

COUNCIL

DATE	7 th September 2023
REPORT OF	Rob Walsh – Chief Executive
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	Helen Isaacs, Assistant Chief Executive
SUBJECT	Review of North East Lincolnshire Council's Electoral Cycle – Consultation Results
STATUS	Open

CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

The Council has two clear strategic priorities – stronger economy and stronger communities. Within that second priority, the review of the electoral cycle for North East Lincolnshire Council will have potential impacts on local democracy as set out in the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) will be commencing a review of North East Lincolnshire Council's Ward boundaries in Summer 2024, with a view to completing that review by Autumn 2025. The new Ward boundaries will come into operation with effect from the May 2026 elections. Prior to this review, there needs to be a decision on whether to retain the current electoral cycle of elections by thirds or move to whole council elections. This decision will impact on the number of Councillors the authority recommends within its submission to the LGBCE next year.

Provisions within the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and the Localism Act 2011 gives the Council power to decide on its election scheme. Currently, Council elections are held by thirds (elections held for a third of Councillors on three years out of every four years), but the Council may resolve to move to whole Council elections (elections held for all Councillors once every four years).

At the Council meeting 25th May 2023, it was resolved that a public consultation would be run on the frequency of our Electoral Cycle. This report details the findings of the consultation.

A resolution for whole-council elections must not be passed unless there have been reasonable steps by the Council to consult "such persons as it thinks appropriate on the proposed change" and the resolution to move to whole council elections must be:

- a) At a meeting of Council which is specially convened for that purpose (Special Council meeting); and
- b) By a majority of at least two thirds of the Members voting on it.

If a resolution for whole council elections is not passed by a two-third majority, the current electoral cycle of elections by thirds will remain. This decision cannot be changed for a period of five years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council

- 1) Notes the consultation responses and outcome detailed within this report at appendix A.
- 2) Determines whether to:
 - a. Continue with the current election frequency of elections by thirds, or
 - b. Change to whole council elections every four years from May 2026;and
- 3) If the Council chooses to change the electoral cycle to whole council elections once every four years, the Assistant Chief Executive be authorised to issue the necessary public information as required by legislation and undertake any further actions necessary to give effect to the Councils resolution.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The LGBCE undertakes periodic reviews of Ward boundaries. An electoral review has not been undertaken for North East Lincolnshire Council since 2001. A timetable for this review has been agreed with the LGBCE.

As part of this process, the LGBCE will require information on council size (number of Councillors) in Summer 2024 and this, in turn, will be affected by whether the Council elects its Elected Members by thirds or as a whole. There is a legal process for conducting this review, which involves a period of consultation.

1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

- 1.1 Council resolved on 25th May 2023 to commence a consultation process with a view to determine if the electoral cycle for North East Lincolnshire Council should be changed to whole council elections.
- 1.2 Having consulted on the proposals for changing the electoral cycle for North East Lincolnshire Council, it is now a decision for Full Council as to whether the Council wishes to change the frequency of elections.
- 1.3 Before any decision to change the frequency is taken, the Council must have taken reasonable steps to consult with such persons as it thinks appropriate on the proposed changes.
- 1.4 The Council undertook consultation which ran for 8 weeks from 2nd June to 28th July inclusive. The consultation was publicised via an article in a Council newsletter which was distributed to every household in the borough in early June. It was also published on the council's website, social media channels, emailed out to everyone in our consultation database and promoted internally. Key stakeholders were also emailed direct (e.g., parish councils, MPs, etc).
- 1.5 In total, 212 responses were received to the consultation, and it was viewed 880 times. A summary of these responses is attached at Appendix A. Overall, 115 respondents supported a move to whole council elections against 96 who preferred to remain as election by thirds. 7 residents had no preference either way.

- 1.6 Reasons given by the consultees for preferring elections by thirds included greater stability of Elected Members knowledge and experience. Reasons given by consultees for preferring whole council elections included financial savings and increased elector participation.
- 1.7 It has been clarified that elections by halves are not an option for this Council. Section 21 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 provides that local authorities may choose to amend their electoral cycle from their current electoral cycle to a scheme for whole council elections or vice versa. Therefore, the only two options available are election by thirds or whole council elections every four years.
- 1.8 Members need to be mindful that the future electoral cycle will impact the Warding Pattern in the upcoming LGBCE Ward Boundary Review. If elections continue on the current frequency of thirds, then the expectation is that future wards will need to be made up of three elected members (although exceptions can be argued). If elections move to whole council elections the warding pattern could see a different number of elected members representing each ward (e.g. one, two or three member wards).

Advantages of Whole Council Elections and Elections by Thirds

- 1.9 The advantages of moving to whole Council elections include:-
- The Council has a clear mandate for four years, allowing it to adopt a more strategic, long-term approach to policy and decision-making – and spend less time and effort on yearly election campaigning.
 - Avoids election “fatigue” and results are simpler and more easily understood by the electorate. There would be clear opportunity for the electorate to change the political composition of the Council once every four years – greater publicity of whole council elections may generate higher turnout.
 - The Electoral Commission suggests that electorates associate more clearly with whole council elections.
 - Less costly for the Council and political parties as well as less disruptive to public buildings used as polling stations.
- 1.10 The advantages of elections by third elections include:-
- Avoids potentially electing a complete change of Councillors with no experience and allows continuity of Councillors; avoids disruption to on-going policies.
 - More likely to be influenced by local rather than national politics. National influence would increase if a Parliamentary election were held on the same day though.
 - Encourages people into the habit of voting, and voting for one person is well understood by voters. Voting for two or three Councillors under whole council elections could cause voter confusion.
 - Allows judgement of a Council annually rather than every four years and allows the electorate to react sooner to local circumstances, thereby providing more immediate political accountability.
 - Smaller parties may find it harder to resource the “whole council”

elections process. It may be harder for independent candidates standing on a matter of strong local interest to get elected without an annual election poll.

2. RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

- 2.1 The advantages of whole council elections and elections by thirds are set out in the report.

3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 The review of the Electoral Cycle is the first stage in the electoral review of North East Lincolnshire Council Wards which will be conducted in May 2024 and implemented from the May 2026 elections.
- 3.2 There is no option to do nothing as this is a statutory review.

4. REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 Before any decision is made on whether or not to move to a scheme of whole council elections is reached, the Council is required to consult and should show regard to the responses in coming to its decision.
- 4.2 All households have been consulted on the proposals as well as key stakeholders as explained in the report.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 There will be no financial considerations to remain with the current cycle of elections by thirds.
- 5.2 There will be a financial saving associated with the move to whole council elections, due to running one election four years as opposed three out of four years.

6. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no children and young people implications arising from this report.

7. CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no climate change or environmental implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

8. CONSULTATION WITH SCRUTINY

- 8.1 By law, it is the responsibility of Council to determine Review of North East Lincolnshire Council's Electoral Cycle.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 As outlined within section 5, there are minimal costs that would result from the consultation process.
- 9.2 Should the review result in a change to the electoral cycle, this could have positive financial benefits, by reducing the number of large-scale elections required. The saving from removing an election requirement in one year is estimated at £150,000.
- 9.3 However, the number of individual ward elections is likely to increase. With an extended period between elections, there are likely to be some additional councillors that either resign or are unable to continue with their duties over that period. Resultant individual ward elections are estimated to cost in the region of £15,000 - £20,000 each, which would reduce the savings achieved.

10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The above report largely sets out the legal implications. The Council is enabled by sections 31 to 36 and s53 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (as amended) to change its electoral cycle. The Act also enables the Council to change the electoral cycles of Parish and Town Councils by way of order. If the Council so resolves, it will be unable to change the scheme again for at least five years.

11. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The work on the Review of North East Lincolnshire Council's Electoral Cycle will be undertaken by officers by way of normal business.

12. WARD IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The proposals contained within this report will, if agreed, affect all Wards.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 13.1 Legislation:
- The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007
[Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2007/53)
 - The Localism Act 2011
[Localism Act 2011 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/22)
- 13.2 Council Report 25th May 2023 – Review of North East Lincolnshire Council's Electoral Cycle
[Council – Special Meeting | Democracy \(nelincs.gov.uk\)](https://www.nelincs.gov.uk/council-special-meeting-democracy)

14. CONTACT OFFICERS

Stephen McGrath – Strategic Special Projects Lead - Communities (01472 323737)

Laura Cowie – Elections Manager – (01472) 324295

Helen Isaacs – Assistant Chief Executive (01472 326127)

**ROB WALSH
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

APPENDIX A

Electoral Cycle Consultation Responses

How often would like elections to take place for North East Lincolnshire Council?	Survey	Emails	Total
Elect one third of councillors each year	94	2	96
Elect all councillors at the same election, once every four years	113	2	115
I have no preference either way	5	2	7

Responses in favour of elections by thirds

Stability, we could potentially have all new councillors not really knowing what to do, experience of existing ones will support new ones.
I think people would vote if it was just every four years and it would give councillors time to put their canvassing pledges into action
While I accept the cost savings put forward by electing it in wholes, it does mean we cannot react to issues effecting us locally. If we keep the system we use it mean local people get heard and listened to all year round not just 6 months before an election. Also it makes it easier for smaller parties to contest these elections
It leads to a more accountable Council, who have to face the electorate once a year for 3 out of every 4 years. It also leads to a more regular turnover of councillors, and fresh faces. Plus it is easier to understand voting for one candidate on one ballot every 3/4 years, rather than 3 votes every 4 years. It also leads to better local connections with the Councillor elected if they are done on separate ballots, and there is a clear distinction.
Frequency of being able to give a verdict on the political representation for my ward and for the council as a whole.
A week is a long time in politics having only 1 election for all candidate is a terrible idea. We want a potential variety of viewpoints in my ward.
Regular elections encourage residents to vote and leads to a much more effective Council with new Councillors learning from peers. Electing all Councillors at the same election can lead to a gaping hole of experience. The campaign structure could fail much more easily because of lack of use.
It allows residents to make changes to their representatives 3 out of 4 years Removes the risk of regular by elections Allows an opposition party to work towards overall control of the 3 year period. However a 50% stand down system, with a fallow year on year 2 and 4, with smaller wards of 2 members and more wards should also be considered. This could be a compromise between the two systems.
Feel it offers more stability in getting things done
More chance of a longer term approach, an element of continuity rather than stop start.
Maintains continuity and gets people into the habit of voting. If have all out elections can lead to instances where the dominant party becomes over-dominant compared to actual

votes cast. Also ensures that council still has experienced members. Also parties would struggle to find candidates to field if 42 were required in one go.
Yearly gives us more opportunity to assess how councillors have performed and to elect new ones
Regular turnover, people on hand who have been there longer for a quicker smoother learning curve.
If not satisfied don't have to wait so long for change.
So that expertise and experience can be shared by seasoned councillors to new ones; But also allowing an influx of fresh ideas and opinions to 'spruce up' a jaded forum!!
Continuity of service for ongoing projects and strategies. Full elections every 4 years may well result in a 'stale' year, where the new organisation is trying to make its plans for the next 3 years.
More effort needed on part of Council and other to engage citizens...abolish need for photo ID
Because it is my point of view.
This system will ensure some form of continuity
Voting three times in four rather than once means greater accountability. It also gives the electors the possibility of changing political control of the council 3 times in 4 years, not just once. Even if control of the council does not change on the by thirds system the political balance may. This means that over a 4 year cycle in each of those years the composition of the council will more accurately reflect the opinion of the electorate than a council which is elected en bloc once every four years
This is more democratic, if a particularly awful Council take control it means that the Borough is not stuck with them for 4 years but can change the make up of the Council by voting a third of the Councillors out, whereas in a 4 year cycle a bad Council has more opportunity to do more damage.
Because it works, and you don't fix something that isn't broken!
Gives some continuity.
Four years with no elections is too long, I agree that it might encourage people to vote, which is desperately needed. It would also take too long to vote off those who are not doing a good job, we want effective councillors, not those along for the ride.
I think that one third of councillors being elected at each election encourages a long term view rather than short terms, which is the bane of our political system
Doing this keeps continuity within the Ward meaning that those Councillors left have an understanding of issues that affect the Ward
voters can react to local issues annually
Allows yearly change to react better to local issues
Things change on a local level so rapidly. I think we need regular local elections to enable us to have a reflective local council that is representative of what local want to see happening.
I think there would be even less continuity of purpose if all were changed at the same time. New candidates would not know what was already ongoing if all were elected at the same time. I think it may also lead to some pushing their own agendas forward if re-elected if new were present if all had been elected/re-elected.
Elections for Councillors should be frequent in case they are not doing enough to help their community or advocating on behalf of residents.
By using this method there is some continuity during the electoral period

<p>The electorate are able to respond to local issues during 3 out of the 4 years. This may mean the numbers for a particular party are changed drastically or just enough to make a point. If we only vote once every 4 years, this is lessening our ability for change according to local / national issues and will be stuck with a council for 4 years. Depending on the make up of that council, this could be disastrous for the area.</p>
<p>Allows for greater flexibility and opportunities to address current and recent issues as well as long term plans.</p>
<p>Keeps decision makers accountable and allows voters to react regularly.</p>
<p>this always leaves a body of knowledge on the council that new members can take advantage of.</p>
<p>I do not like the idea that policies could change dramatically if the whole council were elected at the same time with a fundamentally different agenda to their predecessors. The current system provides a cushion from such policy swings.</p>
<p>keeps existing councillors on their toes</p>
<p>I believe it to be the best method of selection. Also all parties have problems recruiting candidates, and every 4 years means 42 recruits.</p>
<p>If the leading party are not confident enough to implement a scheme as they feel they will not have enough power next year, they shouldn't be implementing the scheme anyway</p>
<p>Do we really want to keep the same Council for 4 years, looking at national Government as an example?</p>
<p>It takes a period of time to understand the dynamics of council. One year is insufficient. Ends up with inexperienced cllrs in the authority</p>
<p>Ensures continuity</p>
<p>Ensures continuity</p>
<p>regular turnover. The once every four years could result in throwing the baby out with the bathwater i.e. policies/ plans etc completely abandoned if a total change of political representation should happen.</p>
<p>The current system keeps the political parties on there toes, a 4 year cycle and they would all take it easy for 3 years, the get interested in the voters again on year 4</p>
<p>I'd do it 2 years because lately people are getting angry with councillors</p>
<p>Gets people into voting habit, less danger of an unrepresentative council in having vote at a time when one party is particularly unpopular, hard to find 42 good quality candidates in one go, harder for independents who don't have party backing.</p>
<p>Better to remove a council that ignores its residents.</p>
<p>less disruption to members and the parties they represent</p>
<p>I do not want to be saddled with inept councillors for 4 years, having thirds means councils can be more reactive to the local people because they can lose out sooner.</p>
<p>For continuity of service - having all new councillors at the same time would be difficult for officers as all councillors would need bringing up to standard at the same time in terms of their knowledge and understanding.</p>
<p>I think there is better continuity for communities to have a small change each year as opposed to potentially a massive change</p>
<p>Councillors should only serve for 3 years not a 4 year cycle</p>
<p>This allows for continuity of services and projects etc rather than losing the background information and knowledge relating to individual topics all in one go should a whole council risk changing every 4 years</p>

Ensures regular participation. Ensures elected members and political parties have more contact with the public and do not become complacent during the four years.
Allows for more continuity
I feel there is more continuity with electing a third of councillors each year rather than what could result in a complete change of all councillors once every four years with no experienced councillors continuing if the electorate decide this. Due to the increasingly small turn outs by NEL residents for the local elections I feel that to elect one third of councillors each year and to make sure there is much publicity for the elections would hopefully increase the participation of the NELC electorate. Local issues need to be dealt with swiftly, local councillors need to represent all of the electorate effectively and not just 'toe the party lines'. - electing a third each year should hopefully address this effectively. We, in NEL, need to desperately increase people participation in local government and issues, keep it in people's minds all of the time and encourage them to question and be involved all the time in the issues that are so important to a fully functioning council and community.
Provides more frequent opportunity for community to engage with elections process. Allows electorate to express their view on current local issues rather than a four yearly basis
This system provides continuity with new members able to pick up processes from existing members rather than the whole council having to learn together.
Like the current system, less massive change.
Keep the status quo
More opportunities for change
I currently run the postal votes process and for me if it was every 4 years there would be a danger of forgetting the process
It keeps a regular turnover of councillors
spreads out the process over time, meaning rather than every four years having to have elections for all which I imagine can be a large process, having smaller elections every year will bring down the workload and make staff carrying out the process more effective as they do it every year
Less affected by national issues at the 4 year cycle. Residents able to react to local issues more often.
In my experience, elections in NE Lincs run very smoothly compared to other authorities where I've worked. I think the main reason for this is because we hold elections every three years out of four and have much more experience in managing them.
to keep continuity of representation

Responses in favour of whole council elections

A four year election cycle will ensure ruling group can make decisions for best of the town during that period, rather than decisions to win the next election. Also, it is financially cheaper to hold elections every four years, saving at least £100,000 in that four year period, if not more.
Electing one third of councillors each year leads to voter fatigue, reducing turn out and engagement from the public. It also increases the costs of the electoral cycle, reduces the stability of the council and damages long-term decision making.
Give residents the chance to move parties if required

I think people would vote if it was just every four years and it would give councillors time to put their canvassing pledges into action
Primarily to reduce cost but also to ensure residents can alter make up of council decision makers if required. To increase voter participation. I believe voting every year reduces electors desire to vote.
Simpler and would allow the council to have long term strategies without having to conduct yearly elections
Allows a complete change in power forcing the councillors to actively work for the community
better accountability of ruling party and quicker change of NELC to better reflect the national political mood
Reduce voter fatigue and increase turnout; Help promote long term decision making; Reduce the costs of the electoral cycle
To have two or three votes every four years "should" generate more interest from the electorate and save money for the Council, especially as so few go out to vote in many Wards. But stop East Marsh having three councillors for less than 7,000 electorate whilst Wolds have only two for over 6,000 electorate and Humberston and New Waltham have only three for well over 9,000 electorate. If Wolds have only two East Marsh should have only two. councillors. Once the multi-story blocks and the Comber estate were demolished East Marsh should have lost a councillor.
More straight forward and cost effective
Saves money and It gives councillors chance to make a difference in their wards.
Needs a reform on how we get to say who is on the council
Every 4 years gives the council the time to implement and make policies work. It also means the entire council have to work together and not be governed by their political party's mandate.
Costs are huge for current system
If the current council are doing a bad job they can be elected out quickly, whereas under the current scheme, it can take several years.
Gives councils time to formulate long term plans 1. 1. rather than reacting to popular or personal issues because of pressure to remain in place. 2. Surely a more cost effective use of public money rather than over frequent short term campaigning. 3. Are this number of councillors with their associated costs really necessary in these days of austerity?
Waste of money and resources. 1 election every 4 years perfectly adequate
It would make more sense to have all our elections but smaller council wards. Too often in wards of 2/3 there is a lazy councillor who benefits from the work of others. Moreover, by having all out elections it allows the council to better train and upskill councillors rather than have to induct new councillors every year. It would also cost the public purse a lot less money to have all out elections. This can be invested in other areas. Finally, all out elections are an opportunity to increase voter participation. By holding them every 4 years it makes election time feel "special" which could increase voter participation. At the moment holding elections every year nearly is tedious and people get voter fatigue and fed up with voting. It would be even better if we could match the local elections with the General Election to have all elections at once and increase participation.
Stability of tenure for councillors once elected and less voting requirements from the public

I think it would be better for everyone as the way you do elections now is not conducive for people to vote, basically they just don't care
More stable administration better able to adopt and implement more long term strategic approaches
It Must be Cheaper that way.
It might encourage greater turnout if all councillors are elected at once.
Councillors focused on policy not getting re-elected Councillor induction and training budgets would get more vfm Cost of election - 66%
I think it would save money for the councils and it will help have a more stable long term plan
Cost savings
To save money because the council waste too much such as freshney place and cinema
Because that is what I want
Would enable an overhaul of the House of Commons and a reduction in the number of MPs to below the capacity of 472 by making provisions for the UKs local authorities to also become parliamentary seats (the existing constituencies would be scrapped altogether). My preferred system would be for people to vote for their local councillor using the traditional first-past-the-post system and then the party which receives the most votes wins the seat on the House of Commons. It would also mean one combined general/local election every four years (or sooner if required) and a considerable reduction in spending on elections as well.
Having elections every year is expensive and ridiculous. People are sick of voting. Let's elect all councillors at the same time as we elect our MP and Police and Crime Commissioner. It would be cheaper, make voting a significant time of year and increase turnout. This would mean councillors would have an actual mandate due to higher turnout
All out elections please with smaller 1 councillor wards. I'm sick of having to vote every year and have no idea who my councillor is as there are just so many in my ward so don't know who is responsible for what area of the ward as I think they have split responsibility even though we elect them all.
Myself and my family would like to see all councillors elected every 4 years. Currently, the council lacks a strategic approach to its policy making. This is especially true in children's services which has suffered over the years. This, in our view, is because councillors are too focused on short term issues rather than taking a longer term view. This also results in Councillor's being reluctant to make unpopular, but often necessary, decisions as they fear loosing seats at that years elections. Having all out elections is also more financially wise for the public purse as it is cheaper to have all out elections every 4 years. It allows the council to train councillors and up skills them over the course of their term in office. Currently, the council focuses on short term training to introduce new councillors every year. It would also be advantageous to have smaller 1 member wards. I have seen myself how some councillors do very little but get by due to the support of their more active colleagues. Smaller 1 member wards would increase accountability and allow real representation as it would create a stronger bond between councillor and electorate.
I want the council to move to all out elections electing councillors every four years. The area has suffered due to a lack of strategic decision making in favour of short term political gain. The public are sick of it! We are sick of voting every year and seeing things

<p>continue to decline. That's why people don't vote! Try electing all councillors every 4 years. Make election time a significant time of year that matters to people and family's rather than a chore every year where we see no difference. If it's 4 years party's can have a manifesto to be judged on. That's hard to do with elections every year so there is currently little accountability elected 1/3 per year. All out is the way to go.. I'm also sick of seeing our money spent by n elections. I've seen in the paper how many people are needed at election time. It must be cheaper to have all councillors elected at once? The money saved can be used to reduce our council tax!</p>
<p>Yearly elections will lead to nothing been done and no long term planning</p>
<p>Save on administration costs. Or why not elect half of councillors every two years?</p>
<p>saves the council money more stability and commitment to council priorities</p>
<p>It would allow a council to actually get some things sorted rather than wasting time.</p>
<p>The public as very little chance of ridding themselves of a ruling party when it is done in thirds, and planning long term is hamstrung by having elections every year somewhere in the boroughs.</p>
<p>more stable council members able to plan long term less costly arranging such frequent elections</p>
<p>All voters vote on same day every 4 years meaning less confusion and a whole new council.</p>
<p>More efficient. Enables members to take unpopular but necessary actions without short-term electoral consequences. Greater stability and potential to better develop members' scrutiny skills. etc</p>
<p>Would enable the council to improve their strategic planning and be consistent</p>
<p>stability, change can be disruptive and also I would think financially more viable to have planning and holding of one elections every 4 years</p>
<p>Providers great certainty for everyone, helping planning and resource management. It would also lead to more productive months without pre election period and could also save lots of money by hosting less elections.</p>
<p>easier. less mucking about</p>
<p>Provides stability and focus for a longer period of time. Less costly.</p>
<p>Allows the work of the council to make progress rather than taking 3 months out of every year while councillors do nothing but canvass</p>
<p>I believe that voting every four years would increase turnout as the public would be more willing to vote if they have more opportunity to effect change. It would also give administrations the opportunity to implement their priorities and manifesto commitments without having to worry about the potential impact of annual elections. This would give some certainty about how the council would operate and also avoid what is, in effect, a hiatus from March to June each year, as focus turns to election campaigning.</p>
<p>It would mean that there would be more time for the council to undertake and complete proposals</p>
<p>Cost savings</p>
<p>Keeping it consistent - more strategic - you know who your councillor will be - might encourage people to vote more!</p>
<p>more efficient and less costly. Contributes to carbon reduction. Less paper, less electricity, people won't be travelling in cars to vote or to count votes/results.</p>

<p>There would be a higher turnout to vote in theory. It's more understandable. Changing councillors every year can be an issue for long-term projects that span over a few/several years. Example may be scope creep.</p>
<p>For consistency</p>
<p>It would give the electorate the opportunity to change a council which may not be acting in the interest of the whole area</p>
<p>A recent report have highlighted the low skills our councillors have: https://mylocal.co.uk/lincolnshire/feed/north-east-lincolnshire-council-in-financially-fragile-position-/79061?fbclid=IwAR1y-gMZpj3aXJz7VOQR-ITpuZJ6bPTsBLckyxRwdJtMWwGY_7jdEkao2pQ This lack of awareness is due to being unwilling to make unpopular but necessary decisions due to fear of repercussions at the ballot box. Moreover, due to having elections every year due to 1/3 up at a time, there is less focus on upskill the current councillors. Instead training is focused on inducting new councillors. Having all out elections every 4 years will allow for the councillors to take a longer term strategic view and consign shortermism to the dustbin of history.</p>
<p>It is impossible to change something/have an impact within 1 year! Too much time & money is spent on the procedure rather than on where the money should be spent.</p>
<p>Means you can get a complete change or a partial change depending on the vote, Also seems easier and cheaper to run</p>
<p>Allows for 4 years of relative local stability and accountability during that period. Limiting the cycle of regular elections should lessen voter apathy.</p>
<p>It should give more political stability</p>
<p>Whole council elections would not only save money but allow members to better embed into their roles and committees</p>
<p>So that when a council has failed in its mandate it is possible to change it significantly to get a better outcome in my opinion rather than in dribs and drabs where a group could cling to power for more than 4 yrs</p>
<p>I think it gives a longer term for things to get done rather than something starting and then it being dropped because of a change in the election. More opportunity to change the political makeup.</p>
<p>Either way, I can only vote once every four years so the voting in thirds is already not responsive for me as an individual voter. I'd prefer that the members of the council were settled for the longer period to allow continuity of priorities, working groups etc.</p>
<p>Cleaner result</p>
<p>So that when the majority of the electorate want to see a change in leadership this can happen more immediately, albeit once every 4 years. Also so that the party elected can focus on a long term plan rather than having the distraction of annual elections.</p>
<p>This seems more cost effective : reflects the national model (albeit time scale would be different) : gives better chance for longer term political planning</p>
<p>Makes sense to hold every 4 years as long term planning is required</p>
<p>To enable the council to deliver a plan before the change around. If people are unhappy with the delivery, they have the opportunity to completely change the council. This will give the sitting council more reason to enact their plans as promised to protect their position.</p>

Too much lack of continuity. Infighting with 'new brooms' being elected every year. Decisions based on electioneering rather than what is best for N.E. Lincolnshire residents. Too 'bitty' overall.
It is the only way to change a council if we so wish.
Time to implement mandated changes. Not worry about losing working majority every 12 months
Party politics means they need to be aware of a kick in the but coming their way if they don't change their ways.
By giving the electorate as a whole the chance to express their view on how the Council is performing and not just a portion of it. It seems a very fragmented system currently.
If some one is doing a bad job they need to be out
Save money
Better use of resources. Electorate won't get voter fatigue.
Vast savings on costs and greater stability of council constitution
If the council has a large majority of 1 party then it can stay in power with a third of the councillors system, even if all their candidates lose.
allow a true turn over of power as the people political sway. allowing greater medium term governance rather than pandering all the time to the reactive political need of the day. for better cost effective use of council resources and enable the town to work together for the medium plan for the town.
It makes more sense
I like the idea of longer-term policy and planning. I think, as a Council officer, it gives us more time to work on projects without having to plan around things like purdah and election campaigns.
3 out of 4 is too much, not time to make a difference.
Ensures consistency in ruling party to allow actions / policies to be developed and implemented. Reduces cost of running elections, as doing once every four years rather than three times in four years.

Other responses received

My only concern is that elections do take place
There are pro's and cons for each
<p>I am writing with regard to the consultation on changing the Council elections to once every four years.</p> <p>While I do think there is merit in one of the most compelling argument in this debate, which is saving on expenditure, I am unhappy that equally important democratic issues are given secondary status.</p> <p>The issues, to my mind, that are of great importance in keeping the present voting by thirds system are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local matters have greater importance – it is less likely that voters are heavily influenced by national politics • stability - avoids the problem of having a great swathe of new, inexperienced Councillors • continuity - avoids the problem of having an abrupt change of direction, should a new administration take control

- immediate accountability - it allows judgement of a council annually rather than every four years and allows the electorate to react sooner to local circumstances

As I understand it, the Electoral Commission is most decidedly in favour of voting once every four years and I imagine their influence and the pressure they bring to bear on this matter is hard to resist.

I have looked into other councils such as Hertsmere and Maidstone, who have succumbed to the demands of the Electoral Commission but I do not think that their examples are worthy of duplication. Some other councils, such as Gloucestershire Council still has kept its cycle of local council elections and I see no reason why we should not follow their example instead.

Elections every four years. The reason for choosing this system is that as an aging branch, campaigning every year is getting too much for we oldies. We have at the moment just one young person and who is working. So, it is down to the oldies...

With regards to the frequency of elections, whilst ordinarily I would have favored one round of elections every four years, on balance I think it is best to maintain the current frequency of local Government elections, because I do think it is important to have some continuity with councillors. I could foresee that with the elections once every 4 year system, potentially every single Councillor could be changed at once and nobody would know what was going on.

We need all councillors elections together, otherwise we get relatives representing us who are supported by their relatives, who may have lost their seat or have more years.

Please let us know your connection to North East Lincolnshire (from consultation responses only)

Resident of North East Lincolnshire	92.42% (195)
Business owner / employed in North East Lincolnshire, but do not live here	4.27% (9)
Representative of a local organisation or group in North East Lincolnshire	2.37% (5)
I have no connection to North East Lincolnshire	0.00% (0)
Other	0.95% (2)