

You Hour Kaing

From: Max and Saria Shierlaw [max.saria@xtra.co.nz]
Sent: Sunday, 17 June 2012 10:17 p.m.
To: Info
Cc: Peter Glensor; Prue Lamason; Sandra Greig - External
Subject: Submission

Personal submission of Max Shierlaw

I wish to be heard.

Two issues:

1. I oppose an extra Councillor for the Wairarapa constituency. The Act makes no provision for Elected Representation to be made on basis of land area or work. The sole criteria is population and Wairarapa's only entitles the area to one Councillor.

This is in the tradition of Joh Bjelke-Petersen's infamous 1972 election redistributions. Please be assured that if the Regional Council approves this "Bjelkemander" I will appeal to the Local Government Commission as I did in 2006.

2. I believe the time has come for a sharper focus on constituency representation in Lower Hutt. By and large our representatives give secondary importance to Lower Hutt issues, preferring instead to write off any problems our residents experience as a result of Regional Council policy to be in the greater interests of the Region. To some extent this can be explained by the fact there is little interest and contest in Regional Council elections. Compared to their City Council equivalents, incumbent Regional Councillors undertake little campaigning, relying on name recognition. Most of the time this works.

To help address this I propose three single Councillor Regional Council "wards" be created in the Lower Hutt constituency. These would be based on combining two of the City Council wards together to form three reasonably equally sized (on population basis) "wards. By proposal is:

- Wainuiomata and Harbour wards combined.
- Northern and Eastern wards combined.
- Central and Western wards combined.

In my opinion this would create a higher profile and better contested elections for the Lower Hutt constituency and would result in the "ward" Councillors placing a greater emphasis on constituent's problems than is the case now. The chances of not being re-elected for poor performance would be significantly greater than they are under the existing electoral arrangements.

Max Shierlaw
4 Clematis Grove
Maungaraki
Lower Hutt 5010.

You Hour Kaing

From: Michael Gibson [michaelpcgibson@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, 20 June 2012 9:41 a.m.
To: Info
Subject: Submission re Proposed Representation Arrangements

I object to the proposal to distort the Councillor-population-ratio figure & double the number of elected members in the Wairarapa.

If, as is claimed in the Council's Public Notice dated June 16 2012, there is a requirement for "greater elected member involvement" in the Wairarapa, this can better be addressed by:-

1/ re-instituting the Council's Wairarapa Committee which was discontinued in 2007 &

2/ giving that Committee clearer guidelines for reporting to other Committees of the Council & to the Council itself.

Reducing the number of elected members to eleven is recommended.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

SIGNED

MICHAEL GIBSON
7 Putnam Street
Northland
Wellington 6012
Tel 4757545

You Hour Kaing

From: Alison & Tony McKone [ajmckone@paradise.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 25 June 2012 7:24 p.m.
To: Info
Subject: Submission on Wairarapa representation

Hello

I am concerned about the proposal to change the way representation is set for the Wairarapa area. It is the people that pay for the Councillors, so it is the people that need to be represented, not the land area. The latest proposal means that Kapiti and Upper Hutt residents are severely under represented compared to the Wairarapa proposal. Wairarapa is not the only region to have water quality and land management issues to deal with.

The Local Electoral Act 2001 says that the representation is determined by population - not land area. Therefore the Wairarapa area should not deviate from this. If the Wairarapa area is calculated this way, then the rest of GWRC needs to follow suit. It is unfair to the voters to have different calculations within the same Council.


One way that could help is if GWRC did not extend into the Tararua District, instead following the boundaries of the Territorial Authorities within Wairarapa Region. Also, surely alot of the work could be undertaken by officers rather than needing full Councillor involvement. After all, GWRC does have an office in the Wairarapa which should be familiar with the issues in the region.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I do wish to be heard.

Regards

Alison McKone
39A Mills Street
Boulcott
Lower Hutt 5010
Ph 973 0977



6 July 2012

Representation Review
Greater Wellington Regional Council
PO Box 11646
Manners Street
Wellington

Dear Sir/Madam,

South Wairarapa District Council makes this submission in support of the Wairarapa Constituency electing two members to the Greater Wellington Regional Council. SWDC believes that having two elected members provides a more effective representation for the communities of interest. The current arrangement of having one member from the Wairarapa does not provide adequate representation as it does not take full account of:


- The large land area of the Wairarapa
- The significant amount of Greater Wellington work undertaken in the Wairarapa
- The increased focus on water quality and land management issues
- The diverse, sparsely populated and widely spread communities in the Wairarapa Constituency.

The Council does not wish to be heard.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jack Dowds', with a large, stylized flourish extending from the end of the signature.

Dr Jack Dowds
Chief Executive Officer



Carterton District Council

COPY

12 July 2012

Representation Review
Greater Wellington Regional Council
P O Box 11 646
WELLINGTON 6142

Representation Review – Greater Wellington Regional Council


The Carterton District Council wishes to express its support for the representation arrangements as proposed by the Greater Wellington Regional Council and in particular the proposal for two representatives from the Wairarapa constituency.

The Council support is for the same reasons as set out in the proposal.

The Council does not wish to be heard regarding this submission.

Yours sincerely

Colin Wright
Chief Executive



You Hour Kaing

From: griggfamily2003@clear.net.nz on behalf of griggfamily2003 [griggfamily2003@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Monday, 16 July 2012 6:06 a.m.
To: Info
Subject: Fwd: submission

Michael Grigg
 29 Hyde st
 Wainuiomata

Submission to Regional Council on Community Plan

I have lot concern what this review is about is it linked to the review is about is about is about a reorgainsation scheme which is set out in the local government schedule 3 which links 19v3 .

I have concerns about what is said is to be diversity as i believe that community representation uses 1] Water Quality issue 2] Soil Managment issue

In ii] b to achieve effect representation I believe the diverse nature of the water quality and Soil management is no excuse for using 19v3 .

Local Government law is about decision making process The Regional Acknowledged the diversity when they consulted on the draft community plan .

These wer5re consulted under as proposed services They ask people in the Wellington Region about about if they support 11] If they supported continuing with the feasibility work 2]] Do you support additional funding for sustainability land management .

These issue were about the allocation of funds .

Local government law is about decision making process .

The decision making process in this case was the draft community plan .

So this should not be a reason for giving another councillor to get effective representation .

If 19v3 is being using the decision making process do not have worked to well and I believe the electoral boundaries should be changed and the boundries in Hutt City reduced in size and three constituency reduced in size have one member each .

The three constituency be called Pencarrow , Lower Hutt and western Hutt .

Giving us effective representation .

The consultation process is about land area .

All thought the Local Drart Community plan about states 50 ha on land beused for enhancing agricultural productivity through irrigation through storing water quality through storm water horticulture enviromental uses .

They hope to get funding from the Governments irrigation funding .

The job of councillor is suppose to make decision makling process work and key job is voting .

The proposal discusses it hopes to achieve government funding

It looks like public private partership .

Not really about community of intrests

The same with Sustainable land manage ment talks of 40 % of land mangement more than 40% of the region land is prone to erosion .

So how do use a debate on land to this to achieve a determination on Representen arragmentms for 2013 .

I believe question is this a proposal for a reorganisation plan .which you find in section 59 f

59 Section this is schedule 3reorganisation .where section 1-4 use the reorganisation for local authorities

Section 1-4 uses the word unitary authory also section 59 uses section 19v3 .

So is the determination being used for a reorganisation programme .

I like to see lower hutt constition split in three giving one ward council each .

- 1 Pencarrow
- 2 Lower Hutt
- 3 Western Hutt

This is a submission on representation review

I which to speak to my submisssion

Michael Grigg
29 Hyde St
Wainuiomata
9703176 b

Alexandra Jackson

-----Original Message-----

From: griggfamily2003@clear.net.nz [mailto:griggfamily2003@clear.net.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 18 July 2012 12:42 p.m.
To: Fran.wilde@gw.govt.nz
Subject: Community representation

Fran Wilde Julie , ken , max , Andrew Trevor and Holly .
one the issue involved in the soil management which is head up Substantial land management .

In the consultation process that is not clearly explained in the election arrangements proposal 2013 Proposal land service improvement items .

My interpretation of this is why they saying they need a extra councillor is because and when it come the focus on water and land management with the government and other process .

One the issue is the government is dumping its responsibilities on the region .

I have linked it withe GWRC Draft long term plan .

Not many people would be aware of what they consulting On the long term plan .

It talks of expanding its work to the Cartertons Mangatarere catchment

Carterton district council has been idenfited as a community of intrerest and the mangatarere catchment The Carterton district is mention as a community of interest

The local electoral act 2001 constituency means a constituency established under this Act and resulting from the division, for electoral purposes, of a region

The electoral act does not mention government does not mention it comes to constituency

They are talking electoral purposes .

The Consultation process for electoral does not say work to get another councilors

Work is a services which was consulted for under the term long term

Work is not a electoral purpose in my honest opinion .

Part 1A

Representation arrangements for elections of regional councils, under section 19 the act states -Review of representation arrangements for elections of regional councils

(1) A regional council must determine by resolution, and in accordance with this Part, -

- (a) the proposed number of constituencies; and
- (b) the proposed name and the proposed boundaries of each constituency; and
- (c) the number of members proposed to be elected by the electors of each constituency.

(2) The determination required by subsection (1) must be made by the regional council, -

- (a) on the first occasion, either in 2003 or in 2006; and
- (b) subsequently, at least once in every period of 6 years after the first determination

Given they have said 74% of the region area is in they have consult twice and should show boundaries .

So what they saying the service which the draft long term says they have consulted twice .

When looking for a community of interest under soil management in the long term annual plan they talk of 40% of the land in our region is erosion prone .

In consultation prose on election arrangement they 74% of the region land

Give it 40% of the region land how much of the work takes place out side the region and what is population of people live outside the region that are covered by the 74% The should be given the numbers of people the 74% of land does not matter .

So the boundaries of communities of interest should be shown it a requirement by law .

One the issue that come out of this but not talked about is 1]in 2008 the Ministry of Agriculture and forestry gave extra funding 2] The long term Draft annual plan states on Sustainable land mangement the Ministry is now reviewing it funding the plan prosses an additional rate to ensure 3]If the ministry funding is cut for 2013/2014 share of the works cost for regional council would rise from 30% to 40% 4] the land owerns cost go up 40 to 50 %

The draft long term plan . shows that there could be funding cuts So we talking public v private partnerships The draft an plan shows the funding will be cut from landowers

These people are not clearly identified in the proposal for arrangements 2013

So I have identied

- 1] two catchments
- 2] Ministry of Agriculture and Forsertry 1] Wairarapa hill country
- 2]Carterton s Matngatarere plain to
- 3] Regional Council
- 6] land owners

1] have to research this information

I do not know how many land owenrs there are or people 2] I do not know the population bases of carterton catchment Mangatatere

But does this warrant another council no .

If yes this rule should apply to all constituency .

The story in City life shows how rule rate payers were treated by the council of the flood maps

The landowners are rural people

What is catchment ?

1. The area drained by a river or body of water. Also called catchment basin.
2. The surrounding area served by an institution, such as a hospital or school.

1. The area drained by a river or body of water. Also called catchment basin.
2. The surrounding area served by an institution, such as a hospital or school.

What is a catchment area

1. The area drained by a river or body of water.
2. The area that absorbs water that contributes to a specific region's groundwater supply.

A community of interest is a non administrative area they do have names and used for collecting statitics , they have no legal status

Catchment could be a boundary for a constituency

..meshblock is the smallest geographic unit for which statistical data is collected by Statistics New Zealand.

Meshblocks vary in size from part of a city block to large areas of rural land. Each meshblock abuts another to cover all of New Zealand, extending out to the 200-mile economic zone (approximately 320 kilometres). Meshblocks aggregate to build larger

geographic areas, such as area units, territorial authorities, and regional councils.

Constituency

Regional council constituencies were established in November 1989. They are subdivisions of regional council areas that are created on population-based criteria to be voting areas within regional councils.

Regional council constituencies are defined at meshblock level, and do not coincide with area units. Constituencies are required to reflect communities of interest and their boundaries, and, so far as is practicable, coincide with those of territorial authorities or wards.

The boundaries of regional council constituencies may be reviewed prior to each triennial local government election. The provisions for such a review are contained in the Local Electoral Act 2001.

Catchments or not given in the the election proposal for 2013 work is government .

Regional Council consult on this issue funding and made the local government government decision making process work .

The matter of Work was about the allocation of funds .

A councillor should not be getting involved in the Day to day running of service .

A councilor job is to make decision for the region

He is elected by a constituency .

It will be the job of the council sub committee to deal with the issue

Council will appoint subcommittees

It will be there roll

They have mention the 4 communities of interest

Diversity of communities and local decision making was done in the draft local plan so the issue of Substantial management should not be proposal on election arrangements or more explanation why are the giving

Because GWRC is putting more funding into it to

I am at lost to why ?

There is territorial Authority of Carton District council as community of interest and the boundaries of this

I believe the

1] Wairapara hill country h

2]Cartertons Mangatere catchment are not list as catchments list as committee of interest .

They list 4 community of interest for the Wairapa Constituency council review and add 1] land area 2]] work

to achieve representation

I got this information buy using the Greater Wellington region council document Have your say on the Wellington regions future

It shows they consulted with the region as a proposed service improvement to expand our sustainable land mangement work to improve water and soil quality . much of this work would improve water and soil cost quality much more of this work would target effluniet and nutrient run of from dairy farms

*So why are not Dairy farmers mention in the proposal for election arrangements for 2013

They consulted how much will it cost .

They ask the Wellington Region not the Wairapapa constituency which is election tool

How much will it cost ?

The additional funding will be \$130 00 in 2012 /13 an average of \$130 000 of \$310,000 for 10years of the plan

They then ask
How would it be fund ?

50% funded by general rates and 50% fund by participating landowners

Then they say -

What do you think

Do you support adduntional funding for sustainable land management programes

You turn to page 16 it say have your say -

Draft long term plan 2012

That is the decision making process

So Diversity of communities [this is in the local government legislation] They have made the purpose of the local government act section 10 and developed commuity outcomes

No need for a new local councilor as local decision making had worked .

To pick information you grt it at the local library

On the same page they talk of an other submission so local decision making is working .

When you go down the page on the draft annual plan they consulted at one centre in 7 of the constituency 1] Wellington 2] Kapti 3] Poirua

4] Wellington

5] Lower Hutt

6] Upper Hutt

I believe the Regional Council Representative is the ex Mayor of Grey Town

But consultation took place so its fear to agrue Wainuiomata Should have a regional councillor .

But the question which was asked Do you support continuing funding for sustainable land management ?

So I have show you the regional council is principles of the local government act are working .

No need for another representative in the Wainuiomata Contitency

This information is not been given out

My research is showing by using different decision making process that the local government act is not working

What I have not researched is the cycle of council meetings and cycle sub committees

the object of a constituency system is to elect councilor to elected the region which means a lot travel to wellington back

this situation seems to be happening in all wards

in wainuiomata tstuffed the bustime up

as the citylife newspaper high lights the regional council stuffed up flood maps .

Also 2 of our councils are not being open mind about a unitary Authority

They want most of the territorial authorites to be wound up by they prepare to give Wairapara Constituency an other .

I have shown you though in making the determination on membership they have used a draft long term draft plan 2012-2022 which has made community out comes .

I believe this information should not be in the process because it about making a council an order and the wording of the law in consulting is determination .

But what is also showing is if they say the need a extra council in the wairapara the the unitary what work as there want be the councillor to go round and meet the public

Also what must be consider the voting power for some people and there votes wont be equal

The consultation shows the Wairarapa constituency with 40,000 and upper hutt 41,000 there voting be worth Wairapara people will be getting 2 votes and upper people one


Is this how the new unitary authority .

The people in the wairapara be valued more than upper hutt

Why are they using or does it have something to do with Schudele 3 section 59 which is about reorganisation .

They using this as part developing reorganisation plan if the territorial are abolish they have 2 councillors when unitary body appears for a period of three years

Michael Grigg
29 Hdye st
Wainuiomata



COPY

007

Civic Administration Building
838-842 Fergusson Drive,
Upper Hutt
Private Bag 907, Upper Hutt 5140
Tel: (04) 527-2169
Fax: (04) 528-2652
Email: askus@uhcc.govt.nz
Website: www.upperhuttcity.com

File: 326/01-005

Chair and Council Members
Greater Wellington Regional Council
Freepost Authority No. 3156
PO Box 11646 Manners Street
WELLINGTON 6142

16 July 2012

Dear Ms Wilde and Council Members

Upper Hutt City Council's (UHCC) submission on Greater Wellington Regional Council's (GWRC) - representation review

Upper Hutt City Council does not support the proposed representation arrangements.

Dismissing the 10% threshold for this proposal is undemocratic and inequitable

UHCC considers it to be both undemocratic and inequitable to allocate additional representation to the Wairarapa at a rate of 1:20,300 people, which falls well below the low end of the +/- 10% range of the legally required representation ratio (1:34,836).

Both Kapiti and Upper Hutt have higher rate paying populations than the Wairarapa and under this proposed scenario would be placed well over the 10% threshold (e.g. 1:49,800 and 1:41,500 respectively). Thus, it would be an inaccurate assertion for GWRC to state that this proposal allows for "effective representation for the distinct communities of interest of Kapiti Coast and Upper Hutt", as per the consultation summary document point (i).

Moving away from the population model to one of land mass is unjust

The Wairarapa district represents a high proportion of the Wellington region's land area and agriculture has led to environmental degradation. In particular, in some of the regions sensitive significant ecological environments. This in combination with "increased focus on water quality and land management issues"¹ has driven GWRC to allocate disproportionate (according to rate origins) resources to address the Wairarapa's land management issues.

However, UHCC notes that the Wairarapa district is largely rural land of extremely low population density by comparison with the more urbanised parts of the region. While there is increased focus on water quality and land management, much of the land is under the same or similar land use types, and the problems/solutions to erosion and agricultural pollution are well documented. Thus, the solutions to reversing environmental degradation should be widely applicable. While in practice the solutions may be very challenging to implement, this challenge does not in itself justify disproportionate representation from the Wairarapa at the regional level.

¹ Summary of initial proposal for the 2013 local elections, point ii.b, GWRC

Alternatively, Wellington's higher density urban environments are inherently more complex and with a significantly higher ecological footprint, which also offer a significant challenge for GWRC. In our view, this complexity and its associated ecological footprint justifiably negate the land area argument (noted in the consultation summary document at point ii.a).

Furthermore, in terms of GWRC's role and functions (i.e. biosecurity, emergency management, environment, flood protection, harbours, land management, parks and forests, transport and water supply), rates that are gathered from the population of the Wellington region are best allocated according to the most efficient and optimal set of outcomes that can be achieved under each functional area. UHCC strongly questions whether disproportional representation for the Wairarapa will achieve the most efficient set of outcomes for the wider region under each of GWRC's focus areas. Particularly considering the regionally significant transport issues that affect the entire population, and the very high biodiversity and ecological infrastructure values present in Upper Hutt's indigenous forests (that are under GWRC guardianship and management).

If GWRC believes that land area should now be one of the criteria used for representation then it stands to reason that the areas with second and third largest land mass (Kapiti and Upper Hutt respectively) should also be entitled to at least two representatives, as those areas with the smallest land mass all have at least two representatives already. However, in saying that our first choice would be to retain the status quo.

In summary

Upper Hutt City Council opposes the additional cost to Upper Hutt rate payers of adding another Councillor to GWRC in a manner that gives disproportionate representation to the Wairarapa. UHCC does not consider the rationale for the proposal to be justified. If disproportionate representation is to be pursued by GWRC, UHCC requests an independent cost/benefit analysis be undertaken to justify how the region's economic resources would be best allocated according to the optimal and most efficient set of outcomes that can be achieved under each GWRC functional area, with a focus to show why the Wairarapa is of particular interest over all other cities/districts.

We wish to be heard in respect of our submission.

Yours sincerely



Wayne Guppy
Mayor

11 July 2012

Greater Wellington Regional Council
PO Box 11 646
WELLINGTON

Subject: Proposed representation arrangements for the 2013 elections.

Submission to the Greater Wellington Regional Council

On behalf of the Hutt City Council we wish to make the following comments on behalf of Councillors.

1. We oppose the proposed increase to two members for the Wairarapa constituency. Local Government electoral law makes no provision for representation based on land area or work undertaken in the constituency. The only criteria in the act for electoral representation is population. Wairarapa's population does not entitle the constituency to two members.
2. We note that Kapiti Coast constituency is proposed to have one member for a population of 49,800 and Upper Hutt one member per 41,500. If your Council is contemplating increased representation then these two constituencies should have a higher priority than Wairarapa.
3. Our Council noted that the same rationale was promulgated by Joh Bjelke-Petersen in the 1972 Queensland State Government elections. Large land area with small populations had Members of Parliament, and these arrangements in part helped secure Mr Bjelke-Petersen's long tenure in power. We are opposed to the broadly similar representation arrangements being advanced in the Wellington Region.
4. In the alternative we propose that the proposed population per Councillor ratio for Wairarapa be extended across the entire Region. A ratio of one Councillor for 20,300 population would entitle Lower Hutt to five Councillors, Upper Hutt to two, Porirua-Tawa to three, Kapiti Coast to two and Wellington to nine. A total of 23 Councillors, but representation would be far more equitable than your proposed arrangements.



5. There was some support for the Lower Hutt constituency being divided into three single Councillor Wards. This could be achieved by combining the six Hutt city Council wards into three which would maintain the 10% population requirement.

6. While support was not unanimous, some Councillors felt that single Councillors Wards have advantages over an at large election in Lower Hutt. These being:
 - Increased accountability to constituents. A Councillor would have responsibility for specific areas and residents would know who to approach with concerns.

 - Potentially more competition in the election. The cost of an election campaign would be less under a ward based system which may encourage more people to stand.

 - The above two points arguably would result in more effective representation for the Lower Hutt constituency.

7. We note the advice given that STV elections are more suited to larger constituencies. However we point out that the Regional Council's decision to adopt STV was made with minimal public consultation. STV should not be used as a reason to present electoral changes which improve representation.

We wish to be heard in support of our submission.

Ray Wallace.

Ray Wallace
Mayor – Lower Hutt



Peter Kennedy
21 Buckingham Street
Melrose
Wellington 6023.

16 July 2012

The Wellington Regional Council - Submissions regarding an increase in the number of
Regional Councillors.

To Whom It May Concern,


As a resident of Wellington, I am appalled at the real lack of consultation over the process in this matter by the Wellington Regional Council. Yet again it highlights the absurd way the Wellington Regional Council tries to ride roughshod over the democratic rights of its ratepayers by not putting this matter out for "proper consultation", and what "consultation" there is, the notice period is very, very short!

By wanting "further representation" in the Wairarapa, the Wellington Regional Council is going to skew the demographic representation, as this will give the Wairarapa a higher representation, population-wise, than the rest of the areas represented under the control of the Wellington Regional Council. Putting it politely, it is a bit like gerrymandering, but hey, the Wellington Regional Council is well versed at that!!!

The other issue of "concern" is that this issue has been raised at a time when an informed debate should be taking place over amalgamation of local councils. I find it very disingenuous that the Wellington Regional Council has sought to raise this issue at such a time, obviously flagrantly trying to put a red herring into the discussion, or should things not go favourably for the Wellington Regional Council, in a straight out attempt to appropriate more money from the ratepayers and residents. Shame on you lot of vagabonds and charlatans!!!

I therefore formally oppose any expansion of the Wellington Regional Council, and recommend that the Council open it up again for further submissions, dependent on the outcome on of the debate on amalgamation. Then, and only then, should a proper debate be had on this issue, if need be.

Yours sincerely,



Peter Kennedy

COPY 010

You Hour Kaing

From: Councillor Solitaire Robertson [Solitaire.Robertson@swdc.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 17 July 2012 4:10 p.m.
To: Info
Subject: Representation Review

I just cleared my emails after work and this has been sitting in my out box all night and day. Would really appreciate if the Council would accept a late submission on the proposed representation review. Kind Regards

Solitaire

Good Afternoon, please find comments from the South Wairarapa District Council Maori Standing Committee in regards to the Greater Wellington Regional Councils Proposed Representation Review.

The Maori Standing Committee of the South Wairarapa District Council wishes to support the proposal for two representatives for the Wairarapa Region. Geographically, the Wairarapa is the largest area in the Regional Councils jurisdiction and we feel that the area is too large to support only one representative and still ensure that the voice of the Wairarapa ratepayers is heard. We do not wish to be heard in support of our views.

Councillor Solitaire Robertson

Mobile: 021 022 87955
Email: solitaire.robertson@swdc.govt.nz