

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Report No</b>	<b>Agenda Item No</b>
Extraordinary Council Meeting	2 December 2009	Unrestricted		
<b>Report of:</b>  Chief Executive  <b>Originating Officer(s)</b>  John Williams, Service Head, Democratic Services.		<b>Title:</b>  New executive arrangements – results of consultation, mayoral petition and referendum proposals  <b>Wards Affected:</b>  All		

## 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Local Government & Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 ('the 2007 Act') introduced changes to the executive arrangements that local authorities must operate. From May 2010 the Council must change from the current Leader and Cabinet model to either a 'new style' Leader and Cabinet system, with a stronger role for the Leader; or a Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet. As required by the Act, the Council has undertaken a consultation exercise with local electors and other interested parties on the options.
- 1.2 However, since the introduction of the Local Government Act 2000 local people have had the right to petition for a referendum on the introduction of a Directly Elected Mayor. To trigger a referendum, a petition must meet strict criteria as to form and content and must contain the signatures of at least 5% of registered local electors.
- 1.3 The Council has now received such a petition requesting a mayoral referendum. Officers have checked each entry on the petition against the electoral register and have established that the petition is valid and contains more than the required number of signatures. A referendum must therefore be held.
- 1.4 This report includes further information about the consultation and petition, and sets out the action that the Council must now take, both in relation to holding the referendum and drawing up proposals for executive arrangements to operate in Tower Hamlets with effect from May 2010.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Council is recommended:-**

- 2.1 To note that a valid petition under the provisions of section 34 of the Local Government Act 2000 has been received and that a referendum on the introduction of a Directly Elected Mayor for Tower Hamlets must be held;

- 2.2 To decide whether the referendum shall take place as recommended by the Majority Group on 6 May 2010 or alternatively as suggested by the Monitoring Officer on 4 February 2010;
- 2.3 To note the results of the public consultation on the form of new executive arrangements undertaken before receipt of the petition;
- 2.4 To consider the extent to which the proposed new executive arrangements would be likely to assist in securing continuous improvement in the way in which the local authority's functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness;
- 2.5 If the referendum is to take place on 6 May 2010:
  - (i) To adopt new executive arrangements based on a new-style 'Leader and Cabinet' (England) model as set out in Appendix A attached, to operate in Tower Hamlets with effect from 6 May 2010; and
  - (ii) That further consultation take place on the detailed proposals for a Mayoral executive to be the subject of the referendum and a further Extraordinary Council Meeting be held in due course to agree those proposals.
- 2.6 If the referendum is to take place on 4 February 2010:
  - (i) To agree the proposals for executive arrangements including a Directly Elected Mayor as set out at Appendix B, to be implemented with effect from 6 May 2010 subject to approval at the referendum;
  - (ii) To agree the outline fallback proposals based on a new-style Leader and Cabinet system as set out at Appendix C, to be implemented with effect from 6 May 2010 in the event that the referendum does not approve the mayoral proposals; and
  - (iii) To agree that the proposals and fallback proposals, together with a statement of the consultation undertaken be sent to the Secretary of State and published as required by statute;
- 2.7 To authorise officers to draft detailed constitutional amendments as necessary to give effect to the above, for adoption at the Council meeting in March 2010.

### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Local Government Act 2000 ('The 2000 Act') introduced a new governance framework for local authorities, separating the decision-making and scrutiny roles. Authorities had to put in place executive arrangements involving the operation of one of three different forms of executive:- a Leader and Cabinet; Mayor and Cabinet; or Mayor and Council Manager.
- 3.2 Since then Tower Hamlets has, in common with most authorities, operated a 'Leader and Cabinet' model under which the Council has responsibility for

deciding how many cabinet members should be appointed and for appointing both the Leader and those cabinet members annually. The 2000 Act provides for a petition signed by at least 5% of local electors to trigger a referendum on changing to a Directly Elected Mayoral system.

- 3.3 The Government wants to further strengthen local leadership and the 2007 Act discontinues two of the forms of executive previously available, including the old-style 'Leader and Cabinet' model operated in Tower Hamlets. All authorities must now choose between the 'Mayor and Cabinet' model and a new-style 'Leader and Cabinet (England)' model in which the Leader of the Council has a stronger role and is appointed for a four year term of office.
- 3.4 The Government believes the changes will promote effective decision-making and enable a longer-term view to be taken, to the benefit of councils and local communities. The new executive arrangements are complemented by other measures included in the bill and outlined in the 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' and 'Communities in Control' white papers including wider powers for overview and scrutiny and the Councillor Call for Action.

#### **4. THE TWO OPTIONS AVAILABLE FROM MAY 2010**

- 4.1 The 2007 Act requires all local authorities with a population of more than 85,000 to adopt one of two forms of executive arrangements:-
- **Either** a new style 'Leader and Cabinet (England)' model, in which the Leader of the Council is elected by the Council for a four year term of office and decides which other councillors to appoint to the cabinet ('Option A' in the Council's recent consultation exercise);
  - **Or** a 'Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet' model, in which an Executive Mayor is elected by the residents of the borough in a separate poll ('Option B' in the consultation). The Mayor would also serve a four year term and would appoint the cabinet members from amongst the elected councillors.
- 4.2 There are many similarities between the two new options and each provides for a 'strong leader' in governance terms. Both the new-style Leader and the Mayor would have responsibility for all executive functions of the Council and decide whether and how those powers are to be delegated. The key difference is how they are appointed. A Leader would be elected by councillors from amongst their number as at present, and the Council can retain the power to remove the Leader from office by a majority vote. An Executive Mayor is directly elected by the residents of the borough and cannot be removed during his/her term of office by the Council. A full comparison between the two new models and the current arrangements is attached at Appendix 'D'.
- 4.3 The 'Leader and Cabinet (England)' option is a variation of the system that 81% of Councils have chosen to operate since the former committee system was abolished in 2000. The Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet model has been available since that date and so far fewer than 3% of authorities have adopted this option.

- 4.4 The Council may not retain the current system, under which the Council appoints the Leader and Cabinet Members annually, beyond 9<sup>th</sup> May 2010. The 2007 Act requires the authority, at a special Council Meeting convened for the purpose before 31 December 2009, to:-
- Pass a resolution deciding on the form of its new executive arrangements;
  - Agree a timetable for implementation of the proposals. The last day that the Council can continue with its current arrangements is the third day after the 2010 local elections; and
  - Agree transitional arrangements as necessary.

## 5. RECEIPT OF A PETITION FOR A MAYORAL REFERENDUM

- 5.1 On 23 October 2009 the Council received a petition calling for a mayoral referendum. Further sections of the same petition were delivered on 16 November (this is the 'Petition Date' for the purpose of calculating subsequent timescales).

- 5.2 The text of the petition reads as follows:-

"We, the undersigned, being local government electors for the area of Tower Hamlets Council to whom this petition is addressed, seek a referendum on whether the electors for that area should elect a mayor who, with a cabinet will be in charge of our local services and lead Tower Hamlets Council"

- 5.3 The petition contains a total of 17,189 entries. In accordance with statutory requirements officers have checked each entry against the electoral register. 6,956 entries were found to be invalid in terms of the criteria set by the regulations as follows:-

Full name not given – 2,094

Person not included on electoral register – 3,408

No address given – 788

Non-Tower Hamlets address – 642

No signature – 10

Under voting age – 14

- 5.4 The text of the petition and the remaining 10,233 entries were found to meet the requirements of the regulations. This figure exceeds the verification number of Tower Hamlets (currently 7,794 electors). The petition is therefore valid and the Council must hold a referendum in accordance with section 34 of the 2000 Act.
- 5.5 As required by law the petition organiser (Councillor Abjol Miah) and the Secretary of State have been notified that the petition is valid and it has been placed on deposit for public inspection.
- 5.6 The question to be put at the referendum is prescribed in law as follows:-

"Are you in favour of the proposal for Tower Hamlets Council to be run in a new way, which includes a Mayor, who will be elected by the voters of that borough, to be in charge of the Council's services and to lead Tower Hamlets Council and the community which it serves?"

5.7 The result of the referendum is determined by a majority of those voting and is binding. Voting will be at polling stations or by postal votes as for an election. The Conduct of Referendums Regulations 2007 no longer provide for the option of an all-postal referendum.

## **6. ACTION NOW REQUIRED**

6.1 Before the referendum, the Council must draw up:-

- a) Proposals for executive arrangements involving an Elected Mayor, including the allocation of functions between the Mayor and the Council, associated constitutional provisions and an implementation timetable, to be introduced if the referendum results in a majority 'Yes' vote; and
- b) Outline fallback proposals, not involving an Elected Mayor (i.e. a new-style Leader & Cabinet system) to be introduced if the referendum results in a majority 'No' vote.

6.2 Once the Council has agreed the proposals at a special meeting, they must be published and made available for inspection; and at least two months before the referendum, sent to the Secretary of State together with a statement of the consultation undertaken.

## **7. THE TIMETABLE FOR THE REFERENDUM**

7.1 The referendum must take place within six months of the Petition Date. It can be combined with a local or general election but may not otherwise be held within 28 days either side of a scheduled election.

7.2 Following the referendum in the event of a 'Yes' vote, at least 3 months must elapse before the mayoral election itself, which in turn must take place in either the first week of May or the third week in October.

7.3 As mentioned above, under the 2007 Act the Council must change its executive arrangements from May 2010 and has already consulted on the two options.

7.4 The Majority Group on the Council has given notice that they favour a timetable under which the referendum would be held on the day of the next Council Elections, 6 May 2010. The Council would still be required to adopt new executive arrangements with effect from that date which, in the event of a majority 'yes' vote in the referendum, would then change again with effect from 21 October 2010, when the first mayoral election for Tower Hamlets would be held.

7.5 The Monitoring Officer suggests that in the spirit of the 2007 Act and to promote effective governance, in particular to avoid the possibility of a two-stage, first to a 'four-year' Leader model and then again some months later to an Elected Mayor, it would be beneficial for the referendum to be held in time for the final new executive arrangements to apply from May 2010. There are a number of statutory steps that have to be observed, but it is possible to achieve this and to

enable the new model, determined by the referendum result, to be in place from the start of the next administration.

7.6 Either timetable would be lawful and for ease of reference they are set out below:-

<b>2 Dec 2009</b>	<b>Extraordinary Council Meeting</b>	<b>Extraordinary Council Meeting</b>
3 Dec 2009	Send proposals/outline fallback proposals and statement of consultation to Secretary of State; publish proposals	
Dec 09/Jan 10		Consultation on the detailed Mayoral proposals to be put to the referendum
<b>4 Feb 2010</b>	<b>Referendum</b>	
Feb 2010		<b>Further Extraordinary Council Meeting</b> to agree final referendum proposals
24 Mar 2010	Council to agree constitutional changes in line with referendum result	Council to agree constitutional changes to implement new Leader and Cabinet model from May 2010.
<b>6 May 2010</b>	If referendum votes 'Yes' – <b>Mayoral Election</b> and introduce Mayoral system of governance; If referendum votes 'No' – introduce new-style four year Leader & Cabinet system.	<b>Referendum</b>  Introduce new-style four year Leader and Cabinet system.
<b>21 Oct 2010</b>		If referendum votes 'Yes' – <b>Mayoral Election</b> and introduce Mayoral system of governance.

7.7 The term of office of the Elected Mayor begins on the fourth day after he or she is elected and he or she holds office until the successor comes into office on the fourth day after the next election.

7.8 Once the proposals have been sent to the Secretary of State, the Council may not promote support for, or opposition to, the referendum proposals and in the final 28 days before the referendum further restrictions on publicity apply.

7.9 Individual council members are not bound by these restrictions and can make their own personal statements on the matter provided that council resources are not used. Individuals are subject to a general restriction on referendum expenses.

7.10 Once a referendum has taken place, no further referendum on the matter can currently be held for 10 years, although the Government has consulted on reducing this 'moratorium' period.

## 8. DRAWING UP THE PROPOSALS

- 8.1 The Council must agree proposals to be the subject of the referendum vote. These must include a Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet form of executive. However, there are a number of detailed issues about how the authority would operate under an Elected Mayor which the Council must consider as follows:-
- The allocation of functions between the Mayor and the Council, including the Policy Framework and the 'local choice' functions.
  - The overview and scrutiny arrangements; and
  - The functions currently carried out by the Ceremonial Mayor
- 8.2 These are considered in turn at section 11 below. The responsibilities of the regulatory committees (development and licensing), other non-executive committees and procedure rules are unaffected by the executive changes.
- 8.3 Before drawing up its proposals the Council must take reasonable steps to consult local electors and other interested persons. The act does not prescribe the form or period of consultation. The Council has very recently conducted a consultation exercise on the executive arrangements and the results of this will inform the current proposals.
- 8.4 In agreeing the proposals the Council must also consider the extent to which the new arrangements will assist in securing continuous improvement in the way its functions are exercised, having regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

## 9. THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 9.1 Prior to receipt of the mayoral petition, the Council conducted a consultation exercise in accordance with the requirements of the 2007 Act. To enable maximum participation, consultation ran for twelve weeks in accordance with Government guidance and included a range of publicity and consultation methods. The Consultation exercise ended on 22 October 2009.
- 9.2 A full report on the consultation exercise is attached at Appendix E. Overall, the consultation attracted **2104** responses. Of these, **1890 (90%)** favoured Option A (Leader and Cabinet), endorsing the Council's preliminary preferred option. This included 497 individual responses and a petition containing 1393 names. **205** respondents (**10%**) favoured Option B (Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet). Information from elsewhere in London and beyond suggests that the response to this issue in Tower Hamlets is considerably higher than in the majority of other authorities.
- 9.3 The question of which model to adopt will now be the subject of the mandatory referendum. However, the Cabinet in July 2009 agreed that a Leader and Cabinet model was the preferred option and this was endorsed by the consultation prior to receipt of the petition. In drawing up detailed proposals and fallback arrangements the Council must have regard to the results of the consultation exercise as well as the views subsequently expressed by the signatories to the 'referendum' petition, and a further petition on the same matter

that was received after 16 November but in accordance with the regulations has not been validated because the initial petition was sufficient to trigger the referendum.

9.4 In addition to expressing their preference for option A or B, respondents were invited to submit comments. The main issues raised by those supporting Option A (Leader and Cabinet) can be summarised as:-

- The Leader and Cabinet option is more responsive to political changes and can promote a consultative form of leadership as the Leader must retain the support of a majority of councillors.
- It provides for greater checks on the Leader's powers as the Council may remove the Leader by resolution.
- The Mayoral model concentrates too much power in a single elected official and diminishes the role of councillors.
- The Mayoral model may attract populist or single issue candidates to the detriment of the agreed priorities, management and administration of the borough as a whole.

9.5 Supporters of Option B (Directly Elected Mayor and Cabinet) commented that:-

- The Elected Mayor option provides for strong leadership and a figurehead for the area.
- There is clear and personal accountability to the public for major decisions and a direct mandate and democratic participation in the election of the Council's leading politician.
- Some authorities that have adopted the Mayoral model have seen significant improvements in performance.
- The Leader and Cabinet model is less democratic as residents do not get a direct say on who leads the Council. It may also provide weaker and less visible leadership.

## **10. SECURING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

10.1 In deciding which option to adopt the Council must consider 'the extent to which the proposed executive arrangements will assist in securing continuous improvement in the way the Council's functions are exercised, having regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness'.

10.2 Since 2001 the Council has operated a Leader and Cabinet model. During this period the authority has achieved a CPA 4-star rating and been judged to be improving well; and Children's and Adults' Services have both secured successive top performance ratings. Of the two options now available to the authority, the new-style Leader and Cabinet model is the closer to the existing system that has delivered this success.

10.3 Being comparatively similar to the current model, the implementation of a new Leader and Cabinet system would have a more limited disruptive impact on the Council's decision-making and support structures; and would promote continuity in the conduct of business. This option may also promote democratic

accountability of the Executive to the diverse communities represented by local ward councillors.

- 10.4 On the other hand, the Directly Elected Mayoral model could provide more direct accountability of the Executive for the Council's performance as well as more certainty of stable leadership over the four year period, enabling the Mayor to take a longer term view and approach to the implementation of improvements.
- 10.5 The costs of implementing the two models are also relevant. In this regard there would be additional costs associated with changing to a Mayoral system including the cost of staging the Mayoral election itself.

## **11. PROPOSED EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENTS: ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

11.1 The Council must draw up proposals for Executive Arrangements, including an Elected Mayor, which will be implemented if approved at the referendum. The proposals must set out the main features of the mayoral system and in addition must indicate:-

- The extent to which the functions specified under section 13 (3) (b) of the Local Government Act 2000 ('local choice' functions) are to be the responsibility of the Executive;
- A timetable with respect to the implementation of the proposals; and
- Details of any transitional arrangements which are necessary for the implementation of the proposals

11.2 Section 8 above identifies a number of points of detail that the Council must consider in drawing up the proposals as follows:-

### **The allocation of functions between the Mayor and the Council**

11.3 The 2000 Act provides for the local authority's functions to be split between the Council and the Executive. Most functions are the responsibility of the Executive, whichever form that takes. The exceptions are in two categories - (i) certain specific functions that must be reserved to the Council or to non-executive committees (these include agreeing the budget and policy framework, amending the constitution, development and licensing functions etc); and (ii) a further list of functions each of which the Council can choose either to reserve to itself or to allocate to the Executive. These latter functions are known as 'local choice' functions.

#### **(a) The Policy Framework**

11.4 Within legislation Council must approve certain plans and strategies and their approval can not be delegated to the Executive. The Executive proposes the plans to Council for approval and if the plans are approved must make decisions within the agreed plans and strategies. The following documents currently fall into this category:

- The Children and Young People's Plan

- The Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy
- The Development Plan Documents
- The Licensing Authority Policy Statement
- The Local Transport Plan
- The Plans and Alterations which together comprise the Development Plan
- The Sustainable Community Strategy
- The Youth Justice Plan

11.5 If Councils wish they may add discretionary plans and strategies to the Policy Framework. However, this could have an impact on the economy and efficiency of the Council, because any changes to these plans could only be approved by Council, and could also blur Executive accountability. It is therefore recommended that the existing Policy Framework should be included unchanged in the proposals.

### **(b) Local Choice Functions**

11.6 There are a small number of functions which in law can be decided by local choice. This means that the Council can decide whether the Council or the Executive is responsible for these areas of decision making. A full list of the 'local choice' functions and their current allocation is attached at Appendix F. In view of the issues raised by respondents to the consultation exercise regarding the concentration of powers in a mayoral model, it is recommended that in the first instance the proposals should allocate all 'local choice' functions to the Council.

11.7 It will be open to the Council at any future point to review this allocation in respect of one of more of the local choice functions, and it is also important to note that in practice the discharge of most of the functions is delegated to officers on behalf of the Council and it is proposed that this remain the same.

### **Overview and Scrutiny Arrangements**

11.8 The statutory requirements for, and powers of, overview and scrutiny are unchanged under a Mayoral executive. As with a Leader and Cabinet arrangement the Council must have at least one Scrutiny Committee. The arrangements for overview and scrutiny are well established in Tower Hamlets and are widely regarded as efficient and effective. It is recommended that the current arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny be included unchanged within the proposals.

### **The 'Ceremonial' Mayor: (a) Duties**

11.9 A Directly Elected Mayor cannot chair meetings of the Council. However, it is a matter for local choice whether the Elected Mayor discharges the ceremonial duties previously performed by the ceremonial Mayor. Government guidance states that in a Constitution which involves a Mayor and Cabinet form of executive, it is unlikely that the Elected Mayor will have enough time to discharge many ceremonial duties and therefore the Secretary of State considers it would be appropriate for these duties to remain with the 'Ceremonial Mayor' of the Authority.

## **(b) The Title of Mayor**

11.10 The guidance says that 'where there is an Elected Mayor and Deputy Mayor the titles can only be used by the Elected Mayor or his/her chosen Deputy'. The title of Mayor cannot be used for the current role of 'Ceremonial Mayor'. The 'Ceremonial Mayor' can continue to carry out the same roles and duties, including chairing meetings of full Council, but must have a new title. Other authorities with a Mayoral form of Executive have introduced titles such as 'Chair of Council' or 'Speaker' for this purpose.

## **(c) Precedence**

11.11 The 'Ceremonial Mayor' currently has social precedence in the district. This will be passed to the Elected Mayor unless the Council opts to include in the arrangements that the 'Ceremonial Mayor' (under a new title) will have precedence. The issue of social precedence is associated with the status of the 'Ceremonial Mayor'.

11.12 It is recommended that the 'Ceremonial Mayor' should continue to have the same duties and responsibilities, including chairing meetings of full Council, and that the 'Ceremonial Mayor' should have social precedence. It is further recommended that the proposals should indicate that the position of 'Ceremonial Mayor' will be re-titled 'Chair of Council'.

11.13 A draft of the Mayoral proposals, reflecting the recommendations above, is attached at Appendix B.

11.14 Once the referendum has taken place it will be necessary for officers to draft the detailed constitutional amendments required to put the result into effect, and report these to the Council for formal adoption.

## **12. FALLBACK PROPOSALS**

12.1 The Council must also agree outline fallback proposals, based on a new-style Leader and Cabinet model, which will be introduced in the event that the referendum does not approve the Mayoral proposals.

12.2 The Council may decide to include in the Leader and Cabinet arrangements a provision for the Council to remove the Leader by majority vote. In view of the concerns expressed by some respondents about the inability, under a mayoral model, of the Council to remove the Mayor; and the identification by supporters of Option A of such a power as one of the key benefits of that option, it is suggested that the fallback proposals should include such a provision.

12.3 A draft of the fallback proposals is attached at Appendix C.

## **13. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

13.1 The legal context and implications arising from the proposals are incorporated in the main body of the report.

13.2 If the Council were to fail to pass a resolution to change its executive arrangements; or fail to hold a referendum in accordance with the relevant regulations, statute provides for the Secretary of State to direct the authority in this regard.

#### **14. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER**

14.1 The cost of holding a stand-alone mayoral referendum is estimated at up to £250k. If combined with the Council elections the additional cost is estimated at approximately £70k. There is no budget provision for either amount. The Chief Finance Officer confirms that this cost will be met from the Council's reserves.

14.2 If the referendum approves the proposal for a Mayoral executive, further costs will arise in respect of holding the Mayoral election itself. These are estimated at approximately £80k if the election is combined with the Council elections on 6 May 2010 or up to £280k if the mayoral election is held as a stand alone poll in October 2010. Further additional costs of between £15k-£20k could arise in the event that a sitting Councillor was successful in the Mayoral election and a subsequent council by-election was necessary. These additional costs would need to be met from existing budget provision.

#### **15. IMPLICATIONS FOR ONE TOWER HAMLETS**

15.1 The new executive arrangements are designed to promote effective leadership and accountability, to the benefit of the whole borough and all its communities.

#### **16. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT**

16.1 The proposals are designed to enable effective decision-making and a longer-term view to be taken on all matters including measures to enhance the local environment.

#### **17. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

17.1 There are no direct risk management implications arising from this report.

---

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1972 SECTION 100D (AS AMENDED)**

#### **LIST OF "BACKGROUND PAPERS" USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT**

<b>Brief description of background papers:</b>	<b>Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and guidance notes.</li></ul>	John Williams x 4204, 1 <sup>st</sup> floor, Mulberry Place.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>LBTH consultation material and responses July – October 2009</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Petition for a Mayoral Referendum delivered on 23<sup>rd</sup> October and 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009.</li></ul>	

## **Appendices attached**

- Appendix A: Draft proposals for Executive Arrangements based on a new-style Leader and Council (England) model
- Appendix B: Draft proposals for Executive Arrangements including a Directly Elected Mayor
- Appendix C: Draft fallback proposals for Executive Arrangements including a new-style Leader and Cabinet
- Appendix D: Comparison of the two options and the current Executive Arrangements
- Appendix E: Results of the Consultation Exercise
- Appendix F: 'Local Choice' functions – current and proposed allocation