

## APPENDIX 3 to Corporate O&S Report – 2 February 2016

**EXCERPT of the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 22 October 2014 at 7.00pm.**

### **67. Motion submitted by Councillor Hebb**

The Motion, as printed in the Agenda, was proposed by Councillor Hebb and seconded by Councillor Halden. The Motion read as follows:

*“Thurrock is an area which is thirsty for regeneration, and needs political stability to attract investment. It therefore needs to demonstrate a more stable; consistent; lower-cost governance system.*

*Following a number of years of being in No Overall Control (NOC) Thurrock Council resolves to investigate and implement a move to a Four Yearly Election model”.*

Councillor Hebb introduced the motion and in doing so made the following key points:

- That a four year election model would make Thurrock more stable and allow time for the ruling group to drive forward and embed their policies.
- That a move to a four year election model would save approximately £400,000 to the Council every four years.
- That it would improve political turnout and engagement.

During the course of debate on the Motion, the following key points were raised both in support and opposition:

- Councillor Gerard Rice felt that in his experience a 4 year election model did not work well or was in the best interests of the electorate, and recounted that some political groups had become complacent for 3 years out of 4 after winning an election. He felt that the current model provided more opportunity for challenge.
- Councillor Speight remarked on the achievements in Thurrock and felt that the electorate wanted more cross-party working not shutting people’s voices out for an additional year.
- Councillor John Kent questioned how elections by thirds created instability, and highlighted a number of regeneration success stories which had been achieved under the current model. He felt that the election by thirds model provided stability.
- Councillor Ray agreed that regeneration was important but felt that the political balance had little effect. He added that there was no evidence to support the claim that a 4 year election model was good for residents and instead stated that it was of paramount importance to let residents have their say.
- Councillor Johnson felt that there would be greater turnout on general election years and that a 4 year election model supported zero based budgeting.

- Councillor Coxshall felt that the 4 year election model would give more time for policies to embed and for the political majority to deliver their manifesto.
- Councillor Snell explained that the 4 year model would give residents less of a voice and that the current system worked well to keep Members on their toes.

Upon being put to the vote, 15 Members voted in favour of the Motion, and 30 Members voted against, whereupon the Mayor declared the motion was lost.