie boundary to run along the West Tamaki Road and the eastern rail line (which is the same as the local government boundaries). Move Ellerslie into Tāmaki to compensate, which is more closely associated which communities to the north. If these changes were made, name the Tāmaki electorate ‘Orakei’. Retain Stonefields in the Tāmaki electorate. Adopt the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission between Maungakiekie and Manukau East. | Allowed in part |
| N17-612 | b, h | Counter-objection J McAlpine Relates to objection N17-005 and others Objects to the suggestion Onehunga and Royal Oak be considered one geographical and interest area to be included in the Maungakiekie electorate. Considers the areas to be quite independent of each other. Objects to the suggestion Panmure be considered separately from Mt Wellington and be linked with Tamaki and Glen Innes. Panmure and Mt Wellington have a shared history and have common interests. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Onehunga in Maungakiekie and include Royal Oak in Epsom. Retain Panmure in Maungakiekie with Mt Wellington. | Allowed in part |
| N17-613 | b, h | Counter-objection A Verrall Relates to objections N17-005 N17-007, N17-008, N17-011, N17-012, N17-015 and N17-017 Objects to the suggestion Panmure should be split from Mt Wellington. The historical connection between the two areas continue to be reinforced through ongoing developments, for example the AMETI Park and Ride serves both areas. Considers Glen Innes, Pt England and Panmure to have a lot in common. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Panmure and Mt Wellington to remain in Maungakiekie. If possible include Glenn Innes with Pt England, Panmure and Mt Wellington in Maungakiekie. | Allowed in part |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N17-614 | b | Counter-objection C Teesdale Relates to objection N17-013 Objects to the suggestion Pt England is better served by being included in Maungakiekie. This area's community and connections are with the Tamaki inlet and Glen Innes. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Pt England in the Tāmaki electorate. | Disallowed |
| N17-615 | b | Counter-objection M and J Welch Relates to objections N17-007, N17-008, N17-015 and N17-017 Similar to N17-613 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Panmure and Mt Wellington to remain in Maungakiekie. | Allowed |
| N17-616 | b | Counter-objection A and M Dance Relates to objections N17-007, N17-008, N17-011, N17-017 and N17-019 Considers Panmure and Mt Wellington should be paired as a group as they share connections and facilities. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Try to keep historically formed communities together. | Allowed |
| N17-617 | b, h | Counter-objection M Thomas, Deputy Chair, Orakei Local Board Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggestion to move the Maungakiekie boundary northwards. Supports uniting Panmure, Tamaki, Pt England and Glen Innes communities within the Tāmaki electorate to better accommodate their communities of interest and links. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the Tāmaki electorate boundary south to Lagoon Drive in Panmure. | Disallowed |
| N17-618 | b | Counter-objection K Parkinson, Orakei Local Board Member Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Similar to N17-617 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-617 | Disallowed |
| N17-619 | b | Counter-objection J Nicholson Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Similar to N17-617 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N17-617 | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N17-620 | b | Counter-objection O Collette-Moxon Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggestion the boundary run along Pt England Road as this will split part of Pt England from the rest of the suburb, including the school, reserve and shopping area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the northern side of Pt England Road into the Maungakiekie electorate. Starting at the mouth of the Omaru Creek, the boundary to run along the creek then between Maybury Street and Taniwha Street and Rowena Crescent before joining the existing boundary. | Allowed |
| N17-621 | b, h | Counter-objection H Donegan Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggestion the boundary run along Pt England Road. Considers East Tamaki and Glen Innes have no community of interest with Green Lane, Onehunga, Ellerslie and One Tree Hill. Their connection is to the rest of the Tāmaki electorate. | Disallowed |
| N17-622 | b, h | Counter-objection K Hickland Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Considers the existing electorate boundaries to have well served the area for a number of years. Does not support parts of Onehunga moving into Mt Roskill. | Allowed in part |
| N17-623 | b, h | Counter-objection E Henson, Ellerslie Residents Association Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggested solution for N17-013 and N17-014. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | Disallowed |
| N17-624 | b, h | Counter-objection G Moody Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggested solution as this does not keep the Glen Innes community together or resolve the split between Panmure and Glen Innes. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Glen Innes, Pt England, Tamaki and Panmure in the Tāmaki electorate. To compensate move Stonefields to Maungakiekie. The boundary could run along Lagoon Drive, Jellicoe Road, the rail corridor, Merton Road, Donnelly Street and Ngahue Drive to join the proposed boundary at Abbots Way. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N17-625 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection T Hyslop Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggestion the Maungakiekie boundary be extended further as the electorate already incorporates a number of different centres.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-626 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection B Cullen Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggested boundary as it is at odds with the historical placement of these communities within the Tāmaki electorate. Considers the geographic area and community of interest for residents of Pt England and Panmure to be strongly associated with the Tāmaki electorate and the wider Glen Innes suburb.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the entire Panmure and Pt England suburbs in the Tāmaki electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-627 | b | <p>Counter-objection J Sax Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggested boundary. Considers Panmure and Pt England should be with Glen Innes and that the Tāmaki electorate should be moved south to unite the Pt England school zone within one electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Pt England, Panmure and Glen Innes in the Tāmaki electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-628 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection T Millar Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Objects to the suggested solution for N17-013 and N17-014.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Stonefields in Maungakiekie in light of its historical association with Mt Wellington. For the Commission to take notice of the natural dividing line of park land from the Ellerslie Racecourse across Abbots Park, Waitarua Reserve, the Remuera Golf Course and sports facilities north of Stonefields.</p> | Disallowed |
| N17-629 | b, n, h | <p>Counter-objection M Burke QSM Relates to objections N17-013 and N17-014 Considers the proposed extension of the Maungakiekie boundary to the north to be at odds with the historical placement of the affected communities in the Tāmaki electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Reiterates the suggestion provided in N13-125 that the Mt Roskill name be changed to a more representative name such as ‘Three Kings’ or ‘Waikowhai’.</p> | Disallowed |

| | | | | |
|------------|------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N17-630 | b, h | Counter-objection | New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objections N17-019 and N17-021 Objects to the suggestion the boundary remain the same as the 2007 electoral boundaries. Considers the boundary should be realigned to the existing local body boundaries, which would also be consistent with the old Mt Wellington and Otahuhu borough boundaries. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission with the southern boundary being Portage Road. | Allowed |
| N17-631 | b, h | Counter-objection | S Durbin Relates to objections N17-019 and N17-021 Objects to the suggestion the area should be linked with Otahuhu in Manukau East. Considers this area to have transport, shopping and community links to the rest of Mt Wellington. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed |
| N17-632 | n | Counter-objection | G Seymour Relates to objection N17-024 Objects to the suggested name 'Mt Wellington' for the electorate, although notes there is some merit in the suggestion. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Maungarei' to acknowledge the geography moving across from Maungakiekie. | Disallowed |
| N20 | | Manukau East | | |
| N20-001 | n | Objection | C Spanhake Objects to the name 'Manukau East' as it does not adequately describe the entire area covered by the electorate, particularly with the disestablishment of the Manukau City Council. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Otara'. Alternatively 'Otahuhu' or 'Middlemore'. | Disallowed |
| N20-601 | n | Counter-objection | New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objection N20-001 Objects to the suggested names 'Otara', 'Otahuhu' or 'Middlemore' as they ignore the Papatoetoe community that makes up nearly half the population of the proposed electorate. 'Otara' would also be confusing as the Otara sub-ward is partly in the Botany electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'Manukau East' for the electorate. | Allowed |

| | | | |
|------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N20-602 | n, h | Counter-objection G Troup Relates to objection N20-001 Objects to the suggested names as none of them could be used to describe the whole area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'Manukau East' for the electorate. If the electorate name must change, name the electorate 'Papatotoe', which has recently celebrated its 150th anniversary. | Allowed |
| N20-603 | n | Counter-objection I McGechie Relates to objection N20-001 Does not consider there is a need to change the name of the electorate. 'Manakau East' still maintains significance as the major southern commercial and industrial area within the region. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the name 'Manukau East' for the electorate. | Allowed |
| N22 | | Manurewa | |
| N22-001 | b, h | Objection A Dalton, Manurewa Local Board Supports the proposed electorate boundaries for the Manurewa and Papakura electorates as they are well aligned with the Council voting districts. | Allowed |
| N23 | | Papakura | |
| N23-001 | b, h | Objection G A Rasmussen Supports the inclusion of the Redoubt Road area within the Papakura electorate as they are part of a distinct community of interest in the Papakura area. | Allowed |
| N23-002 | b, h | Objection J Robinson Similar to N23-001 | Allowed |
| N23-003 | b, h | Objection B Burrill Supports the proposed boundaries between the Manurewa and Papakura electorates. | Allowed |
| N23-004 | b, h | Objection B McEntee, Papakura Local Board Similar to N23-003 | Allowed |
| N23-005 | b | Objection R and S Coles Similar to N23-003 | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| N23-006 | b, h | Objection | Sir J Walker and C Penrose, Auckland Council – Manurewa-Papakura Ward Councillors Similar to N23-003 | Allowed |
| N23-007 | b | Objection | B Mockeridge, United Future NZ Party, Auckland Branch Objects to the movement of the boundary between Alfriston-Ardmore Road and Fitzpatrick Road and Eastern Redoubt Road from Hunua to the Papakura electorate as the strip more naturally belongs with rural Clevedon. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing Hunua-Papakura boundary from Redoubt Road, south along Mill Road to Ranfurly Road, east along Ranfurly to Brookby Road, south along Alfriston-Ardmore Road to Clevedon-Takanini Road, eastwards to Parish Line Road, southwards to Papakura-Clevedon Road, then eastwards along Papakura-Clevedon Road to the unchanged boundary at Creightons Road. | Disallowed |
| N23-008 | b, h | Objection | T Weeler Supports the proposal to move Alfriston and the top end of the Papakura-Clevedon Road into the Papakura electorate. Alfriston has greater community links with Papakura than with Manurewa or Hunua. | Allowed |
| N23-009 | b, h | Objection | A Baker Is concerned by the movement of the Clarks Beach and Waiau Pa area away from the Papakura electorate which could indicate the Karaka area and Hingaia Peninsula are likely to move in the future. These areas have a strong link to Papakura. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ensure the Hingaia Peninsula and Karaka remain part of the Papakura electorate. | Allowed in part |
| N23-010 | b | Objection | N Grant Similar to N23-009 | Allowed |
| N23-601 | b | Counter-objection | New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objection N23-007 Supports the objection. Does not consider the Redoubt Road and Brookby area should be included in the urbanising Papakura electorate. Also objects to the inclusion of Mission Heights, which is an urban area, in the peri-urban Hunua electorate. | Disallowed |
| N23-602 | b, h | Counter-objection | W Simpson Relates to objection N23-007 Objects to the solution suggested by N23-007 on the basis the areas have far more affinity to Papakura than to Pukekohe. Travel from this area to Papakura is a 10 to 15 minute drive and many people in the area work in Papakura and have an affinity to the Papakura area. | Allowed |

Suggested solution: Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission.

| | | | |
|------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N23-603 | b, h | Counter-objection V Jack Relates to objection N23-007 Considers the community of interest of residents in the area to be with Papakura. Residents in the area use facilities, schools, shops and work in Papakura. Does not have a connection with Pukekohe. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N23-602 | Allowed |
| N23-604 | b | Counter-objection N Kuypers Relates to objection N23-007 Similar to N23-602 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N23-602 | Allowed |
| N24 | | | |
| N24-001 | b, h | Hunua Objection S Crockett Objects to the movement of the Waiau Pa and Clarks Beach communities from the Papakura electorate to the proposed Hunua electorate. | Disallowed |
| N24-002 | b, h | Objection A Seabrook Objects to the exclusion of Waiau Pa and Clarks Beach from the Papakura electorate. The community has ties to Papakura and it is through this area that most residents work, shop and commute. | Disallowed |
| N24-003 | n, h | Objection A Baker Objects to the name 'Hunua' being used for the electorate as it has a very close affinity to the Auckland Council Franklin local board and the Franklin identity. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Franklin'. | Disallowed |
| N24-004 | n | Objection C Spanhake Objects to the name 'Hunua' for the electorate as it is not representative of the entire area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Franklin'. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N24-005 | b | <p>Objection R H McGregor</p> <p>Objects to the proposed electorate boundaries with Waikato and Botany. Following the new Auckland boundary splits the rural communities from their local towns Pukekohe and Waiuku. The Botany boundary includes an urban area in the rural Hunua electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the urban areas around Botany into the Botany electorate (Murphy Road, Thomas Road, Flat Bush Road, Chapel Road and Ormiston Road). Have the southern boundary follow the Waikato River taking in Maioro, Otatau and Aka Aka until it reaches a point west of Tuakau then north to a point at Buckland, east to Ridge Road.</p> | Disallowed |
| N24-006 | b | <p>Objection Iris</p> <p>Objects to the Mission Heights area being included within the proposed Hunua electorate. As a rapidly developing area it shares little with the mostly rural Hunua electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Place the Mission Heights suburb within the Botany electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N24-007 | b | <p>Objection A Grey</p> <p>Objects to the proposed boundary between Hunua and Botany electorates as it splits the community of Flat Bush in half, placing areas of high development in a predominantly rural electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include an area bound by Caldwell's Road, Sandstone Road, Ormiston Road and Murphys Road within the Botany electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| N24-601 | n | <p>Counter-objection G Seymour</p> <p>Relates to objection N24-004</p> <p>Objects to the suggested electorate name of 'Franklin'. Recommends the Commission favour Māori names for the historical association and support for te reo Māori.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name 'Hunua' for the electorate.</p> | Allowed |
| N24-602 | b | <p>Counter-objection R Kyd</p> <p>Relates to objection N24-005</p> <p>Objects to the solution suggested by N24-005 for the boundary with Waikato on the basis it is more sensible for the areas of Maioro, Otatau, Aka Aka and Tuakau to be part of the Waikato electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission.</p> | Allowed |

| | | | |
|------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N24-603 | b, h | Counter-objection A Dalton, Manurewa Local Board Relates to objections N24-005 to N24-007 Supports the proposed inclusion of parts of Flat Bush in the Hunua electorate as these areas are fast growing. Including these areas in Botany would require other significant changes to Botany and other electorates in the area which would not be in the interests of effective representation. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed |
| N24-604 | b, h | Counter-objection S Stewart and D Quax, Auckland Council, Howick-Pakuranga-Botany Ward Councillors Relates to objections N24-005 to N24-007 Supports the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission as it has largely succeeded in keeping completed developments in the Botany electorate, while keeping planned developments in the Hunua electorate. The Hunua electorate is a town belt seat and will necessarily include areas of high growth. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed |
| N25 | | Waikato | |
| N25-001 | b | Objection W R Cowie Objects to the Hamilton East boundary not using the Waikato Expressway to define city limits as the Waikato District Council and Hamilton City Council have done since construction of the road began. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include this block of land bounded by the Waikato Expressway in the Hamilton East electorate. | Allowed |
| N25-002 | b, h | Objection Hamilton City Council Objects to the proposed Waikato electorate including the area around the Ruakura Research Centre and Percival Road, which are within the city's eastern boundary. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have two general electorates to cover Hamilton City: Hamilton East and Hamilton West. The area around Ruakura Research Centre and Percival Road to be included in Hamilton East. | Allowed |
| N26 | | Hamilton West | |
| N26-001 | b | Objection N and L Henderson Supports the realignment of the electorate boundaries to bring an area east of the Waikato River within the Hamilton West electorate. | Allowed |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| N26-002 | b, h | Objection Similar to N26-001 | W Noble | Allowed |
| N26-003 | b | Objection Similar to N26-001 | A Chew | Allowed |
| N26-004 | b | Objection Similar to N26-001 | R Hamilton | Allowed |
| N26-005 | b, h | Objection Similar to N26-001 | N Fitzsimmons | Allowed |
| N26-006 | b | Objection Supports the inclusion of the areas east of the Waikato River in the Hamilton West electorate as the river is not a natural divide anymore. | P E Hancock | Allowed |
| N26-007 | b | Objection Objects to the inclusion of suburbs to the east of the Waikato River being included in the Hamilton West electorate as the River is a clear boundary. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the portions of the Hamilton West electorate to the east of the river back into Hamilton East and Waikato electorates. | J Hall | Disallowed |
| N26-008 | b, h | Objection Objects to Flagstaff being included in the Hamilton West electorate given it is situated in Hamilton East. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary along Kay Road, Sylvester Road then directly to the river. | B Hesketh | Disallowed |
| N26-009 | b | Objection Similar to N26-008 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N26-008 | R Bryant | Disallowed |
| N26-010 | b | Objection Similar to N26-008 | R Watkins | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N26-601 | b | Counter-objection J Hall Relates to objections N26-001 to N26-006 Objects to N26-001 to N26-006 which support moving an area lying to the east of the Waikato River, in the existing Hamilton East and Waikato electorates, into Hamilton West. Considers more weight should be given to the length of time the existing boundaries have been in place, the Waikato River as a topographical feature and facilities of communication than the community of interest arguments put forward in the objections. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain as much of Hamilton West to the west of the Waikato River as possible within statutory tolerances. | Disallowed |
| N29 | | Bay of Plenty | |
| N29-001 | b, n | Objection L Turner Objects to the proposed boundaries between Tauranga and Bay of Plenty electorates and their names. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have both electorates based around the city, one based on each side of the harbour and including Te Puke. These electorates should be re-named to reflect their communities better, 'Tauranga Moana' and 'Mauao'. Alternatively rename Bay of Plenty 'Matakana'. | Disallowed |
| N29-002 | b, n, h | Objection H Anderson Similar to N29-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Divide the electorates based on east and west areas, using the harbour as a guide. Name the electorate 'Mauao' after the mountain. | Disallowed |
| N29-003 | b, n | Objection P A Dey Objects to the boundary between the proposed Tauranga and Bay of Plenty electorates as it does not represent community groupings within the area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use the harbour as a boundary to create Tauranga East (Mt Maunganui, Omanu and Windmere) and Tauranga West (Te Runa, Omokaroa and Whakamarama) electorates. Use the grouping of Pyes Pa and Greerton as a way to balance electorate numbers. Name the electorate 'Tauranga East' to better reflect the community represented. | Disallowed |

| | | | | | |
|---------|---------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| N29-004 | b | Objection | D Page | Objects to the inclusion of the urban Pyes Pa area in the rural Bay of Plenty electorate. The residents of Pyes Pa have links with Tauranga and no community of interest with Bay of Plenty. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Pyes Pa in the Tauranga electorate. | Allowed |
| N29-005 | b, h | Objection | L Baldock | Objects to the inclusion of Pyes Pa, which is a rapidly growing area, in the Bay of Plenty electorate as it has a community of interest with Greerton and Tauranga CBD. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the Arataki area in the Bay of Plenty instead, which has a similar population size to Pyes Pa and a community of interest with the Bay of Plenty electorate. Alternatively, consider redrawing Bay of Plenty and Tauranga as Tauranga East and Tauranga West. | Allowed |
| N29-601 | b, n, h | Counter-objection | A von Dadelzen | Relates to objections N29-001, N29-002 and N29-003 Objects to the suggestion the Tauranga and Bay of Plenty electorates be redrawn along an east/west line as the existing and proposed boundaries have historically worked well over a number of years, with the urban community of interest well grouped together under Tauranga and the rural community of interest well grouped under Bay of Plenty. Also objects to the suggested names for the electorates. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. If a name change is required, supports the name 'Western Bay of Plenty' for the electorate. | Allowed in part |
| N29-602 | b, n | Counter-objection | M Brookes | Relates to objections N29-001, N29-002 and N29-003 Similar to N29-601 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed in part |
| N29-603 | b, n | Counter-objection | M Christiesen | Relates to objections N29-001, N29-002 and N29-003 Similar to N29-601 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N29-602 | Allowed in part |

| | | | |
|------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| N29-604 | b, n | <p>Counter-objection D Sorensen Relates to objections N29-001, N29-002 and N29-003 Similar to N29-601</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N29-602</p> | <p>Allowed in part</p> |
| N29-605 | b | <p>Counter-objection S Morris Relates to objections N29-001 to N29-005 Does not support a complete redraw of the Tauranga and Bay of Plenty boundaries on the basis it would cause confusion. The Tauranga electorate boundaries have been similar since 1996 and there appears to be little support for the suggestion. Considers Pyes Pa has similarities with Papamoa and Welcome Bay as all three are growing outer suburbs of Tauranga.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. Extend the boundary by Papamoa to Bell Road to cater for future growth on the rural-urban fringe.</p> | <p>Allowed in part in relation to Bell Road.</p> |
| N29-606 | b | <p>Counter-objection R Foggin Relates to objection N29-005 Considers Tauranga only needs one MP and the suggested split is not a good idea.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Tauranga within one electoral district.</p> | <p>Allowed</p> |
| N31 | | | |
| N31-001 | b | <p>Rotorua Objection M Dean Objects to the proposed boundary change including the western side of the road going through Oropi Village within the Rotorua electorate as their community of interest is with the Tauranga area.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> All those living in upper Oropi and upper Pyes Pa should be included in the Bay of Plenty electorate.</p> | <p>Allowed in part as it relates to Oropi.</p> |
| N31-002 | b, h | <p>Objection P de Monchy Objects to the areas of Ohauti, Oropi and Waitao being included in the Rotorua electorate. These communities are linked to Tauranga in terms of a community of interest, the road network and iwi connections.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Shift the boundary south-east to the Kaimai and Otawa Ranges, placing Ohauti, Oropi and Waitao in a Tauranga affiliated electorate, while keeping the links Te Puke and Maketu have with Rotorua.</p> | <p>Allowed in part as it relates to Oropi.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N32 | East Coast | | | |
| N32-001 | b, h | Objection New Zealand Labour Party | Objects to the inclusion of Maketu in the East Coast electorate as it is the landing site of the Te Arawa waka and will split the Te Arawa rohe between two electorates. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Use State Highway 2 as the boundary for Rotorua, then follow the Kaikokopu canal to the sea. Retain Murupara and Galatea within the Rotorua electorate. | | |
| N32-002 | b, h | Objection Gisborne District Council | Objects to the proposed East Coast electorate as it would adversely affect: existing boundaries (with increasing disparity between local authority and parliamentary boundaries), community of interest (iwi affiliations and primary patterns of interaction by residents and businesses), topographical features and facilities of communication. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> East Coast to include Wairoa in the south and Opotiki and Whakatane in the west. | | |
| N32-003 | b, h | Objection J T Kurapa, Murupara Community Board | Objects to the communities of Murupara, Galatea, Ruatahuna, Mingimui and Te Whaiti moving from Rotorua into the East Coast electorate because their community of interest and facilities of communications are with Rotorua. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the community of Waiohau at the northern end of the ward in the East Coast electorate as this community has commercial, community, health, education and social ties with Whakatane. | | |
| N32-004 | b, n, h | Objection R Dolman | Objects to the geographical divide between Gisborne and Opotiki which are both within the proposed East Coast electorate, and the island nature of the Tauranga electorate. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Disestablish the East Coast electorate and use the Māori electorate boundary as the edge of a new 'Mahia' electorate that encompasses Gisborne down towards Napier. The Bay of Plenty electorate should encompass the areas of Opotiki, Whakatane, Murupara, Kawerau and Tupeke. Extend Tauranga to the border of the Coromandel electorate. | | |
| N32-005 | b | Objection T Ballantyne | Objects to an area of the Rotorua electorate being moved into the East Coast electorate. The community of interest of this area and media communications are with Te Puke or Tauranga. The main centre of the East Coast electorate is Gisborne and it covers a vast area. This area is not associated with Gisborne or the East Coast region. | Disallowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*] **Decision of Commission**

| | | | |
|---------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N32-006 | b | <p>Objection A Third</p> <p>Objects to the make up of the proposed East Coast electorate as parts of the electorate have no community of interest with Gisborne.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The East Coast electorate should include the top of the East Cape, Gisborne and Wairoa. The Bay of Plenty electorate boundary should remain the same.</p> | Disallowed |
| N32-007 | b | <p>Objection L Russell</p> <p>Objects to the movement of Maketu to the proposed East Coast electorate. It is geographically remote and does not share community links with the East Coast. Proposed electorate boundaries do not take into account the Te Arawa Iwi affiliation the area recognises.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the Maketu area within an electorate identified with the Bay of Plenty and the Western Bay of Plenty district.</p> | Disallowed |
| N32-008 | b, h | <p>Objection P Hickson</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Pongakawa and surrounding areas in the proposed East Coast electorate. Their community of interest lies with the Bay of Plenty.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Redraw adjacent boundaries to keep the Bay of Plenty together and for the East Coast electorate to gain population from the south east.</p> | Disallowed |
| N32-009 | b | <p>Objection A Natusch and 7 others</p> <p>Supports the proposed change to the eastern boundary of the East Coast electorate as this area has a greater social and commercial community of interest and communication networks with the coastal area from Maketu through to Whakatane and is more integrated with the coastal area than with Rotorua.</p> | Allowed |
| N32-601 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection Gisborne District Council</p> <p>Relates to objection N32-002</p> <p>Further to making objection N32-002, Gisborne District Council suggests an alternative boundary for the East Coast electorate to that proposed by the Representation Commission taking account of existing boundaries, community of interest, topographical features and facilities of communication and the general electorate population quota.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> East Coast to be made up of the existing East Coast electorate area, the Wairoa District area and eight meshblocks of the Whakatane District.</p> | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N32-602 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection T Bonne, Mayor of Whakatāne District Council</p> <p>Relates to objection N32-003 (and N32-001, N32-005, N32-006 and N32-008)</p> <p>Objects to the Murupara Community Board’s suggestion the communities of Murupara, Galatea, Ruatahuna, Waiohau, Minginui and Te Whaiti be excluded from the East Coast electorate. Notes the East Coast electorate is under quota and is predicted to decline significantly against quota. Including these areas in East Coast is more consistent with the established local authority boundaries and will provide administrative efficiencies as well as more consistent governance. There is strong collaboration occurring between Opotiki, Whakatane and Kawerau Councils, all of which will sit within the East Coast electorate under the proposal.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission for inclusion of the southern part of the Whakatane District within the East Coast electorate.</p> | Allowed |
| N32-603 | b | <p>Counter-objection A Natusch and 9 others</p> <p>Relates to objection N32-001</p> <p>Objects to the suggestion SH2 should be the boundary between East Coast and Rotorua because this would divide a community of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission as they better serve the greater proportion of the community.</p> | Allowed |
| N32-604 | b | <p>Counter-objection R Patterson</p> <p>Relates to objection N32-007</p> <p>Objects to the suggestion Maketu be excluded from the East Coast electorate because it is geographically remote and does not share community links with the electorate. Notes the iwi affiliation referred to in the objection is not a relevant statutory criteria for the general electorates. Also notes the coast from Coromandel to East Cape shares many community links and common interests.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission.</p> | Allowed |
| N33 | | | |
| N33-001 | b, h | <p>Taranaki-King Country J Ponga</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Temple View in the Taranaki-King Country electorate. Temple View is part of the Hamilton City Council area and has links with Hamilton as opposed to the rural Taranaki-King Country electorate.</p> | Allowed |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| N33-002 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | M Gray | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Temple View in the Hamilton West electorate. | | | | |
| N33-003 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | T Cassidy | Allowed |
| N33-004 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | S Kenyon | Allowed |
| N33-005 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | D and W Walmsley | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move rural and semi-rural properties into the Taranaki-King Country electorate, such as the area around Horotui, in preference to moving the Temple View suburb of Hamilton City into the electorate. | | | | |
| N33-006 | b, h | Objection Similar to N33-001 | S P Rose | Allowed |
| N33-007 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | C Bradley | Allowed |
| N33-008 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | K Peakman | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing boundaries. | | | | |
| N33-009 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | B and F Johnston | Allowed |
| N33-010 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | C Tamihana | Allowed |
| N33-011 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | E Pogai | Allowed |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N33-012 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | Dr M Walmsley | Allowed |
| N33-013 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | M R Thompson | Allowed |
| N33-014 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | C B Thomas | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Temple View in the Hamilton West electorate. | | | | |
| N33-015 | b | Objection Similar to N33-001 | Jodi | Allowed |
| N33-016 | b, h | Objection Similar to N33-001 | Hamilton City Council | Allowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Have two general electorates to cover Hamilton City: Hamilton East and Hamilton West. The Temple View area to be included in Hamilton West. | | | | |
| N33-017 | b | Objection Objects to the Hamilton International Airport being included in the Taranaki-King Country electorate as it provides services to the Hamilton area, and should be affiliated with a Hamilton electorate. The airport is owned by five shareholding Councils based in the Waikato region, and has close working relationships with the Hamilton MPs. | Hamilton International Airport NZ | Disallowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Extend the Hamilton West electorate boundary to include the Hamilton International Airport. | | | | |
| N33-018 | b | Objection Similar to N33-017 | Hamilton & Waikato Tourism | Disallowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N33-017 | | | | |
| N33-019 | b | Objection Objects to the proposed split of Egmont National Park between Taranaki-King County, New Plymouth and Whanganui. The park should have one member of Parliament responsible for it. | J Hall | Disallowed |
| <i>Suggested solution:</i> Egmont National Park to be wholly within one electorate, preferably Taranaki-King Country or New Plymouth. | | | | |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b* = boundary, *n* = name, *h* = hearing]

Decision of Commission

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N33-020 | n | Objection Objects to the name 'Taranaki-King Country' as there is now very little of Taranaki included in the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'King Country'. | C Spanhake | Disallowed |
| N33-021 | n | Objection Objects to the name of the proposed Taranaki-King Country electorate as the name does not represent a significant part of the electorate. | M Oliver | Disallowed |
| N33-022 | b, h | Objection Similar to N33-001 | The Temple View Residents' Association | Allowed |
| N33-023 | b | Objection Objects to the size of the Taranaki-King Country electorate. As a long thin electorate it does not meet community of interest, topographical and communication criteria. The proposed electorate covers three regional councils and nine local councils, as well as being 315km long and a four hour trip. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Establish a north Waikato electorate that covers the Waikato District, and Matamata-Piako Council areas. Have the southern parts of Taranaki-King Country aligned with Rangitikei, another electorate that could benefit from a north-south division. | J Lawson | Disallowed |
| N33-024 | b, n | Objection Objects to geographical spread of the proposed Taranaki-King Country electorate. North to south it is 315km, covers a number of local bodies, and represents a large number of unique interests. The name of the electorate also fails to accurately represent the makeup of the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Redraw the boundaries to follow local authority boundaries where possible, for example an electorate made of the Waikato District and Matamate-Piako districts would meet population quota and have a strong community of interest link. Another option is to name the electorate 'Raglan-Taranaki-King Country'. | R Gallagher | Disallowed |
| N33-025 | b, n, h | Objection Objects to the township of Raglan being part of the Taranaki-King Country electorate, an area it has nothing in common with. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Place the town in the Waikato electorate. Alternatively rename the electorate 'Raglan-King Country-Taranaki'. | R MacLeod | Disallowed |

| | | | Allowed in part |
|---------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| N33-601 | n | <p>Counter-objection G Seymour</p> <p>Relates to objection N33-020</p> <p>Objects to the suggestion 'Taranaki' should be removed from the electorate name.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Te Rohe Pōtae' as the proposed electorate reflects the original Rohe Pōtae.</p> | |
| N33-602 | b, n | <p>Counter-objection J Lawson</p> <p>Relates to objection N33-020</p> <p>Notes the electorate has the third highest number of objections and agrees the constituency should be split as suggested by many submitters. Agrees the name 'Taranaki-King Country' is no longer appropriate. Objects to the suggested name 'King Country'.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> If the electorate is not split the name should reflect that it is made up of King Country and parts of Hamilton, Waikato, Taranaki and Manawatu-Whanganui.</p> | Disallowed |
| N33-603 | b, n | <p>Counter-objection R Gallagher</p> <p>Relates to N33-020</p> <p>Objects to the suggested electorate name of 'King Country'. The electorate name should include Raglan as it is a vital town and tourist destination in the electorate or the name should reflect the fact the electorate is made up of King Country and bits of Hamilton, Waikato, Taranaki, Manawatu and Whanganui.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Bits Of' or 'Raglan-King Country'.</p> | Disallowed |
| N33-604 | b, n | <p>Counter-objection R McDowall</p> <p>Relates to objections N33-024 and N33-025</p> <p>Does not consider Taranaki-King Country to be excessively large compared to other New Zealand electorates. Suggests more organic electoral boundaries that reflect the local regionalism of the area could be adopted.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing northern boundary of the Taranaki-King Country electorate. Retain Stratford in Taranaki-King Country and the existing boundary with Whanganui. Taranaki-King Country could gain further population from Taumarānui.</p> <p>Supports adopting the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission for New Plymouth and that the name 'New Plymouth' be retained.</p> <p>The Whanganui boundary could move southwards to include Turakina, Marton and possibly Bulls to reach its population quota. Alternatively, the boundary could move north east to include Raetihi and possibly Ohakune.</p> <p>The boundary of Rangitikei could be extended northwards to include Rangipo and its surrounding area.</p> | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N35 Napier | | | |
| N35-001 | b, h | Objection Tuhoe-Te Uru Taumatua Trust Objects to Tuai, a mainly Tuhoe village, and the eastern Te Urewera National Park being included within the Napier electorate. This isolates a small section of Tuhoe land away from the rest of the Iwi and places a small section of the land that falls within the post-treaty settlement agreement within a separate electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adjust the north west boundary with East Coast so that Lake Waikaremoana and Tuai are included in the East Coast electorate as well as all parts of the Te Urewera National Park. | Disallowed |
| N35-002 | b | Objection A Milton-Tee Objects to part of Poverty Bay being included in the Napier electorate, splitting a community of interest. This area is a long drive from Napier and close to Gisborne and should be represented by one MP. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain all of Poverty Bay and the East Coast north of Gisborne in one electorate. | Disallowed |
| N35-003 | b | Objection J Hall Objects to the inclusion of Matawai, Rakauroa, Otoko and Waikohu in the Napier electorate as they have a stronger community of interest with Gisborne and a road connections with the rest of the Opotiki-Gisborne State Highway (State Highway 2) in the East Coast electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Re-draw the East Coast / Napier boundary to the south of Matawai Road (SH2), so that the communities of Matawai, Rakauroa, Otoko and Waikohu, and all of Matawai Road are included in East Coast. If offsetting land switches are required, to stay within both electorates' population tolerance, this could be achieved by shifting the southern end of the East Coast-Napier boundary to follow the Waipaoa River between Lavenham Road and the sea. | Disallowed |
| N35-004 | b | Objection S J Cave Objects to the inclusion of Ngatapa and surrounding areas in the Napier electorate as they are geographically separate from Napier and have strong links to Gisborne. | Disallowed |
| N35-005 | b | Objection H Telfer Objects to the movement of the proposed Napier / East Coast boundary north towards Gisborne as it disrupts a community of interest, moving small towns affiliated with Gisborne into the Napier electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the Napier electorate southwards instead of north. | Disallowed |
| N35-006 | n | Objection C Spanhake The current name does not adequately describe the entire area covered by the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Hawkes Bay'. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| N36 N36-001 | n | New Plymouth Objection C Spanhake | Disallowed |
| <p>Objects to the electorate name as the boundaries have expanded to include the entire Taranaki peninsula.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Taranaki'.</p> | | | |
| N37 N37-001 | b | Whanganui Objection S Taylor | Disallowed |
| <p>Objects to the inclusion of Stratford in the Whanganui electorate. Stratford has strong community links with the Taranaki-King Country electorate and is best served by being placed with its community of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move Stratford back to Taranaki-King Country and instead make up population numbers with Opunake.</p> | | | |
| N37-002 | n | Objection C Spanhake | Disallowed |
| <p>Objects to the name Whanganui being used for the electorate as it does not adequately describe the entire area covered by the electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Waitotara'.</p> | | | |
| N37-601 | b, h | Counter-objection A Chesswas | Allowed in part |
| <p>Relates to objection N37-001</p> <p>Supports the inclusion of Stratford in Whanganui as it provides residents with better access to a closer and more compact electorate. Considers this should also be extended to the inhabitants of rural Stratford north and east.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Preferred solution is to include all of the Stratford District together in Whanganui. Alternatively recommends the Commission consider a boundary following either the high voltage transmission line, the Makino Stream, the Stratford-Okahukura railway line or along the Kahouri Stream, Patea River and Stratford-Okahukura railway line.</p> | | | |
| N37-602 | b, h | Counter-objection R and J Gardin | Allowed in part |
| <p>Relates to objection N37-001</p> <p>Supports the inclusion of Stratford in Whanganui. Considers Toko, Douglas, Tututawa, Strathmore and Te Wera should also be included in Whanganui.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> For the boundary to follow either the railway line or the high voltage transmission line.</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| N37-603 | b | <p>Counter-objection D Woollaston Relates to objection N37-001 Supports the inclusion of Stratford in Whanganui. Considers Taranaki East should also be included in the electorate to prevent the splitting of a community of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary north.</p> | <p>Allowed in part</p> |
| N37-604 | b | <p>Counter-objection N Oliver Relates to objection N37-001 Supports the inclusion of Stratford in Whanganui. Considers all Stratford based areas and whoever uses Stratford as its main centre should also be included in the electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include all of Stratford’s outlying rural areas in the Whanganui electorate.</p> | <p>Allowed in part</p> |
| N37-605 | b | <p>Counter-objection N Law Relates to objection N37-001 Similar to N37-602</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Stratford, Strahmore, Toko and Douglas in the Whanganui electorate. For the boundary to run along the railway line or the high voltage power lines.</p> | <p>Allowed in part</p> |
| N38 | | | |
| N38-001 | b | <p>Rangitikei Objection A Bates Objects to Shannon being included in the Rangitikei electorate as the Shannon community shares little in common with the electorate. Shannon and Tokomaru are urban areas that identify with the Ōtaki electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Shannon and Tokomaru in Ōtaki and extend Rangitikei into the Whanganui electorate instead.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N38-002 | b | <p>Objection Horowhenua District Council Similar to N38-001</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| N38-003 | b | <p>Objection S Field Similar to N38-001</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> While the boundary needs to move a little south, Shannon should stay in the Ōtaki electorate.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| N38-004 | b, h | Objection Similar to N38-001 | New Zealand Labour Party | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N38-003 | | |
| N38-601 | b, h | Counter-objection Relates to objection N38-002 | F Macdonald | Disallowed |
| | | Objects on the grounds of population demographics, the history of the electorate and voting figures within the Ōtaki electorate. | | |
| N43 | | Mana | | |
| N43-001 | b | Objection | J Lacy | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the inclusion of 74, 76 and 78 Victory Crescent, Tawa in the Mana electorate. The rest of the street is included in the adjacent meshblock in the Ōhariu electorate. All residents of the street share a community of interest with Ōhariu. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move 74, 76 and 78 Victory Crescent, Tawa into the Ōhariu electorate. | | |
| N44 | | Rimutaka | | |
| N44-001 | b | Objection | S Ruthven | Allowed |
| | | Objects to the proposed boundary between Rimutaka and Hutt South dividing communities in the Western Hills suburbs and the inclusion of Avalon and Taita in Rimutaka. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include all of the Western Hills suburbs in the Rimutaka electorate and include all of the valley floor (including Avalon and Taita) in the Hutt South electorate. | | |
| N44-002 | b, h | Objection | A Lawson | Allowed |
| | | Objects to the boundary between Rimutaka and Hutt South electorates splitting the Western Hills community between two electorates. The proposal to bring a portion of the Western Hills into Hutt South is an improvement. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include all of the Western Hills suburbs under one electorate. | | |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| N44-003 | b | Objection | J Cronin | Allowed in part |
| | | Objects to the inclusion of Normandale within the Rimutaka electorate as its community of interest is with Korokoro, Maungaraki and the Petone/Alicetown area. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move Normandale into Hutt South and to balance the electorate quotas move those parts of Avalon not in Rimutaka and parts of Boulcott and Epuni into Rimutaka. | | |
| N44-601 | b | Counter-objection | New Zealand Labour Party | Disallowed |
| | | Relates to objection N44-002 and similar objections | | |
| | | Supports the proposal to include the entire Hutt Valley in two electoral districts. Considers continuing to split the Western Hills into two districts is a more optimal interpretation of the statutory criteria than disturbing the existing boundary on the valley floor. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | | |
| N45 | | Ōhariu | | |
| N45-001 | n | Objection | H Wylie | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the name Ōhariu for an electorate so close to the centre of Wellington. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Wellington West'. | | |
| N45-002 | n | Objection | C Spanhake | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the name Ōhariu being used for the electorate as it is not an identifiable place name. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Wellington North'. | | |
| N45-003 | b | Objection | C Baker | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the movement of Wadestown from the Wellington Central electorate into Ōhariu as they do not share any community links. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the Wadestown area in the Wellington Central electorate. | | |
| N45-004 | b | Objection | A D Baker | Disallowed |
| | | Similar to N45-003 | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N45-003 | | |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| N45-601 | n | <p>Counter-objection G Seymour Relates to objection N45-001 Objects to the suggestions to change the name of the electorate to English names.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name ‘Ōhāriu’ with a macron on ‘hā’. An alternative name of ‘Kauhau’ could be considered as the local maunga.</p> | Allowed |
| N46 | | | |
| N46-001 | b | <p>Hutt South</p> <p>Objection W Church Supports the moving of Maungaraki and Korokoro to the Hutt South electorate, as the community of interest and infrastructure are closely linked to Lower Hutt.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Consider moving Normandale to Hutt South as well, as it is similarly linked to Lower Hutt.</p> | Allowed |
| N46-002 | b | <p>Objection R McLennan Objects to the proposed boundary between Rimutaka and Hutt South dividing a small number of properties away from the rest of their Normandale community.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move 183 and 185 Miromiro Road to the Rimutaka electorate. A more logical division of Hutt South and Rimutaka would be around Naenae, Fairway Drive and Kelson and Belmont. Alternatively, include Korokoro in Hutt South and both Maungaraki and Normandale in Rimutaka.</p> | Allowed |
| N46-003 | b | <p>Objection Western Community Committee, Hutt City Council Objects to the boundary between Hutt South and Rimutaka electorates. Communities of interest have been lost and streets split in two between the electorates.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The boundary line should go across the Hutt Valley to create a definitive north south divide. Normandale and Harbour View should be linked with Maungaraki in Hutt South while all of Naenae should be included in the Rimutaka electorate.</p> | Allowed |
| N46-004 | b | <p>Objection R Wallace, Mayor - Hutt City Council Similar to N46-003</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to N46-003</p> | Allowed |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| N46-601 | b | <p>Counter-objection M Shierlaw</p> <p>Relates to objections N46-001 to N46-004</p> <p>Does not consider the suggested changes to the boundary between Hutt South and Rimutaka go far enough. The Western Hills are a community of interest and should be in the same electorate, as they largely are for local authority elections.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Hutt South to include Normandale, Harbour View, Tirohanga, Belmont and Kelson. Include Naenae in Rimutaka to compensate for the additional population for Hutt South.</p> | Allowed |
| N48 | | | |
| N48-001 | n | <p>Rongotai</p> <p>Objection C Spanhake</p> <p>Objects to the name Rongotai being used as it is a small and diminishing suburb within the electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Wellington East'. Alternatively name it 'Miramar', 'Wellington Suburbs', 'Port Nicholson' or 'Lyall Bay'.</p> | Disallowed |
| N48-601 | n | <p>Counter-objection G Seymour</p> <p>Relates objection N48-001</p> <p>Prefers the electorate keep a Māori name to reflect local history. 'Whāitaitai' represents the body of the taniwha tūpuna that is embodied in the Motukairangi (Mirimar Peninsula).</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Whāitaitai'.</p> | Disallowed |
| S02 | | | |
| S02-001 | b | <p>West Coast-Tasman</p> <p>Objection C McLellan</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Tasman in the same electorate with the West Coast as the areas have separate interests and no linked infrastructure.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Align the Tasman area with Motueka and Nelson.</p> | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S03 | Kaikōura | J Roper-Lindsay | Disallowed |
| S03-001 | <p>Objection Objects to the Kaikōura electorate as it is a vast size that does not take in the communities of interest and links in the North Canterbury area.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The area between the Conway River and Ashley River should be moved into the Waimakariri electorate (which could be re-named ‘North Canterbury’). To counter this increase in the current Waimakariri electorate, electors in the south of the current area (south of the Waikakariri River) should be moved into Christchurch East or Central as appropriate.</p> | Disallowed | <p>on the basis the electorate would not be able to meet the required quota.</p> |
| S03-601 | <p>Counter-objection G Seymour</p> <p>Relates to objection S03-001</p> <p>Prefers to maintain Māori names for electorates.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the name ‘Kaikōura’ for the electorate.</p> | Allowed | Allowed |
| S03-602 | <p>Counter-objection J Arden</p> <p>Relates to objection S03-001</p> <p>Generally supports the objection but considers it covers too wide an area.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Waimakariri ratepayers should be included in the Waimakariri electorate.</p> | Disallowed | Disallowed |
| S04 | Waimakariri | M Fryer | Disallowed |
| S04-001 | <p>Objection Insufficient regard has been given to existing boundaries and community of interest.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Move a population of around 5,000 from the southern end of Waimakariri into Christchurch Central.</p> | Disallowed | Disallowed |
| S04-002 | <p>Objection L Hills</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of areas in the north of the electorate, which have no community of interest with Rangiora.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The Waimakariri electorate to have the same boundary as the area covered by the Waimakariri District Council.</p> | Disallowed | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| S04-601 | b, h | Counter-objection Hon K Wilkinson, MP for Waimakariri Relates to objections S04-001, S04-002 and S06-001 to S06-007 Objects to any additional population being added to the southern end of the electorate. Objects to the suggested change of the boundary between Waimakariri and Christchurch Central from the railway line to Main North Road as the railway line is a natural boundary. Objects to the splitting of the Redwood community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed |
| S04-602 | b, h | Counter-objection J Gerard QSO Relates to objections S04-001, S04-002, S06-001, S06-005 and S06-006 Supports moving as little population as is necessary from urban Christchurch into Waimakariri. Notes Waimakariri District Council area is one of the fastest growing areas in New Zealand. Objects to the suggestion Main North Road should be the boundary. Considers the railway line to make a sensible boundary. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundary proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed |
| S04-603 | b, h | Counter-objection W Head Relates to objections S04-001 to S04-004 and S06-005 and S06-006 Objects to the suggested change of the boundary between Waimakariri and Christchurch Central from the railway line to Main North Road as it does not reflect the nature of the community straddling the Main North Road or the use of amenities in the area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Extend the northern boundary of Christchurch Central to include Regents Park residential area on the south of Styx Mill Road, continuing the boundary east of Cavendish Road to Claridges Road and along Glasnevin Drive to Sawyers Arm Road, thereby placing Redwood and Casebrook in Christchurch Central. Alternatively, adopt the boundary of the railway line proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed in part |
| S05 | | Christchurch East | |
| S05-001 | b, h | Objection S K Laing Objects to the inclusion of Mairehau in Christchurch East. Connections are with Papanui and Merivale, not the east of the city. The area is in the Shirley Papanui ward. | Allowed |
| S05-002 | b, n, h | Objection J M Laing Similar to S05-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the name for Christchurch Central to ‘Avon’ or ‘Hagley’. | Allowed as to the boundary. |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| S05-003 | b | Objection N D Priestley Similar to S05-001 | Allowed |
| S05-004 | b | Objection S Chisholm Objects to the inclusion of St Albans and Mairehau in the Christchurch East electorate as they are strongly connected to the central city, Merivale and Papanui. | Allowed |
| S05-005 | b | Objection B Tily Similar to S05-004 | Allowed |
| S05-006 | b, h | Objection G Abraham Objects to the proposed boundary for Christchurch East as it splits the suburb of St Albans in two. | Disallowed |
| S05-007 | b | Objection N Button Objects to the inclusion of Mairehau in the Christchurch East electorate as its connections are not with the east. Also concerned the proposed boundary will split the St Albans/Mairehau community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> There should be community discussion about a new name for Christchurch Central as the electorate is now bigger than central Christchurch. | Allowed in part as to the boundary. |
| S05-008 | b, n, h | Objection A Riches Objects to the inclusion of Mairehau and St Albans suburbs in Christchurch East as they are closely connected with Christchurch Central and Redwood rather than the east. As the Highfield Park subdivision is constructed Mairehau will grow as a link to the CBD. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Mairehau, Shirley and most of St Albans in Christchurch Central. Christchurch East should grow south rather than west. Christchurch Central should be named 'Avon' or 'Christchurch'. | Allowed in part in respect of Mairehau. |
| S05-009 | b, h | Objection D and M Gubbins Objects to the inclusion of Mairehau in Christchurch East as church, social activities and facilities all revolve around Christchurch Central. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries. | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S05-010 | b | Objection L Mortensen Objects to the boundary between Christchurch East and Christchurch Central (between Queen Elizabeth II Drive and the Styx River) going through the consented Highfield Park subdivision, which could split the community in half. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Move the boundary to run along the proposed Christchurch Northern Arterial motorway to be built approximately 400 metres west of the current proposed boundary, which will separate Redwood and Highfield Park. | Disallowed |
| S05-011 | b, h | Objection K Tanner and 202 others Petition objecting to the community of Bromley being moved into the Christchurch East electorate when it is linked with and uses local services and public facilities in Woolston. Splitting the community between two electorates would break up this community of interest. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundary between the Christchurch East and Port Hills electorates. | Allowed in part |
| S05-601 | b | Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objections S05-001 to S05-009, S06-008, S06-011 and S06-012 Supports the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission between Christchurch East and Christchurch Central. Notes the need to add electoral population to Christchurch East to replace post earthquake migration. Considers the Representation Commission has selected the most appropriate adjacent areas to move from Christchurch Central, including parts of Shirley, which enables a measure of unification of communities of interest and aligns with the Electoral Act criteria. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | Allowed in part |
| S05-602 | n, h | Counter-objection R Alexander Relates to objections S05-001 to S05-009, S05-011, S06-008 and S06-011 Notes a number of objectors do not want to be part of the Christchurch East electorate. Suggests the electorate should have a future focused name. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Parklands'. | Disallowed |
| S05-603 | b, h | Counter-objection N Button and 122 others Relates to objections S05-001 to S05-005 Petition in support of the objections to retain Mairehau and St Albans within Central Christchurch. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Mairehau and St Albans in the Christchurch Central electorate. | Allowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | |
|---------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| S05-604 | b | <p>Counter-objection T Comer Relates to objection S05-008 Considers Mairehau and St Albans do not have much in common with Christchurch East. Notes the people of Bromley have traditionally used the areas of Linwood and Woolston as their main community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Bromley in the Port Hills electorate.</p> | Allowed in part |
| S05-605 | b | <p>Counter-objection A Gilbert Relates to objections S05-008 and S08-005 Objects to the suggested boundary change. As a resident of Bromley, uses shops and facilities in Woolston and Linwood. Does not support this area being included in Christchurch East. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S05-604</p> | Allowed in part |
| S05-606 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection A Sisson Relates to objections S05-008, S05-011 and S08-005 Supports the Bromley area remaining in the Port Hills electorate. Bromley’s community of interest and connections, including schooling and sports and leisure activities, are with Port Hills. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S05-604</p> | Allowed in part |
| S05-607 | b | <p>Counter-objection B Christian Relates to objections S05-008, S05-011 and S08-005 Considers Bromley to have a strong connection to Woolston and its facilities, whereas Christchurch East facilities are further away and require access to transport. Notes the school links between Bromley and Woolston. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S05-604</p> | Allowed in part |
| S05-608 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection T Bennett Relates to objection S05-011 Supports the Bromley area remaining in the Port Hills electorate. Notes Woolston and Bromley have community connections and links with schools and social and sporting activities in the area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S05-604</p> | Allowed in part |

| | | | |
|------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S05-609 | b | Counter-objection R Comer Relates to objection S05-011 Supports the Bromley area remaining in the Port Hills electorate. Notes the distance and differences between this area and areas in Christchurch East. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S05-604 | Allowed in part |
| S05-610 | b, n, h | Counter-objection J Norton Relates to objection S05-011 Objects to the suggestion Bromley be included in the Port Hills electorate because of links with shops and facilities in Woolston. As a resident of Bromley the counter-objector does not go to Woolston and considers Bromley to be more connected to New Brighton and will be better represented by the MP for Christchurch East. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Bromley in Christchurch East. | Allowed in part |
| S06 | | Christchurch Central | |
| S06-001 | b | Objection S Thompson Objects to the boundary between Christchurch Central and Waimakariri running along the railway splitting a community of interest. Northcote school would be in Christchurch Central but many children will come from Waimakariri. <i>Suggested solution:</i> It would be more appropriate to use Main North Road as the boundary as a better division between Northcote and Redwood suburbs. | Disallowed |
| S06-002 | b | Objection M Moore Similar to S06-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S06-001 | Disallowed |
| S06-003 | b | Objection N Baker Similar to S06-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S06-001 | Disallowed |
| S06-004 | b | Objection M M Barry and 23 others Petition objecting to the proposed boundary with Waimakariri, along the railway line, splitting the Casebrook community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The boundary to run along Main North Road, a stronger and more logical boundary. | Disallowed |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| S06-005 | b, h | Objection | Sigjaws Trust - Neighbourhood Support Objects to the proposed boundary with Waimakariri along the railway line as it would make more sense to divide Redwood and Northcote which are two separate communities already. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the boundary to Main North Road. | Disallowed |
| S06-006 | b, h | Objection | Casebrook Intermediate School Casebrook Intermediate is located on Veitches Road, in the Waimakariri electorate, but near the boundary with Christchurch Central and Ilam electorates. It is the preference of the school for as much of its community as possible to be covered by a single electorate. The proposed change splits off a large part of this community, along the railway line. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Ideally all of Redwood to remain within Waimakariri. If this is not possible, a compromise would be for the boundary to follow Main North Road (a busy four lane carriageway) as a more logical boundary line. | Disallowed |
| S06-007 | b | Objection | M Barry Objects to the proposed changes on the basis it will split the Redwood community. | Disallowed |
| S06-008 | b | Objection | N Wagner, MP for Christchurch Central Objects to the loss of Mairehau to Christchurch East, as their community of interest is with St Albans, Merivale and Papanui, and to the proposed boundaries in the northern part of the electorate splitting communities. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Marshland Road and Queen Elizabeth II Drive are the natural boundaries of the community. Keep Mairehau in Christchurch Central. | Allowed in part |
| S06-009 | b, h | Objection | L Chandler Objects to the lack of cohesive community being represented by the Christchurch Central electorate. It is being dominated by northern suburbs. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The northern boundary of Christchurch Central should be moved closer to the city and extend the western boundary. | Disallowed |
| S06-010 | b | Objection | S Butters Objects to North Linwood being included in Christchurch Central as demographically the area is more like Christchurch East and it will help with consistency of representation if most of the red zone is in one electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Between Avonside Drive and the north east side of Linwood Avenue to the north west side of Buckleys Road should be included in Christchurch East. | Substantially allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| S06-011 | b, n, h | Objection D A Unka Objects to the boundaries for Christchurch Central being redrawn while the area is in a constant state of flux because of redevelopment following the earthquakes. Also objects to Mairehau being moved to Christchurch East as this area looks west to St Albans, Merivale and Papanui as part of their community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> The boundaries for Christchurch Central to remain the same until there is a clearer picture of the city's population for the long term. Name the electorate 'Otakaro'. | Allowed in part in respect of Mairehau. |
| S06-012 | b, n, h | Objection G Abraham Objects to the proposed boundary at Cranford Street which cuts St Albans in two, dividing a close knit community. Does not support a change of name, as the district covers the central city and the CBD the name 'Christchurch Central' should be kept. | Disallowed in respect of boundary. |
| S06-013 | n | Objection J Simpson Objects to the name of the electorate as it does not reflect the proposed new boundaries. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Avon' or 'Avon/Otakaro'. | Disallowed |
| S06-014 | n | Objection M Doocey Objects to the name of the electorate, as the boundary extends so far north the name is no longer relevant. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Avon'. | Disallowed |
| S06-015 | n, h | Objection K Varley Considers that, in recognition of the devastation and loss associated with Central Christchurch, the name should be changed. Also the proposed boundary changes mean the area can no longer be identified as Christchurch Central. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Change the name of the electorate to 'Avon' or 'Otakaro'. | Disallowed |
| S06-601 | b, h | Counter-objection Sigjaws Trust - Neighbourhood Support Relates to objection S06-005 Further to making objection S06-005, Sigjaws Trust reiterates its support for the boundary between Christchurch East and Waimakariri to be Main North Road to enable the Northcote and Redwood communities to continue to work together. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Main North Road to be the boundary between Christchurch Central and Waimakariri. | Disallowed |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| S06-602 | b, h | Counter-objection Relates to objection S06-008 | H Perry Supports the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. Notes there has been a large loss of population in Christchurch East. Including Mairehau in Christchurch East recognises the Palms shopping complex is a focus point of the area. Notes Cranford Street is a more significant barrier that divides St Albans. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | | |
| S06-603 | b, n | Counter-objection Relates to objections S06-011 to S06-015 | D Maclure Objects to the suggested names 'Avon' and 'Otakaro' on the basis they would take away the electorate's identity. Also objects to the submissions that suggest changes to the boundary to the north with Waimakariri. | Disallowed |
| S06-604 | n | Counter-objection Relates to objection S06-011 | G Seymour Supports the suggested name 'Ōtākaro' for Christchurch Central and the use of Māori names for electorates. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Ōtākaro'. | | |
| S06-605 | n | Counter-objection Relates to objection S06-012 | S Waddel Objects to the suggestion the electorate keeps the name 'Christchurch Central' as the name is not suitable given the proposed boundaries extend beyond the central city. | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Avon' or 'Avon-Otakaro'. | | |
| S06-606 | b, n | Counter-objection Relates to objection S06-012 | M Spackman Objects to the name 'Christchurch Central' as the proposed electorate includes Redwood in the north and Beckenham in the south. Also objects to the boundary suggested by S06-012 as it is not defined clearly. | Allowed in part as to the boundary. |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Christchurch Otakaro' in recognition of the importance of Ngai Tahu's historical attachment with the Avon. Retain St Albans and Mairehau in the electorate and look at other areas to adjust the electorate size. | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S06-607 | b, n | <p>Counter-objection A Blazey Relates to objection S06-012 Does not support the northern boundary following the railway line as it is not a logical boundary. Does not support the exclusion of Mairehau and St Albans and considers they are not connected to the east. Supports a name change for the electorate.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The northern boundary to follow Main North Road. Retain Mairehau and St Albans in Christchurch Central. Instead include the Harewood Road section, Casebrook and the area east of Linwood Avenue in Christchurch East. Marshlands could also be included in Christchurch East. If further population is required the Beckenham area could be reallocated. Depending on the final boundaries, the name of the electorate could be ‘Christchurch North’. Alternatively name the electorate ‘Avon-Otakaro’.</p> | <p>Allowed in part in respect of Mairehau. Disallowed as to name.</p> |
| S08 | | | |
| S08-001 | b | <p>Port Hills Objection D Taylor Objects to the inclusion of Halswell in the Port Hills electorate. Does not want any change to the boundary while housing subdivisions in the Halswell area are being built. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| S08-002 | b | <p>Objection L Dawson Objects to the movement of Halswell between the Port Hills and Selwyn electorates given it was moved into Selwyn within the last decade. Halswell has strong community links to Selwyn, more so than Christchurch. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the Halswell area in the Selwyn electorate.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| S08-003 | b, h | <p>Objection G Jones and 68 others Petition objecting to Halswell and the surrounding area being moved into the Port Hills electorate. The community of interest is much stronger with Ellesmere townships in the Selwyn electorate, and will provide continuity of representation for the residents. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the existing boundary to the north of Halswell, Oaklands and Aidanfield and along Worsleys Road to Summit Road.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |
| S08-004 | b, h | <p>Objection G Jones Similar to S08-003. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S08-003.</p> | <p>Disallowed</p> |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing] **Decision of Commission**

| S08-005 | b | Objection | M Fryer | Objects to the proposed boundaries on the basis they do not have sufficient regard for community of interest. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Leave Banks Peninsula in Selwyn, but move populations from the Somerfield/Spreydon area and the Prebleton area into Port Hills. Christchurch East to reach quota by gaining population from Bromley, Woolston and Ferrymead. | Allowed in part |
|---------|---------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S08-006 | b, n, h | Objection | R Ellery | Supports the proposed changes to include Banks Peninsula within the Port Hills electorate. However, there are some inconsistencies around the suburb of Aidanfield which has been isolated from the rest of its community in Port Hills. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. Redraw the boundary around Aidanfield to ensure the community stays together. | Disallowed |
| S08-007 | n | Objection | P Moore | Supports the inclusion of Akaroa in the Port Hills electorate due to the similar urban nature of the areas. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. | Disallowed |
| S08-008 | n | Objection | S Moore | Supports the movement of areas of Selwyn into the Port Hills electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. | Disallowed |
| S08-009 | n | Objection | C Moore | Supports the movement of areas of Selwyn into the Port Hills electorate. Port Hills is a more urban electorate that shares much more identity with the area. However, does not support the name 'Port Hills'. | Disallowed |
| S08-010 | b, n, h | Objection | M Bishop | Supports the boundary changes for the proposed Port Hills electorate. The communities of Westmorland, Halswell, Oaklands and Aidanfield are within the city council area and are considered suburbs of Christchurch and are not affiliated with rural Selwyn. The proposed changes split the Aidanfield community and the electorate name is not representative of the community. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. Redraw the boundary around Aidanfield to ensure the community stays together. | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| S08-011 | b | Objection M Moore Objects to Aidanfield being split in half by the proposed Wigram electorate boundary. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the entire suburb of Aidanfield in the Port Hills electorate. | Disallowed |
| S08-012 | b, n | Objection H Eksteen Supports the inclusion of Aidanfield and Halswell in the Port Hills electorate as their community of interest and connections are with Port Hills . <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula' . | Allowed in part as to the boundary. |
| S08-013 | b | Objection D J Martin Objects to the inclusion of the rural area of Sutherlands Road in the Port Hills electorate. Port Hills is an urban electorate that will not fairly represent the interests of farmers. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the boundaries as close as possible to the existing boundaries. | Disallowed |
| S08-014 | n | Objection B Moore Supports the unification of Governors Bay in the proposed Port Hills electorate, however the name does not represent the electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula' . | Disallowed |
| S08-015 | n | Objection A Knops Objects to the name of Port Hills as it is only one geographic feature of the electorate which is based upon the wider Banks Peninsula area. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula' . | Disallowed |
| S08-016 | n | Objection G Marks Similar to S08-015 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula' . | Disallowed |
| S08-017 | n | Objection D Aitken-Edwards Similar to S08-015 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula' . | Disallowed |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| S08-018 | n | Objection C Spanhake Similar to S08-015 | Disallowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. | |
| S08-019 | b, n, h | Objection H Ring Supports Halswell being moved to Port Hills. Objects to Port Hills as it is an inaccurate description of the electorate. | Disallowed as to the electorate name. |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. | |
| S08-601 | b, n, h | Counter-objection Rt Hon D Carter MP Relates to objections S08-001 to S08-004 Objects to suggestions the Halswell area be excluded from the Port Hills electorate. As MP for Banks Peninsula from 1996 to 1999, considers Halswell to be an important link for the urban part of the electorate and the Banks Peninsula. Supports a change of name as 'Port Hills' is a geographically incorrect description for the proposed electorate. | Allowed in part |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the Halswell area in the electorate. Name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. | |
| S08-602 | b | Counter-objection M Ryan, Oakvale Farm Ltd Relates to objection S08-001 Notes the greater Halswell area is undergoing significant residential development. Supports the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission as they will ensure the area is represented by an MP based in and concerned solely with the Christchurch City Council. | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Adopt the boundaries proposed by the Representation Commission. | |
| S08-603 | b, h | Counter-objection R Gartars and 194 others Relates to objection S08-003 Petition opposing the objection and petition S08-003. Considers greater Halswell to be part of urban Christchurch and associates with Christchurch City, not rural Selwyn. | Allowed |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the greater Halswell area in the Port Hills electorate. | |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S08-604 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection L Macfarlane</p> <p>Relates to objections S08-005, S08-010 and S08-012</p> <p>Supports the retention of the existing boundaries between Port Hills and Selwyn and objects to the inclusion of Halswell in Port Hills. Notes Halswell has more in common with other Selwyn towns such as Prebbleton, Lincoln and Rolleston, which are also undergoing rapid expansion, than the Port Hills suburbs. Education links between Halswell and Selwyn are also strong. Objects to the suggestion in S08-005 that Prebbleton be included in Port Hills.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing boundaries between Port Hills and Selwyn. Adjust the Selwyn boundary elsewhere, for instance, retain Hei Hei, Masham, Islington and Broomfield in the Wigram electorate.</p> | Disallowed |
| S08-605 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection C Pascoe</p> <p>Relates to objection S08-005</p> <p>Supports the objection to the proposed boundaries. Objects to the inclusion of Halswell in Port Hills. Supports the suggestion to include Somerfield from Milton Street south into Port Hills.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Banks Peninsula and Halswell in Selwyn. Include population from Somerfield (south of Sparks, Milton and Frankleigh Streets, west of Rollesby Street and east of Colombo Street) in Port Hills.</p> | Allowed in part |
| S08-606 | b | <p>Counter-objection K Tritt</p> <p>Relates to objection S08-005</p> <p>Supports the suggestion to move Somerfield into the Port Hills electorate.</p> | Allowed |
| S08-607 | b | <p>Counter-objection J Lobban</p> <p>Relates to objection S08-006</p> <p>Objects to the suggestion to include Aidanfield in the Port Hills electorate. Considers all of Aidanfield should be included in Selwyn.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> The boundary to follow Wigram Road, around the outside of Templeton Reserve, along Templeton Road and onto Hendersons Road.</p> | Disallowed |
| S08-608 | b, h | <p>Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party</p> <p>Relates to objections S08-006 to S08-012</p> <p>Objects to suggestions the suburbs of Halswell, Oaklands and Aidanfield etc have connections only with the city and that the Heathcote River boundary unreasonably splits Aidanfield. Considers the community of interest ties and connections between these suburbs and the Selwyn electorate, in particular Tai Tapu, Lincoln and Prebbleton, are well established. Notes Aidanfield is a growing area that is bisected by the new Southern Motorway.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the suburbs of Halswell, Oaklands and Aidanfield etc in Selwyn.</p> | Allowed in part |

| | | | |
|---------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S08-609 | b | Counter-objection L Jackson Relates to objections S08-008 and S08-010 Objects to the inclusion of Halswell in the Port Hills electorate. Notes this area has only recently been moved into the Selwyn electorate and considers it to have a longstanding community of interest with Tai Tapu, Prebbleton and Lincoln in the Selwyn electorate. Suggests it would be more appropriate to review the boundaries once construction has been completed and the effect on population can be seen. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Halswell, Oaklands and Aidanfield in Selwyn. Retain Hornby, Islington and Hei Hei in Wigram to balance population numbers. | Allowed in part |
| S08-610 | n | Counter-objection G Seymour Relates to objection S08-008 Objects to the suggestion to name the electorate 'Banks Peninsula'. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Name the electorate 'Akaroa', which would be consistent with Māori naming practices. | Disallowed |
| S08-611 | b | Counter-objection L Macbeth Relates to objections S08-008 and S08-009 Objects to submissions that support the movement of areas of Selwyn into the Port Hills electorate. Considers the rural interests of the community would be better represented by Selwyn. Supports objection S08-013. <i>Suggested solution:</i> For the boundaries to be as close as possible to the existing boundaries. | Allowed in part |
| S08-612 | b | Counter-objection P Knight Relates to objections S08-008, S08-009, S08-010 and S08-012 Supports the retention of the existing boundaries. Objects to boundary changes for the Halswell area and suggests boundary changes are not made until population movement in Christchurch stabilises. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Halswell in the Selwyn electorate. | Disallowed |
| S08-613 | b, n | Counter-objection N Taylor Relates to objection S08-010 Objects to the inclusion of Westmorland, Halswell, Oaklands and Aidanfield in Port Hills. Considers these communities' links and services are with Prebbleton and Rolleston. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain the existing electorate boundaries and names used for the 2011 election. | Disallowed |

| | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| S10 | Selwyn | | | | |
| S10-001 | b, h | Objection | N Moffett | Objects to the communities of Hornby, Islington and Hei Hei moving from the Wigram electorate to Selwyn. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep these areas of Hornby within the Wigram electorate. | Allowed |
| S10-002 | b | Objection | E Moffett | Similar to S10-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S10-001 | Allowed |
| S10-003 | b, h | Objection | N R Wederell | Similar to S10-001 | Allowed |
| S10-004 | b, h | Objection | N L Mayo | Similar to S10-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S10-001 | Allowed |
| S10-005 | b, h | Objection | M Mora, Chair of Riccarton Wigram Community Board | Similar to S10-001 <i>Suggested solution:</i> Similar to S10-001 | Allowed |

| | | | |
|---------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S10-006 | b, h | <p>Objection New Zealand Labour Party and 180 signatories</p> <p>Petition objecting to the inclusion of the suburbs of Broomfield, Islington, Masham and Hei Hei in Selwyn, removing their link with Wigram. These areas have no historic ties to Selwyn.</p> <p>The Labour Party also objects to:</p> <p>The inclusion of Halswell, Oaklands, Westlake and Aidanfield in Port Hills. These fast growing areas should keep their links with Prebbleton and Lincoln in Selwyn.</p> <p>The inclusion of Bromley in Christchurch East, splitting it from adjacent Woolston in Port Hills. These two suburbs are closely integrated communities.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Broomfield, Islington and Hei Hei in Wigram.</p> <p>Unite Halswell, Oaklands, Westlake and Aidanfield, perhaps by using Halswell Road as the boundary.</p> <p>Unite Bromley and Woolston, connecting the majority of the red zone within Christchurch East, with the boundary following the Heathcote River to Brougham Street.</p> | Allowed in part |
| S10-007 | b | <p>Objection Hon A Adams, MP for Selwyn</p> <p>Supports the proposed Selwyn electorate boundaries, however it leaves two small areas isolated from their communities.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Include all houses on Old Tai Tapu Road in the Selwyn electorate by cutting through paddock land between the end of Halswell and before Old Tai Tapu Road.</p> <p>Remove the detour down Sawyers Arms Road and Harewood Road and have the boundary run consistently along Russley Road.</p> | Allowed in part |
| S10-008 | b | <p>Objection Hornby High School</p> <p>Objects to the movement of Hornby High School from the Wigram electorate into Selwyn. The Hornby schools operate as a distinct cluster and should be represented together with their community.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Hornby High School in the Wigram electorate.</p> | Allowed in part |
| S10-009 | b | <p>Objection Ashburton District Council</p> <p>Objects to the exclusion of the Rakaia community from the Rangitata electorate that contains Ashburton, as the two areas are linked under the Ashburton District Council, have common social and economic interests as well as sharing common population demographics.</p> <p><i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep Rakaia within the Rangitata electorate.</p> | Disallowed |

Electoral District and Nature of Objection [*b = boundary, n = name, h = hearing*]

Decision of Commission

| | | | |
|---------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| S10-010 | b | Objection A Burnip and J Richards Objects to Rakaia and a narrow strip of land to the coast being moved from the Rangitata electorate to Selwyn. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Keep the area in Rangitata. | Disallowed |
| S10-601 | b, h | Counter-objection E Ebborn Relates to objections S10-001 to S10-006 and S10-008 Supports in principle objections S10-001 to S10-006 and S10-008. Suggests moving Somerfield from Wigram to Port Hills as the Somerfield area identifies with the communities to the south rather than the west. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include Somerfield in Port Hills with the boundary running along Frankleigh and Milton Roads, which is the Christchurch City Council boundary for Somerfield. | Allowed |
| S10-602 | b, h | Counter-objection New Zealand Labour Party Relates to objection S10-007 Objects to the suggestion the proposed boundaries be adopted with only minor changes. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Closer adherence to the statutory criteria can be achieved with the adoption of boundaries closer to the existing boundaries. | Allowed in part |
| S10-603 | b, h | Counter-objection Dr J Kirk Relates to objection S10-007 Objects to Broomfield, Islington and Hei Hei being included in Selwyn on the basis they have a strong community of interest with greater Hornby and virtually none with Selwyn. Notes these communities have very high health, social and education needs. Considers the inclusion of these communities in the greater Hornby area important for them to have a voice to access services, as they may find it difficult for their needs to be represented in Selwyn, a high decile electorate. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Hei Hei, Broomfield and Islington in the Wigram electorate. | Allowed |
| S10-604 | b, h | Counter-objection M Mora, Chair of Riccarton/Wigram Community Board Relates to objection S10-007 Objects to Broomfield, Islington, Masham and Hei Hei being included in Selwyn on the basis the community south of Yaldhurst Road has its community of interest in the wider Hornby area and associates with Hornby schools and facilities. <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Broomfield, Masham, Islington and Hei Hei in Wigram. Consider moving areas of south east Spreydon into either Port Hills or Christchurch Central. | Allowed |

| | | | | |
|------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| S10-605 | b, h | Counter-objection | N Bryden | Allowed |
| | | Relates to objection S10-007 | | |
| | | Objects to Hei Hei, Broomfield and Islington being included in Selwyn. Considers these areas have their community of interest in the greater Hornby area. Notes the Hornby hub and retail centre is poised to become one of the largest community hubs in urban Christchurch and there are industrial and education developments in the greater Hornby area. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Retain Hei Hei, Broomfield and Islington in Wigram. Consider including Russley and Hyde Park in Ilam or Selwyn electorates. | | |
| S16 | | Invercargill | | |
| S16-001 | b | Objection | J Hall | Disallowed. Noted the islands are uninhabited. |
| | | Objects to the omission of the Antipodes, Auckland, Bounty and Campbell Islands from all proposed electorates. As part of New Zealand they should have representation. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Include the islands in the Invercargill electorate. | | |
| M01 | | Te Tai Tokerau | | |
| M01-001 | b | Objection | M Waddell | Disallowed |
| | | Objects to the large size of the Te Tai Tokerau electorate and the long distances people have to travel to reach an electorate office, which does not provide equal representation for Māori. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Establish a Kaupapa Māori Parliament through the Māori electoral seats and in association with Te Waiaimega oga Hapu o Aotearoa. | | |
| M06 | | Ikaroa-Rāwhiti | | |
| M06-001 | b, h | Objection | Tuhoe-Te Uru Taumatua Trust | Allowed |
| | | Objects to Tuai, a mainly Tuhoe village, and the eastern Te Urewera National Park being included within the Ikaroa-Rāwhiti electorate. This isolates a small section of Tuhoe land away from the rest of the Iwi and places a small section of the land that falls within the post-treaty settlement agreement within a separate electorate. | | |
| | | <i>Suggested solution:</i> Reallocate 20 meshblocks that cover Tuhoe land from Ikaroa-Rāwhiti to the Waiariki electorate. | | |

GGG **Non Specific Electorate**

GGG-001 **Objection** **B Jacobson**

Recommends the discontinuance of the Māori electorates since the introduction of MMP has ensured representation of all ethnic minority groups are better served and there is no advantage in maintaining a separate Māori roll.

Disallowed, outside jurisdiction.

GGG-002 h **Objection** **A Work**

Similar to GGG-001

Disallowed, outside jurisdiction.

GGG-003 **Objection** **J Darragh**

Objects to the boundary changes on the basis they favour the National Party.

Disallowed

Suggested solution: Keep the current electorates as they are balanced.

GGG-004 **Objection** **Dr M Harvey**

Objects to the loss of one list seat as the MMP system will be less democratically representative of demographic and political perspectives of voters.

Disallowed, outside jurisdiction.

Suggested solution: That the number and proportion of list MP's to electorate MP's be kept the same.