

**Alana Mackay – Cambridge Community Board - Four**

Four years would certainly provide greater continuity and more opportunities to achieve our goals.

**Andrew Brown – Waipā District Council - Four**

I favour a four year term but not longer. Four years allows a decent period to get things done but not too long before voters can have their say.

**Andrew Myers – Cambridge Community Board - Four**

66% of a three year term can be poorly utilised - the first year for people to get bedded in and learn the ropes, one year in the middle to be of effect, and a final year to win an election. I think this is a massive waste of public money. I would therefore support a four year term or perhaps longer.

**Angela Holt – Te Awamutu and Kihikihi Community Board - Four**

Yes, I would like to see local body go to a longer term. In my experience I have found we just get going and there is an election. It would also be advantageous to new elected members, as this gives them 12 months to get the jist of things (quite a bit to pick up) and then get stuck in for the next three years. Four years is probably a good length as if there are elected members people are not happy with then there is an opportunity to vote them out.

**Barbara Kuriger – Taranaki-King Country MP – Four**

I am open to a four year term but don't support any longer term than that.

**Bruce Thomas - Waipā District Council - Four**

I think a four year term would be more beneficial mainly for new councillors. No longer as I see difficulty in governance if a majority of the wrong element can have an influence, and the time to make change is longer.

**Clyde Graf – Waikato Regional Council - Four**

Four years may be okay, but that's the limit. The likelihood of cronyism and corruption increases with the length of the term. Like in some parts of the USA, there should be a limit to the number of terms a politician can do. In my opinion, two consecutive terms should be the limit.

### **Crystal Beavis – Waikato District Council – Four**

We need a better balance between voter 'sovereignty' and effective government. However there's no point changing the term for local government without also changing the term for Parliament.

Three years does not allow enough time for effective government at either local or national level.

It's possible to raise an argument in favour of a longer term, but from a practical perspective I think New Zealanders would likely object to a term of government longer than four years. The last referendum on this subject in 1990 rejected extending the term of office from three years to four years so I don't think anything longer would find favour with the electorate.

### **Dale-Maree Morgan - Waipā District Council - Four**

I understand that it is a point that has been discussed at Waipā DC, and council has always supported calls for an extension for the term from three to four years.

### **Jacqui Church – mayor, Waikato District Council - Four**

Yes, I think it should be at least a four-year term. For good governance, both at local and central level, it is key to our growing nation that we have a framework and vision with some collective vision of longer-term planning.

A longer term will help with the effectiveness of planning, implementing and actually getting things done for our people and communities.

### **John Wood – Te Awamutu and Kihikihi Community Board - Four**

Yes, I think a four year term gives a better time frame for those elected to develop a full understanding of their role and to become effective.

### **Liz Stolwyk - Waipā District Council – Four**

Yes, I do think a four year term would provide elected members with more time to plan and deliver on the communities wishes for the long-term plans. A four year term would enable members to really 'get stuck in' and I believe provide some cost savings as well. I would love to see more accountability put on each of our elected members to demonstrate their effectiveness in their communities.

### **Lou Brown - Waipā District Council - Four**

I agree with the extension of the term to four years allowing councillors to become more professional and skilled in what is a part time job.

### **Marcus Gower – – Waipā District Council - Four**

Yeap four years, three is too short to get any big projects underway, give more opportunity to see things completed.

### **Mike Keir, Waikato District Council - Four**

I do support the increase in terms to four years (including the national government term)

Four years is time enough to get moving on policy, five years is too long if you get a poorly performing government in like the one we currently have.

Three years is too short for councils and government to work on the complex issues that constitute both local and national government.

### **Mike Pettit – Waipa District Council – Four**

I believe four years would make sense, as three years isn't a lot of time between Long Term Plans to get projects or significant policy change through. I wouldn't support longer, as rate payers need a chance to confirm or make changes to council make up and it's long enough for a councillor or community board member to commit to.

### **Pamela Storey – Waikato Regional Council - Four**

I strongly support a four-year local body term, with offset cycles to alternate with central government electoral terms. A three-year term generally sees a council spend a good portion of the first year getting their feet under the table (particularly with inductions for first-time councillors), and much of the last year focused on an upcoming election. A four-year term would enable better long-term planning, allows more time to bed in policy, and lessens the frequency of the politics around an election cycle.

### **Philip Coles – Waipā District Council – Four**

The term should be extended to four. Administering an election involves a significant amount of time and resources and reducing the frequency would save a large amount of ratepayers' money. This could be budgeted to other projects that could benefit the community better.

For a newly elected member, it takes time to get the full understanding of local government protocols and to be able to influence change. Three years comes around very quickly and before you know it, you are back into the process for re-election.

**Susan O'Regan - Waipā District Council – Four**

I absolutely think the term for local government should be lengthened to four years and lined up with central government funding cycles. For what it is worth I believe central government terms should be for four years as well. Short-term thinking and concern for re-election often complicates planning for both local and central governments and it's time we matured beyond that and made better decisions longitudinally.

**Clare St Pierre – Waipā District Council - Three**

I'm not in favour of extending local body terms to four years. We already have longer term processes in play for planning and policy development which are separate to the election term, but for me, three years is already a long time personally to commit to a public role that isn't well remunerated while calling for quite a sacrifice at a personal level.

**Elise Badger – Cambridge Community Board – Three**

I am happy with the term of three years for local government.

**Mike Montgomerie - Waipā District Council - Three**

Being new, I am not sure about the length of term question. The current three year term fits nicely with council's current Long Term Planning cycle. It seems appropriate that a new LTP is adopted during the second year of a triennium. I would be less comfortable being expected to approve a LTP after only a few months in the job which could happen if the election cycle and LTP cycle got out of phase. Another consideration is the balance of experience and regeneration on council. It takes some time to become an effective councillor. I feel that a councillor will likely achieve maximum effectiveness in their second term and beyond. An eight year commitment to the role might be viewed by some as a discouragement to stand (or re-stand) compared to a six year commitment.

If a change to the term automatically meant a change to the LTP cycle to match, then four years (or more) seems a long time to wait between reviews of the LTP.

### **Stuart Kneebone – Waikato Regional Council – Three**

I think three years is about right. There are always pluses and minuses.

### **Jill Taylor – Te Awamutu and Kihikihi Community Board – Three**

Three years long enough.

### **Jo Davies-Colley – Cambridge Community Board - Three**

No. Three years is a good length of time for local body terms. It gives the elected member enough time to have an impact on their community and see some of their strategies and goals hopefully come to fruition. A shorter term also allows the community to change their elected members after 3 years if they have felt they have not been effective advocates for them.

### **Kane Titchener – Te Awamutu and Kihikihi Community Board – Three**

### **Louise Upston – Taupō MP – Could be swayed to four (but for now – Three)**

“There will be a variety of views around a four-year term, and it’s something I’m open to.

“Increasing a local body electoral term from three years to four years, or longer, is a double-edged sword. If a councillor is making good decisions and working hard on behalf of the people they represent, it makes sense for them to stay in office longer. If not, it is better that they don’t have the opportunity to inflict further damage. Of course opinion will be divided on what is ‘good’, and that’s where people get to have their say by voting.

“Personally, I’m happy with a three-year term. Lengthy stints in government can make politicians complacent at best, and arrogant at worst. An election every three years reminds the candidate and the voters of what the candidate stands for and how they have committed to represent their constituents. It holds them accountable.

“If a councillor is elected for two terms it equates to six years under a three-year cycle. With a four-year cycle, they have eight years to either make a positive difference – or not.”

### **Roger Gordon - Waipā District Council – Not sure**

The turnout of voters, the participation in consultation exercises, the representative reflection around the council table, and even in some

degree the picture painted by the recent satisfaction survey, are suggesting that the current system is not fit for purpose, a little broken. We need to concentrate on that challenge.

There are many ideas globally about increasing localism in decision making and enabling effective voice through participatory democracy.

We have begun some work on this by the new initiative World Cafe, and the Community Boards Review are both a step in the right direction, But there are many others models and ideas we could consider.

### **Sally Whitaker – Te Awamutu and Kihikihi Community Board – Not Sure**

I have not yet had enough experience as an elected member to come to a firm view on this. I think there are likely to be some advantages to extending it to four years but also some pitfalls.

There are reviews of both the Electoral Act and the Future for Local Government underway that consider these issues and it would be premature to act on voter age in isolation from the other factors until the reviews are complete.

### **Sue Milner – Cambridge Community Board – Not Sure**

Three years seems like a good length of time, but for some it is too short. For newly elected members the first year can seem to be all about learning the way local government (and that means your local council), as well as how it fits in to the overall structure of governance in New Zealand. For a first timer it could seem that they have barely got to really understanding the system, yet others will be very keen to be looking forward to the election and their next term!