

## Jury Requested Submissions – Delivered Meeting Two November 12<sup>th</sup>

---

### Ron Nelson (former City of Greater Geelong councillor)

1. The Mayor should choose his/her Deputy, who then serves with him/her for a one year term. This allows the Mayor and their Deputy to form a solid base of two votes. For the Mayor to pass reports etc in Council they need seven votes and this base of two sets the tone much easier for them to pass these reports rather than Councillors conducting back room deals to undermine the Mayor. The current system is the rest of the Councillors choose the Deputy and this has caused significant problems. Over the last four years as a CoGG, I witnessed the Mayor be undermined by one of his Deputy Mayors which made the his job extremely difficult and fractured the Council.
2. Single ward Councillors should remain, however Councillor representation should be removed from the CBD (currently Brownbill Ward) and it be represented by the Mayor. The personality who was elected Mayor by the people to be the voice coming from Geelong's centre. It also removes the issue of one too many councillors that existed from 2012-2016.

Multi-Councillor wards have not worked in Geelong. Sadly, such a system allows for some Councillors to be lazy and neglect suburbs and shirk or handball responsibilities to other Councillors in their ward, whereas single ward Councillors must be more accountable. Multi-Councillor wards would be almost the size of a state electorate, making it more expensive to nominate and run as a candidate unless assisted by a major political party, thus facilitating political party agenda infiltrating Local Government. In addition, the size makes it difficult for a Councillor to know his/her ward and its constituents intimately and represent them knowingly.

3. Furthermore, but of most importance, is the State Government had the legislation to remove Councillors that did not adhere to the 'Code of Conduct' and it should have removed those individual Councillors for such poor behaviour rather than dismissing all Council. One doesn't dismiss a classroom of children because of a couple of bad students, it suspends the recalcitrant students and makes an example of them. That is what the State Government should have done and the people of Geelong would still be represented by elected representatives.

Thank you  
Ron Nelson

---

### Tony Ansett (former City of Greater Geelong councillor)

Hi I would like to point out that the Vote to pick the type of Set up of Councillors does not show the option of Single Ward single Councillor option. The single Ward 1Councillor option was supported by

the community in 2001 after we had Regional representation. The reason also for this was we went from 96 Councillors and 12 in the North to 12. No other Council in Victoria has similar set up with Rural in the North to Coastal in the South.

Can I ask after the Minister had mentioned in a letter to the Advertiser, saying there was a vote for Single Ward can I ask that this Vote be scrapped inbound start again to be fair. The "States Quo" is not broken and has Community support.

In the North of Geelong the new set up whatever has to be the same as other Wards. A draft Ward setup showed 4 Wards with 3 Wards holding 3 Councillors and the North holding 2. This means the North then has a different voting ratio and makes the North different to the rest. Constitution would say this can not be done.

Geelong was to be split into 3 yet again with little Community input it was made 1. The ward system here at least made the North level with the rest.

Is there an option for splitting Geelong into 3?

Geelong is growing and yet no option to have more Councillors.

Our Neighbours have areas around 20,000 with 7 Councillors each. Geelong is 225,000 with 12 Councillors and the Mayor. Going on this ratio Geelong should at least have 20 Councillors and not 13. This number would be better for Democracy.

State and Federal have a Ward setup and are parochial and should be for their patch. Geelong also needs Local Government to have a single Ward and have a Representative that is Parochial.

Windermere Ward had 19,000 people and over 670 square Kilometres more than the rest of the Wards put together. This area needs at least 1 Councillor. Then you have Corio Norlane North Shore with great needs. This area also needs at least 1 Councillor and then you see Bell Post Hill, Bell Park, Hamlyn Heights, Hern Hill, North Geelong, Rippleside needs a Rep too. 3 very much needed Councillors who can represent their patch. What happens if 2 Councillors for the North get Voted in and they both live in Church St. I would say parts of Lara, Corio, Norlane Anakie Little aRiver would be missing a voice. Council is very busy with issues from Portarlington to Anakie with City taking up a huge part of that.

In England and Wales it is not unusual to see Councils 40 Councillors plus in size.

Separation from Bureaucratic set up needs to occur with Mayor and Councillors set up on their own with their staff to support them. The Mayor needs his or her staff to support them and not be under the CEO. You have State Members Federal Members with better setups and the responsibility of the Mayor is enormous. Geelong West Hall and offices would be an ideal set up of the new Councillors.

The word Council for all operations is also very confusing. City of Greater Geelong staff should not be called Council. This means operational should be called City or we revert back to Shire. Council is and should be used for the elected. Or the new elected are called Aldermen as in Tasmania this is the case. I don't know how many times I see this as a major issue. Elected should have a separation because the Councillors did not control staff the CEO does.

Kind Regards  
Former Councillor

Tony Ansett

---

## Keith Fagg (former City of Greater Geelong Mayor)

“What could be implemented to assist the Mayor and Councillors in interpersonal relations so they can work as a united team towards a long term goal?”

With this question, the Jury rightly articulates the desire of the wider Geelong community to have a unity within Council.

The key to effective interpersonal relations between all Councillors in a renewed CoGG Council is holding shared values, with a common vision and purpose.

The most likely way of achieving this is through the suggested structure, where a team of candidates for Mayor, Deputy and Councillors would stand together on a clearly articulated, shared set of ideas. Even if not every candidate from a particular ‘ticket’ was successful, with such a structure, a Mayor and Deputy elected together with at least some of their team should give the Councillor group a much enhanced chance of working co-operatively together.

No structure can fully guarantee effective lines of communication, trust and goodwill but there is a much greater possibility where a majority of Councillors are fundamentally on the same page. Those common values need underpinning by agreed standards of behaviour – not only what is not allowable but setting high standards about what is expected. This is reinforced by a robust Councillor Code of Conduct. Hopefully, this formal document would only become a last resort, a position I would sincerely hope a re-structured and refreshed Geelong Council would never encounter.

For the record, below are the notes I spoke from with the Geelong Jury groups on October 29th on the question “How do we want to be democratically represented by a future council?” With most groups, I was able to express most points but as there was wide-ranging discussion, not all points were addressed with each group.

- Geelong deserves the best governance from the best Council the community can muster. CoGG Council should come to be regarded as the best governance ‘board’ in Geelong.
- Need competent, community-minded people who can think strategically across the whole municipality and are financially literate.
- Take a close look at Melbourne City Council model as this has proven to be robust and is working well.
- Smaller council (say 9) with fewer councillors but better resourced, esp. support staff, enabling Councillors to keep focussed on the big picture.
- Mayor & Deputy Mayor elected as a team, with other candidates with same vision and values standing with them on a ticket
- Suggest un-divided electorate (ie. no wards) so Councillors must take a strategic, Geelong wide focus.

- Before being eligible to nominate for future election, all candidates for CoGG elections should :
  - have successfully completed a short course on Local Government and Councillor responsibilities, run by either the Local Government Department or a Govt. approved course by MAV.
  - be nominated by at least 100 people.
- Establish an on-going jury for Council to consult with on major matters where a broader community voice is needed eg. City Plan, budget, etc, key strategic planning issues.

Due to the time needed for legislative changes needed for a new CoGG Council structure and the important cultural changes that need to occur within the organisation, it is my view that the Administrators should continue for at least a further 12 months beyond October, 2017.

Keith Fagg

---

Fr. Kevin Dillon

**SUBMISSION TO THE CITIZENS' JURY  
SATURDAY NOVEMBER 12, 2016**

*I am grateful for the invitation to address the "Citizens' Jury" regarding the re-formation (and "reformation") of the Council of the City of Greater Geelong.*

*I have no more expertise, qualification or training than any other citizen of Geelong, so I offer these thoughts simply for what I am: a citizen. But perhaps something of what follows might be helpful to those charged with the responsibility of guiding the local government of Geelong with a new vision and culture which might truly engage the community it is called to serve.*

*The question I have been asked to address (in around 200 words) is: How do we want to be democratically represented by a future council?*

*I have also been asked to comment on the issue of the Homeless and needy".*

*So I guess the 200 words starts.... "now"!*

**Question 1: Democratic representation.**

The Council would still consist of 12 people who are residents of the Geelong region.

There would be six wards, not twelve. This would still allow recognition of the varying needs of different areas. **Voters in all wards** would be asked to elect **ONE** "Ward" councillor, on a "first past the post" basis.

The remaining six Councillors would be elected by **ALL** voters. To be eligible for nomination, candidates would need **the written support of thirty** nominators. Voters would be given detailed background information on all candidates, based on their experience, training, and especially their "track record" of service to the community, including references.

All candidates would need to demonstrate that they had no formal affiliation with any political party for up to three years prior to the Council election. If elected, they would be required to make a public pledge that they would not stand for political office in State or Commonwealth Government for three years after leaving the Council.

From the list of eligible candidates, voters would vote for a maximum of **SIX** "City" candidates for Council. Each vote would have equal value. The candidates who assembled the highest number of votes across the City would be declared elected.

The "City" councillor with the highest number of votes would be invited to be the Mayor. Should he / she decline the invitation, it would be issued to the "City" councillor with the next highest number of votes.

### **Question 2: Care of the homeless.**

While the Council should not be required to "re-invent the wheel" with regard to this major social issue, it should be, and should be seen to be far more involved in supporting those community groups and individuals who currently provide a magnificent service to the homeless and disadvantaged with what appears to many to be minimal support from Council.

The plight of the homeless is a major community issue, and the Council should be fully alongside the many organisations, both funded and voluntary, who undertake this demanding work.

This requires a proactive approach by Council, as what is perceived by many of those who support the homeless see the Council as being at best non-cooperative, and at worst in opposition. The Council may see this as unfair, but it is certainly how many who work selflessly in this demanding area feel. The gap must be closed.

### **3: The "Culture" of Council.**

Council employees are employed by the people of Geelong via the ratepayers. Some, perhaps many people in the community, be they ratepayers or not, see the Council in a negative way – perhaps as "obstacles", or even "an enemy".

This attitude may well be undeserved and unfair, as Council workers and officers are required to implement the regulations, laws and by-laws of the Council. But as in many situations, it's not just what you do, it's the way you do it that can make all the difference.

Extensive training in 'customer service' for all Council employees who are engaged in personal contact with the Geelong public could do much to change this difficulty. It's not that "the customer is always right". Often the "customer" can be rude, ignorant and abusive. However, effective engagement with the people of Geelong by the people they are paying to help them should not be the adversarial encounter it is too often felt to be.

*Well, that's 559 words, not 200. Sorry to be long-winded. But maybe an idea or two might help somewhere.*

*Good luck with your efforts to guide Geelong on a new path.  
Fr. Kevin Dillon*

---

## **James Williams (Councillor for City of Greater Bendigo)**

### Democracy in local government.

Democracy takes many political forms and in Australia we have moved to what we call one vote one value and proportional representation. It is supposed to mean that we all share the rights and privileges that go with our right as an individual to vote. Yet in saying the above and looking at the

democratic system I find numerous contradictions and alternative methodologies. Examples like proportional voting in the senate where preference deals and votes are translated down the order and become expansive and extensive in their distribution to the point that the voters whom cast the vote would question the validity of their distribution in determining the results.

Boundaries based on assumptions starting with countries at our federal level which use the ocean as a boundary but include several Islands, states all of which draw lines on maps or use a river to divide communities of interest and finally local government, unrecognized in our federal constitution but based on supposedly communities of interest. All supposed to deliver a fair and equitable result when distributing wealth and wellbeing to us the people of Australia.

Local government and the system we work within is largely dictated to us by the other two forms of government, state and federal, we rely on their good will and funding and at the end of the day we as individuals rely on the skills and abilities of our elected representatives to both listen to and implement the best and most effective outcomes for our communities. Not very complex at all with competing ideas and ideals, varying demands for infrastructure, services and a rapidly changing technological and environmentally challenging world that appears to all and sundry to be meeting its capacity to cope with an ever increasing population.

So how does this relate to Geelong and its governance and form of government that will best serve your future and community into the future?

What I am saying is that there is a raft of options and I believe opportunities that can be considered but that all relies on good will and the ability of those you vote for to work constructively and harmoniously together. What you need to consider is what your communities want and desire for the future and how that is best delivered by the new governance and structure you recommend to the community and government.

The size of the council and its budget, along with the diversity of your communities and the vision for the future should be considered in the structure you choose for local government. As the economy and budget grows it allow governance, budget allocation and the day to day chores of maintenance to become better managed within the organizations of council themselves so larger councils ultimately need to be even more strategic in their thinking and budget allocations to both match and attract funding not just from other forms of government but also from the private sector. The bigger the council and associated budget the greater and more strategic the role. This is not only the case with government but also business. It means you need good policy and practice and even a rolling review of what you deliver and how that is imbedded in your local government organization.

Some examples of local government are the ward system where each councilor has a ward based on population and supposedly communities of interest and this has largely been the system used in local government in Victoria in the past and present. The mayor is then elected from the elected councilors and can serve a time as determined by those councilors.

The state of Queensland uses a popularly elected mayor whom is elected by the people and the councilors are elected in a separate vote to council. The mayor is often individually resourced and can be seen to act independently of council but the relationship and good will remain integral to their success. Campaigns for mayoral races can be expensive and extensive but the size of local government in Queensland is usually significantly larger than in Victoria. They generally have a portfolio system where individuals take responsibility for various aspects of council's role and bring results and recommendations back to the council for major decision making. Melbourne council now has a similar system with its own set of unique variances and election processes.

All systems have their advantages and disadvantages. Bendigo now has three wards with three councilors in each ward, divided equally on voters with boundaries all radiating out from the middle of town to retain diversity into the rural sectors and a proportional area and voting system that I struggle to understand. The majority of councilors preferred the old single ward structure. I am a proponent of one ward and a voting system where you choose how far your preferences for candidates are numbered. I also have concerns as to the nature of an independent mayor and office when separating the role and vote from the rest of the councilors. It would be worthwhile looking at the Melbourne structure.

My preferred system would be a vote for councilors numbered in preference as you see it and to the extent to which you wish to support the candidates starting with one and so on. If you were to support a popularly elected mayor I would ask that a separate line be provided where you indicated from the candidates your one and only vote any of the candidates who would need to be elected to win the mayoral position.

I wish you all well in your deliberations and I look forward to the models and outcomes you propose for your great region.

Kind regards

Cr. James Williams  
City of Greater Bendigo

---

## Andrew Richards (former City of Greater Geelong councillor)

My submission seeks to help explain what happens under the two different election models for mayor and councillors, that I experienced as a City of Greater Geelong councillor from 2008 to 2012 (Mayor and Deputy Mayor elected by Councillors), and 2012 to 2016 (Mayor elected by people, and Deputy Mayor elected by councillors).

It also seeks to explain the effect of single member wards on the decision making process during that time.

It also seeks to discuss the effect of certain other issues such as portfolio and committee allocation, and other related matters.

Where possible, I will try to talk in general terms, rather than refer to individual councillors.

### **Some background on myself:**

I have worked in and around politics and government at all three levels of government, on and off for almost twenty years. During that time, I have also worked in the Labour Movement, and in several other roles as varied as construction worker on one hand, and communications professional on the other.

**The Old Model:**

From 2008 to 2012, as an elected councillor for the City of Greater Geelong, I experienced the election of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor by councillors. This system has some positives and negatives.

The positives were:

1. The Mayor generally always had the support of the councillor group;
2. The Mayor understood and had a good rapport with most if not all councillors as they understood what it was to be a councillor, had been a councillor before being mayor, and generally were destined to continue on as a councillor after their time as mayor ended.
3. As issues came up in a part of the City of Greater Geelong that was not in the Mayor's ward, the ward councillor would be called on to explain and help the councillor group understand what the circumstances were.
4. The Mayor understood and had a good rapport with average residents and ratepayers, as they still had to look after a council ward, along with being the mayor.
5. If the Mayor struggled with the role and needed to be replaced, it was only a maximum of twelve months before this could be achieved.
6. The Council CEO led discussion with stakeholders both inside and outside the City of Greater Geelong. As a positive, this cannot be emphasised enough. In the 2008-to 2012 term, it was my experience that when meeting important stakeholders, the CEO led the discussion, and the Mayor was present as a representative of the elected council group. This was very important in terms of governance.
7. There are times when a councillor cannot communicate with the mayor, and at these times, councillors rely on talking with the CEO. If you cut the CEO out of key meetings, and allow only the mayor to attend, communication breaks down.
8. Council officers were clear in what they had to do, because all decisions came through the council chamber. The Mayor had no power to make any decision that wasn't put through the council chamber. This ensured a greater level of transparency than was possible under a directly elected mayoral system, where the Mayor has extra powers under law, and can direct the council officers to perform duties without reference to the council chamber.
9. Further, the Mayoral position could not be used to marginalise or exclude councillors who did not agree with the Mayor of the day.
10. All of the above applied equally to the Deputy Mayor. By and large, Deputy Mayors of that period were supportive of the Mayor, the Councillors and residents and ratepayers.

11. As the council was seen to have a collective approach, both within the group, with the council officers, and with residents and ratepayers in general, decision making tended to be less controversial, and involve more people in the process. Any idea that came through the Mayor's office was subjected to scrutiny and appraisal by councillors. Bad ideas generally did not survive.
12. In terms of election funding, a Mayor only needed to raise funds to win a ward election. In my experience, this was achievable by the average Geelong resident or ratepayer. This is important in terms of giving access to people from all parts of society, to stand for election.
13. If the mayor lost a vote on an issue in the council chamber, it was not seen as a vote of no confidence in the mayor. As a result, council business was dealt with more quickly and efficiently. Issues were put to the chamber and dealt with, and we all moved on.

The negative was:

1. part of each year in the lead up to a Mayoral ballot was taken up with councillors positioning themselves for a run at being Mayor in the following Mayoral year.

This happens at all councils that have councils electing the Mayor, and is not unusual. It can sometimes be distracting in the last few months of a Mayoral year, but did not result in any noticeable different outcomes in the council chamber

**Note:** In order to avoid this, a majority of councillors in the 2008-2012 term supported the last Mayoral term to be two years covering October 2010 to October 2012, for the then incumbent Mayor, as there was council chamber was working reasonably effectively, decisions were being made, and there was also uncertainty from the newly elected Baillieu Liberal State Government's promise to bring in a directly elected Mayor at the 2012 council elections.

### **The New Model:**

I will now talk about the 2012 to 2016 term with a directly elected Mayoral model.

**Consultation:** The implementation of this system was marked by a lack of consultation with residents and ratepayers in the City of Greater Geelong, and in that sense was markedly different to the Citizen's Jury process that is now in place.

The Liberal state government's directly elected mayor for Geelong policy underwent minimal policy development in the lead up to the 2010 state election. After the election, the government put little effort into consultation with local citizens about the model of government.

**The new model in practice:**

As most would be aware, the new model was a directly elected Mayor placed directly on top of the current system, with the directly elected Mayor being granted some executive powers. This system also had some negatives and some positives.

The positives were:

1. During the election process, there was some more scrutiny of policies and ideas that a Mayoral candidate brought to the election. In previous council elections, there was little to no scrutiny of individual promises and commitments

**Note:** it is arguable that all commitments a Mayoral or Councillor candidate makes, either in office or during an election campaign, put them in danger of contravening the Victorian Local Government Act, as councillors are expected to come to the council chamber with an open mind for all arguments. Very specific public statements made in the heat of an election campaign tend to run counter to the spirit if not the letter of this law. Not having to elect a Mayor each year, meant that councillors were not distracted by a Mayoral ballot each year.

2. It has been argued that a Mayor takes time to learn the role, and that a four year term assists that process. So far, that has not been my experience under the directly elected Mayoral system. In my opinion, both directly elected Mayors did not improve in the role.

The negatives were:

1. The directly elected Mayor can quickly lose support from the councillor group. This can be for a variety of reasons, and is not always the Mayor's fault, but it was my experience with both directly elected Mayors that they lost the support of the councillor group reasonably quickly and in my opinion, made no attempt to understand why, or to try to repair the situation.
2. The focus of the entire council – officers, residents and ratepayers, media, councillors – quickly became the Mayor. As residents and ratepayers contacted council for meetings on issues, the Mayor's diary was quickly filled up. Invariably, this generally meant that they had to wait long periods to see the Mayor, if at all. An experienced community leader and elected

representative would have struggled to deal with this state of affairs, and both directly elected Mayors were first time, inexperienced representatives.

3. Further, with everything revolving around one figure (the directly elected Mayor), if they were not available, or did not make themselves available, things tended to break down and issues were not dealt with.
4. The executive powers granted to the directly elected mayor can be sometimes used against political opponents, in order to gain support for an idea, or to punish councillors for their lack of support for an idea. In my opinion, this was the case at times.
5. Further, council officers quickly became confused as to where they should seek direction from on an issue. The Mayor would make one decision and the council chamber would make another. This put immense pressure on council officers, councillors and the Mayor.
6. In the future, it should be avoided at all costs, so that council officers can clearly understand what they have to do and why.
7. There is much anecdotal evidence that both directly elected Mayors put a lot of pressure on the council CEO and council officers to do things that the Mayor did not have support from the council chamber for.
8. With no Mayor to vote on each year, the focus then shifted to the Deputy Mayor. There was intense politicking around this position during the entire 2012 to 2016 period.
9. At one stage, there was a move to elect two Deputy Mayors, due to the inability of the first directly elected Mayor to make a decision on who they wanted when called in to cast a deciding vote.
10. Note: It is fair to say that the election of the Deputy Mayor, became a vote of confidence in the directly elected Mayor, with the resulting breakdown in communication and teamwork when the directly elected Mayor did not get their choice for Deputy Mayor supported.
11. Across both directly elected Mayors, there was virtually no interest in individual ward matters. Both directly elected Mayors were interested in the same narrow set of issues. These issues were mostly about the Geelong CBD, which whilst central, makes up only a tiny part of the City of Greater Geelong.
12. There was no way of removing a directly elected Mayor if they could not perform the role, without going to an election. When this happened, it cost the council over \$500000.
13. The Council CEO was cut out of many discussions that the Mayor would attend, and as a consequence there was a substantial breakdown in communication across the council. This meant that when communications broke down between the mayor and councillors, the

councillors could not approach the CEO to be briefed on the issue at hand, because the CEO themselves were not briefed.

Note: At the time of the first directly elected Mayor resigning their position, there was an immense sadness from most if not all the councillor group, that this had happened. Councillors had offered help to the first directly elected Geelong Mayor, but those offers were largely rebuffed. In my opinion, most councillors had wanted the new council to work.

### **Recommendations and Ideas:**

Some further ideas and some recommendations are as follows:

A collective decision making process is, by its nature, a slower process. In government, at all levels this can be a good thing as the more time that is taken and the more people involved in the process, there is generally more support and acceptance of the decision afterwards. In other words, major decisions about a community are better accepted when you take the whole community with you.

When power is concentrated in the hands of one person, or only a few people, you are relying far more on their character as human beings to exercise it responsibly and reasonably in the interests of the whole community. This can only be determined when they are in the role. Both directly elected Mayors were new to this kind of elected role, and there was no way of knowing if they could exercise it responsibly and reasonably in the interests of the whole community. It is for others to judge if they performed that role well.

However, the idea that the community would then grant more power into the hands of one or only a few individuals, runs counter to the principle that executive power should be shared across a group to ensure it is used responsibly.

Further, the City of Greater Geelong is greatly varied in terms of the different areas that make up the municipality. The idea that one individual can effectively represent the entire area, in all its variety seems in hindsight, wishful thinking.

Further, the fact that both directly elected mayors were independently wealthy business figures, who stated that they paid for their campaigns out of their own funds, is very telling. The directly elected Mayor model would seem to only allow people with substantial wealth to run for Mayor.

Therefore, I am strongly of the view that the Mayoral election process should revert to a councillor elected from the councillor group, with no executive power in the Mayor's office. This would be a return to the collective system in operation until 2012, with all council decisions being made in the council chamber.

If for some reason, the Citizens Jury sees fit to recommend keeping the directly elected Mayoral model, then I strongly recommend they be given no executive power outside the council chamber.

If the Citizens Jury sees fit to continue with a directly elected Mayor, I am in favour of directly elected Mayor/ Deputy Mayor ticket, so that the problems associated with the current model (as outlined above) do not resurface.

**Wards:**

For some time, City of Greater Geelong has been composed of twelve single member wards. This had some positives and some negatives.

The positives were:

1. Residents and ratepayers could easily find their councillor to raise an issue.
2. Local issues were able to be raised easily within the council.
3. The cost of an election campaign to run for council was within reach of most residents and ratepayers.

The negative was:

1. the day to day issues in council wards took much greater priority, and the future needs of the council as a whole, were sometimes treated as a secondary issue.

As one of the main roles of government is to prepare the community for the future, hanging on to single member wards would seem to be a mistake.

For this reason, I am in favour of multi member wards of no more than 40000 to 50000 residents and ratepayers (three times the size of a current single member ward). This would result in four wards with three councillors in each, and a total of twelve councillors as a whole.

This would allow average residents and ratepayers to nominate for council and be able to raise funds to run a reasonable campaign, whilst also getting away from the single member ward issues.

**Portfolios:**

My experience of the portfolio system was that it operated much like the single member ward system in councillors being all powerful within their portfolio. Again, this made it hard to ask questions and become informed about another portfolio area. For this reason, I am supportive of the council moving to a committee system, where a group of councillors are responsible for various areas of interest.

**Further contact:**

I am happy to address the jury on these and other issues of interest.