

## Appendix A

*Please state why you favour your chosen option:*

1. It will prevent a personality politician from entering the mix who will struggle to lead a council that is potentially of a different political perspective.
2. I would like an elected Mayor because I would like to get away from the dominance of a party political system with its fixers and have a direct say in who leads local affairs. My vote gets dissipated in the party machine, whatever colour it is. A mayor would be more visible and more publicly accountable, despite being un-removable and s/he would also know her/his chances next time round are subject to direct vote. The role would also spark more political interest as opposed to current apathy.
3. I feel this is the best option for the residents and workers in the borough. The election of a mayor that cannot be removed during their term seems rather archaic.
4. They can be deselected if they are not effective. Also a deputy.
5. I am for the idea of the electorate having a choice in terms of who they appoint as leader. I am also for some of the power being taken out of the hands of political parties. I think this model would keep them on their toes and 'honest'.
6. Council is too party political. More likelihood of the leader doing what he or she thinks is right as opposed to what will be popular with local developers.
7. I have not seen enough or probed the issues and practicalities to have a valuable view. The decision should not be influenced more by the questionnaire responses. This is for our Leader to debate and decide.
8. I think to have one person in post for 4 years with no removal options if there were problems is too risky in the current climate.
9. Residents should have the right to elect the Mayor and Cabinet of their own choice, who are accountable to the public for their performances. This elected body should always consult the public in their any major schemes and developments.
10. Directly Elected Mayor for full years without option to change is too long. The preferred system aligns with the existing format which works extremely well.
11. More likelihood of speedier action. More likelihood of the leader doing what he or she thinks is right as opposed to what will be popular.
12. Because too many decisions are taken by people who are not directly accountable for those actions. The councillors may be elected to represent a ward but not to take responsibility for a particular job. A mayor could be elected who was of a different political party to the one in control which would only be a good thing in terms of accountability.

13. I believe a directly elected mayor would be a great asset to the local electorate.
14. Better to have somebody who is elected by residents of the borough rather than chosen by the political party that way the mayor can act in Borough residents' best interests. Why can't the mayor be removed during the term of office? Bit odd, maybe it is to make us vote in favour of the new leader model? In the event of major wrong doing removal should be applicable to anybody holding such a post after investigation.
15. Because there is more consistency within party leadership and you can remove a leader that is poorly performing.
16. Option 2 would be worthy.
17. This is the only way that those who govern us will be truly accountable & responsible to the electorate & transparently so.
18. For more public accountability.
19. Councillors more accountable to the electorate.
20. If the Mayor elected has a committed vision clearly throughout plans that can be carried out with a visible impact on the Borough for his creativity and progressive action with the support of his task force in the following year it would be beneficial.
21. An elected mayor gives greater interest to local politics. However I fear that it might be too much to ask of the electorate given that so few vote. And also with the degree of apathy that exists, how would local politics best be served? I'm in favour of an elected Mayor but I think that the alternative might be a better system. I think I would prefer a shorter term - two years if elected. The 4 year stint for one election is pure 'gravy'<sup>1</sup> and I'd like to see complete accountability and anyone sitting back and taking the ride would need to be booted out asap if they proved incompetent or fraudulent.
22. Option 2 appears to have the most democratic input at a grass root level.
23. Checks and balances spread power. Allows for non-party government.