

# Public Document Pack

## Extraordinary Council Wednesday, 12 October 2022 Additional Information Pack

Agenda Item No.	Supplementary Information	Page Number
3	Comments Received in Response to the Electoral Consultation	3

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Comments received in response to electoral consultation</b>
I think an all-out election is a good idea as it helps to elect the best councillors and remove the ones who do very little work for their ward.
Maybe reduce the number of councillors and make wards similar voter size.
You should also look at the total number of councillors. Do we really need to have and pay for 60?
Whilst wanting the vote you will see them once the elections are over they disappear!!
Greater checks on postal voting needed as corruption is a high risk
Please reduce the number of councillors.
This is not a good idea. If implemented it means a local person has an income for being a councillor for 4 years but at the same time prove to be totally unsuitable for the job. We do not need 60 councillors to run Peterborough City Council. 30 Councillors could easily look after and make the decisions for a population of 200,000 people. The current system of 1/3 seats being voted for each year gives new candidates change to bring something new to the table which is essential for a growing city
Same time as General Election would also be good, even more money saved.
Full revision of governance is required. Removal of leader and cabinet and replacement by a committee system. Partial reform will do nothing to improve the current dictatorship by Fitzgerald. No majority of seats, but his cabinet clique makes all the decisions.
Having election every year is better as you are more likely to know how your councillors are helping your area. If every 4 years can easily be forgotten
I am happy with councillors of Peterborough.
I couldn't face having this dreadful lot of Tories in for another four years! The worst council leader in my forty years in Peterborough.
This plan must save money.
Good idea - should save a lot of money.
I think the current system makes more sense and stops us getting stuck with a bad decision for 4 years.
Will stimulate participation & boost accountability.
The current system is more democratic than the all-out system, since if a political party is popular nationally in a particular year, they will probably win 3 seats in many wards. If the council make a hash of things it will take 4 years to make any changes, whereas with the current system at least one councillor in each ward could be changed.
This council is very good at wasting money. So hopefully this will save some money. Not that any of the councillors are any good.
Absolutely no to once every 4 years. A gradual transition best. It's more democratic. Peterborough is currently has extremely poor calibre people in leadership posts and the thought of them being secure for 4 years would be even more ruinous for the city and cost far more than holding the extra elections.
No
N/A
Should be all out every two years, to keep councillors on their toes ,and do best for their area, therefore earning the money they get paid, every 3 or 4 years makes them too complacent
I currently like the current system which means that changes can be made each year if we are not happy with things in our ward.
Look at lowering the councillors to one per ward, Hampton Vale has two Conservative's and one Liberal Democrat and they don't work together for the good of the community but if you had one councillor they would.
There should also be the option for wards to recall councillors who do Nothing
I feel voting in thirds enables there to be some continuity for the public and the councillors to build relationships in the community.

Elections every 4 years like a GE, however have them set 2 years apart
This would reduce the costs for the running of the polling stations on a nearly an annual basis and makes more sense to the voting public for it to be everyone out at the same time.
The only thing that will stabilise Peterborough City Councillors, is when they all realise they have to work together doe the benefit of the city, NOT follow the leader with a view to helping themselves.
Peterborough City Council has become too political and is a turn-off, rather than encouraging people to help or report issues. Councillors must work together to help Peterborough.
You will lose the individuality of candidates if you hold elections every 4 years. It will make it harder for new candidates to be recognised and get their message across. It will lead to more of the status quo and voting along party lines rather than for individual candidates. It will become harder to bring new faces and ideas into the council.
It makes sense to do this
Voting Yes, as this should result in a more joined up forward thinking approach from councillors, with more decisive action being taken, less stale mates and will also ease the burden on Council Officers who are fatigued by the number of ballots and elections they have to oversee
Cannot come soon enough
The current system is good and ensures we get a regular chance to change our minds instead of being stuck for 4years.
Had local elections earlier this year - not a single notification from any potential councillor before election and nothing from those elected since. Appalled that they are so complacent.
You can't just have 1 election every 4 years as there will always be exceptions - resignations etc. Not worth changing.
Local elections should be about local issues but sadly are often more about "sending a message" to national government. All out elections every four years would make it even more likely that people's votes were determined not by the merits of those standing but by what is happening at the national level.
A lot can change locally in 4 years and I would like more control over the people working to provide our services so think an option to change them after 3 years is better than 4
No
All out is where we came from. It was deemed in need of change so we went to this rota system. Why switch back? Can't see any justification for change. Very easy to lose experienced folk all at the same time with all out elections
Surely the cost savings will be substantial, however am concerned about delays to progression of issues when administrations change
I'd also like to see the current "first past the post" system changed to a more representative system.
In a time that Councils funding has been slashed and key services are being cut. It seems to be an absolute waste of money administering local elections every year.
This is ridiculous and verging on dictatorship. I guess the Tories are absolutely desperate to keep their jobs no matter how incompetent they are!
I don't think it helps long term planning when Councils are elected on virtually an annual basis.
This should focus decisions into the longer term not what sounds/looks good. It will cost less as well
I think the system now works and enables new councillors to fit in easier as they have experienced colleagues already in place. Four years of a poor council could lead to disaster when pushing through questionable policies
I think that this would be fair and easy for the voters.
A move to be welcomed as it will improve long term strategic thinking & planning. A review of the existing "cabinet" arrangements is also desirable.
Bad Idea.

Have elections at a different time to General Elections.
Much better to elect by thirds, avoiding large swings of political power at the council.
It is preferable and more democratic for people to have a regular vote rather than confining us to every four years, which will give us fewer democratic opportunities.
Having elections by thirds provides more stability and less dramatic changes in Council composition. Having all out elections under the First Past the Post system can produce very distorted results where small swings in numbers of votes cast can be magnified into massive changes in number of seats. If we are to have all out elections, I would prefer to see them happen under a PR system, such as the Single Transferable Vote, which is used for council elections in both Northern Ireland and Scotland. All out elections would also severely hamper smaller parties as they would be required to find up to 60 candidates, which may prove difficult for some of them. In summary, I think it is good to look at this proposition and, as a councillor I am keen to see views from the public before voting on it, but my current view is that I would prefer to keep the current election by thirds system.
This questionnaire is very poorly worded and I would suggest it is designed to get a particular outcome
Regular elections help policies engagement and continuity of experience in the elected member cohort
This will bring stability and save costs. Also will end the month every year when nothing happens due to purdah rules.
I think more people would vote. Many think 'not another election' and lose interest....whereas once every so many years might trigger a better response and more people voting!
Surely this would have a cost savings application to the council which has had its financial behaviour under the spotlight recently.
This election voting proposed new voting system is about favouring the current administration in charge of Peterborough City Council
Would hate to see all out election as at least the way it is leaves the chance of some decent people staying and not taken over by hypocrites like Nicol Days So called Green party who showed no interest in trying to stop Ferry Meadows from being commercialised and dug up by saying it was not her area to deal with within the council !!!
It may encourage to vote as it's a one off
Question 1 is not well expressed and ambiguous.
adopting a longer term, more strategic approach to politics makes sense for the city
I believe a 4 yearly electoral cycle is detrimental to the democracy of local government.
Whilst going to one election every 4 years will reduce the cost of the election process. Having an election every 4 years will keep the same political party in power for the same time and not give the electorate chance to remove that party if they do not believe them to be doing a good job whilst in control
The election cycle must remain as it is - this way the electorate can consider who they vote for every two years and gives
greater democratic accountability
The current election cycle gives the greater democratic accountability. It allows the electorate to shape their views every two years. The current cycle should remain
The proposal to change is only to save money, it will not improve the system. Having a gradual change of councillors is far preferable to having massive upheaval every 4 years bringing in lots of inexperienced people all at once. Short term savings should not be brought in when it brings with it a worse system long term.
This potentially could mean losing a lot of experienced councillor's all at the same time, very concerning

A lot better for the council to have at least 4 yearly strategic plans in place with this approach. I'm sure councillors will be against this and want to continue with existing system but it only benefits them and not the actual city!!
I would love to see the Conservatives be ousted.
The thirds system allows the public to show their approval or disapproval for an administration far more regularly. Keeping the council more aligned to the needs of its constituents. It also allows for easier transfers of power and knowledge as councillors change more gradually.
The current system works, affording opportunity of change
And surely it would save money.
I feel if Councillors only get elected once every 4 years then we would not see them in the intervening years. If there has to be an election every year (except 1 every 4 years) then we get to see them whilst they are canvassing.
In my view, I think 'all out' elections would give more stability to budgeting and financial planning.
All out elections will be less wasteful in terms of time and money. It will also allow the work of the council to be conducted with a longer term approach
If everyone is only voted in every 4 years there is no opportunity to change the political landscape within Peterborough if it is all going wrong.
Surely the cheapest way to do it and would allow certainty within the council
We need accountability and option to change make up of councillors every year and not every years
If we want to change direction of council we should have chance every year not wait 4 years
We need to end the Marxist Communist destruction of our city.
I would have thought that stability would be best served by the current system of having new councillors gradually joining a team of established people. Having all out elections would mean a larger change and mean we are then 'stuck' with what we have for the following 4 years.
General elections should be held at least every 4 years not every 5 years. I understand that there is a fix term parliament act.
Surely the cost-saving of one election cycle every 4 years is greater than annual ward-specific elections? Plus provides more continuity for residents having a consistent administration for 4 years.
Elections every year mean counsellors are too busy worrying about upcoming elections and not doing the job they are supposed to be paid for
Although I have ticked no to all out elections I have indicated that if it is introduced then 2024 would be preferable to commence all out elections. Could it be explored if 2023 could legally be the 'fallow' year? There will be elections in 2024 anyway and there is likely to be a general election as well so why not incorporate all outs in 2024. I am sure residents in the City will also appreciate a year off as they have faced many elections over recent years. Financially the City is exploring and challenging spend to identify possible savings, postponing 2023 elections would realise a financial saving. 2024 for all out elections will also enable all political parties to plan for this massive change to the current arrangements.
I feel strongly about this.
This makes sense, should have happened years ago
In my opinion it would save a lot of money, which can only help the finances of the council
Rolling elections allow a more dynamic change in the Council make up.
The constant change does not allow for good decision making. Too much time is wasted bickering and campaigning not focussing on why the residents deserve and need. It is also much more cost effective to run elections once every 4 years.
Not much of a consultation if you only ask one question and have no documentation giving pros and cons of what is being asked. I consider election all councillors at once to be increasing the democratic deficit in this country rather than decreasing it. It makes it more likely that the council will listen to itself first and the people second. All parties will find it harder to find candidates if

they're trying to find 60 every 4 years. You'll end up with some candidates being elected unopposed, another democratic deficit. I have more to say but I don't know how much room is left as this dialogue box is one line deep. Another failure in this online consultation.
None
I believe the election of all councillors will result in meaningful changes that reflect public opinion.
It levels the field and offers more opportunities to effect real change - thus increasing accountability for incumbents
In wards that have more than one councillor the election system should ensure that the councillors represent the range of parties that people have voted for – it should not be the case that <u>all</u> the councillors in the ward represent the party that got the most votes.
As this leaflet was not available to me until after 19 <sup>th</sup> September this cut-off date should be ignored. I saw no mention of this idea until I was able to call into a Library (I am disabled) and cannot take part in most of the council's debates, planning applications etc as I don't have internet or mobile phone due to the cost. No-one I have spoken to, on the street, knew of this proposal.
Comments from Paul Bristow MP attached.

This page is intentionally left blank