

Mayors rule

Michael Kenny and Guy Lodge consider the case for introducing more elected mayors in England

On 1 May 2008, Londoners will get the chance to exercise a democratic right that is denied to most other English citizens.

They will get to vote for who they want to be their mayor. It is not just Londoners who enjoy this privilege. In March, Parisians re-elected their socialist mayor Bertrand Delanoë, following a successful term in office, characterised by a range of popular policy innovations. Across many other European and American cities, mayors are also providing a sense of direction and vision for their communities.

Back in the 1990s, the first Blair government, with such international examples in mind, became convinced of the merits of mayors. Indeed, Blair saw them as the central plank of his plans for local government reform. Yet, a policy that might have blazed a democratising trail for his government ended up as a damp squib. Powerful voices in local government and politics across England opposed the introduction of mayors, believing them to represent a threat to their power and influence, and were aided in their struggle by a flawed implementation process. As a result, there are still only 13 elected mayors.

The failure to roll out mayors more widely represents a great missed opportunity for those who wish to see a more vibrant local politics in England. The experience of the last six years has proved that mayors work: by providing a name and face they have delivered a more visible and accountable model of leadership, and, moreover, have proved best equipped to deal with the challenges of contemporary governance and service delivery. There is also considerable evidence that mayors have overseen an improvement in the performance of councils.

Not surprisingly, there are signs of renewed interest in elected mayors across all of the main political parties (Cameron 2007, Blears 2008). Elected mayors have figured prominently in the prognoses for the revival of local government set out in a number of recent reports, not least the Government's Local Government White Paper, which declared mayors to be the most effective form of political leadership (DCLG 2006, Cities Renaissance 2007, Marshall and Finch 2006).

Despite this support for mayors, none of the political parties has, as yet, developed a concrete proposal to introduce them more widely. The 2006 White Paper ducked this issue, leaving in place the conditions set out in the Local Government Act of 2000. In this article we argue that, without the development of a radical new strategy for implementation, England's towns and cities will continue to be deprived of the benefits that mayors can deliver. We make the case for mayors, then set out two proposals that are explicitly designed to ensure the wider dissemination of this leadership model.

At the heart of our argument is the belief that it is only when mayors are in place in more of England's towns and cities that central government will seriously begin to transfer powers and functions to local government. Mayors, we argue, are therefore necessary if we are to begin to unravel the excessive levels of centralism that characterise English governance. As well as their undoubted local merits, elected mayors may also contain one part of the answer to the increasingly vexatious 'English Question'.

Mayors work

England's experience of directly elected mayors has produced an array of positive

stories – of initiative, achievement and growing legitimacy – which, together, contribute significantly to the case for the mayoral model. Though few in number, all our mayors have been shown to make a difference in their localities (Wilson and Game 2006).

Even Hartlepool's mayor, Stuart Drummond, who achieved celebrity status for standing for election dressed as a monkey, has confounded sceptics

In Middlesbrough, 'Robocop' Ray Mallon cut crime by 18 per cent in his first year of office (Randle 2004). In London, Ken Livingstone has pioneered ambitious and agenda-setting policies in relation to transport and the environment, most notably through the congestion charge. In Doncaster, Martin Winter developed a high-profile Fighting Litter, Abandoned Cars and Graffiti (FLAG) campaign. And, in Stoke-on-Trent, Mike Wolfe developed a Better Service Fund (known locally as 'Mike's Millions'), which used money raised from an increase in council tax to clean up and improve the physical fabric of the city (Randle 2004).

Evidence from the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) suggests that mayors have proved to be highly capable executive leaders. The latest CPA report praises North Tyneside, finding it to be one of the most improved councils in the country (Audit Commission 2008). Since the introduction of an elected mayor, Hackney has demonstrated sustained and continuous improvement, moving from its status as a 1-star authority in 2005 to a 3-star one in 2007, while also being considered to be improving strongly – the top category in the 'direction of travel' assessment. Another mayoral authority, Stoke-on-Trent, was also one of a tiny number to have moved up two grades in this exercise.

Even Hartlepool's mayor, Stuart Drummond, who achieved celebrity status for standing for election dressed as a monkey, has confounded sceptics. His election was widely considered as emblematic of how this system could open local government to mavericks or joke candidates. Since he threw away his costume, and proved willing to be tutored in the ways of local government management, his record of achievement is commendable. He has coordinated policies that have led to a 20 per cent fall in crime, and overseen demonstrable improvements in education and social service provision (Randle 2004).

In its last CPA review, Hartlepool was judged to be one of the top-performing authorities in the country, achieving a 4-star ('excellent') rating. Drummond was subsequently re-elected with a massively increased majority. He was even a finalist for the title of 'world mayor' for 2005.

More generally, the record of performance of elected mayors is one factor behind their success at securing re-election. Of the nine incumbents who have stood for re-election, seven have been successful.

This is not to suggest that mayor-led authorities always outperform their counterparts, nor to imply that these leaders themselves are, in every case, responsible for the various achievements of their councils. But there is a considerable body of evidence to support the contention that mayors have enhanced and overseen improvements in local authority performance. Particularly impressive has been the role of a few mayors in turning around poorly performing councils. Hackney, for instance, prior to the introduction of a mayor, was on the verge of being taken over by central government (Wilson and Game 2006).

The mayoral model of leadership also seems to be best equipped to meet the new challenges shaping contemporary service delivery. The world in which local government now operates has changed dramatically – broadly speaking, from an era of direct responsibility for service provision to one in which it is required to coordinate complex and diverse delivery chains. This shift, and

the much greater emphasis placed by central government upon the importance of partnerships between public authorities and the private and voluntary sectors, has placed a premium on what a leading evaluation of the political leadership in local government terms 'facilitative leadership' (Stoker *et al* 2007).

That phrase captures an array of styles and attributes increasingly required in local political management and policy development. Facilitative leadership places a premium on being an effective, but not always partisan, decision-maker; on an ability to draw citizens and other stakeholders into a shared vision of the locality, and on the orchestration of coalitions of support for specific activities. The popular electoral mandate of elected mayors, their high profile, capacity to embody a particular place, and relative independence from local parties, mean that they are well placed to practice such a style of leadership.

The coordination of partnerships involving public, private and voluntary sector bodies has been a hallmark of this group of

mayors. In Watford, Dorothy Thornhill used her position to bring together public and private partners to secure agreement for a new hospital in the town (Dhillon 2006). The mayor of Lewisham, Steve Bullock, has successfully brought together different agencies to develop a particularly effective local strategic partnership (Dhillon 2006).

A major review of local authorities in England established some important causal linkages between the number of executive freedoms enjoyed by a leader and the overall performance of an authority (Stoker *et al* 2007). A survey (see Table 1) that the review conducted of councillors, officers and stakeholders in a representative sample of 40 authorities demonstrated that mayors are perceived within local government as best equipped to deal with managing partnership relationships, and cross-cutting policy issues more generally (*ibid*). The review found that, of the three models offered in the Government's 2006 White Paper, the one most likely to deliver leadership of a facilitative and partnership-based kind is the mayoral model.

Table 1. Opinions of councillors, officers and stakeholders in a representative sample of 40 authorities

Agree/strongly agree that...	...without a mayor %	...with a mayor %
Decision-making is quicker	46	61
The role of leader has become stronger	69	79
The leader of the council has a higher public profile	59	82
It is easier to find out who has made specific decisions	40	48
The public is more involved in decision-making	16	30
The council is better at dealing with cross-cutting issues	40	48
The council's relations with partners have improved	46	57
It is easier to find out about council policy	51	59
Backbench members are more engaged	11	12
Political parties dominate decision-making	47	29
It is easier for women to become involved in council business	22	34
It is easier for ethnic minorities to become involved in council business	16	34
Issues of ethical conduct have a higher profile	41	43

Source: Stoker *et al* 2007

The outward-facing character and enhanced profile that the post of mayor confers is of particular relevance to the economic fortunes of England's towns and cities. One of the main reasons why a succession of reports on the state and future of British cities have called for more elected mayors is the body of evidence that links this office to economic growth and regeneration: from Barcelona to Chicago, mayors have improved the economic fortunes of cities (Marshall and Finch 2006, *Cities Renaissance* 2007).

American expert Bruce Katz describes US mayors as the 'chief economic development tsars of their city', possessing a range of fiscal, planning and financing powers, which enable them to set a framework for the physical landscape, industrial development and residential patterns of their city (Katz 2005). Mayors such as Steve Goldsmith of Indianapolis and Graham Richard of Fort Wayne made their cities attractive to new kinds of business and residential investment.

High-profile mayor of Dresden Herbert Wagner used his tenure to boost tourism, and thereby enhanced the economic fortunes of this city from the former East Germany. Other mayors have transformed the outlook and economic health of their cities during their time as mayors – figures including Francesco Rutelli in Rome and Pasqual Maragall in Barcelona (Stoker 2004a).

Governance and economic benefits aside, perhaps the most interesting question is whether elected mayors represent a useful tool in the struggle against growing public indifference to, and disengagement from, local politics. On the issue of voter turnout – a useful but limited proxy for engagement – there is no clear evidence that more of the electorate will vote for mayors than in council elections generally. But mayors do score highly in terms of profile, visibility, and promoting a sense of political accountability.

Mayors are known to a far greater proportion of the local populace than are leaders selected by majority parties: firstly, because they have emerged from election

campaigns, and, secondly, because the office conveys a profile and embodies a legitimacy that the more traditional model of a council leader lacks.

A poll conducted during the first term of the original cohort of mayors in 2003 found that, on average, 57 per cent of voters in mayoral areas recognised the name of their local leader, compared with 25 per cent average recognition for leaders in others (Randle 2004). Name recognition rose to 73 per cent for mayors in the North East. This report also found that, in mayoral areas, people's awareness of and identification with local political issues is likely to be markedly higher in non-mayoral areas (Randle 2004).

Research commissioned by the Government in 2001 found that almost eight out of 10 respondents agreed that a directly elected mayor might be someone who could speak up for the whole area (DTLR 2001). Around two thirds of all respondents agreed that a directly elected mayor would make it easier to get things done (65.3 per cent) and make it clear who was responsible when things go wrong (66.3 per cent) (*ibid*).

Many mayors hold open surgeries, appear on phone-ins and respond via email to comments from their local constituents, and, in general, provide a more identifiable focus for the concerns of local people. The sense that the impersonal processes and machinery of local government are embodied in one figure, and one whom people expect to hold accountable for council decisions and performance, appears to generate a very positive sense of connection.

Even when their personalities or policies elicit negative responses from parts of their electorate, the office of mayor helps channel people's sense of identification with the locality in which they live into political interest and awareness. Few who have observed London's current election campaign can doubt that a kind of localised demos has come into being (or more accurately been reborn) in that most diverse of cities. Councillors, council leaders, and appointed executives do not come near to making this connection.

Just as importantly, this newly created office has not generated the swathe of negative headlines about corruption or incompetence that was widely predicted. There have undoubtedly been a number of adjustment problems and real political difficulties (especially for independents facing hostile local parties), as the office, and the new model of local governance of which it forms a part, bed down. But nothing resembling the catastrophes predicted by critics has occurred.

Introducing more mayors could spur local parties to innovate in positive ways, for example through the use of primary-style selection meetings

While the most high-profile and powerful mayor currently in post, Ken Livingstone, has attracted a good deal of controversy of late, it is worth noting that the strong feelings generated by the current election campaign in London have not spilled over into a widespread questioning of the office itself.¹

For many sceptics, the most likely consequence of introducing mayors was that local politics would become more personality-based. The worry was that candidates' experience, records in office or political qualities would be eclipsed in a 'beauty contest' in which charisma, personality and spin might prevail. While it is true that direct election provides the potential to throw up mavericks or incompetents, or propel celebrities or rich local notables into office, few mayoral elections have, in fact, produced policy-light contests. Indeed, such an argument reflects an unacceptable complacency about the calibre of the leadership that currently prevails within local govern-

ment. It also betrays a distrust of local electorates that is itself highly revealing.

More importantly, it is a mistake to assume that a campaign that focuses to some degree on 'character' is, necessarily, undemocratic in content. Questions of personality and presentational style are intimately interwoven with issues about trust, authenticity and policy in modern elections, whether we like it or not. Indeed, experience suggests that the choices between leadership styles and personalities that mayoral elections generate are more likely to entice voters (especially younger ones) to the ballot box.

It is also true that local political parties have survived the introduction of mayors, including the election of a handful of independents in places such as Middlesbrough and Hartlepool. These independents have not signalled the triumph of crude populism over local party politics, but have, instead, allowed a number of individuals to emerge and make an impact on local political life who were outside the charmed circles of the local political networks: of the first group of elected mayors, five were from non-local-government backgrounds.

Moreover, there is some evidence to suggest that the presence of independents has forced local parties to smarten up their act and rethink their policy portfolios in areas where independents have been elected. Introducing more mayors could spur local parties to innovate in positive ways, for example through the use of primary-style selection meetings, which could enable them to reach out to a wider pool of local talent.

A further accusation was that mayors would be too powerful, and not subject to enough checks and balances in the current system of local government. Rather than agents of democratisation, mayors, it was feared, might try to rule in Napoleonic fashion, without being held to account. This is an important concern, but much of this

1. Although the question of whether the Greater London Assembly is in possession of sufficient scrutiny and oversight powers in relation to the Mayor of London is likely to remain a live issue.

worry is as applicable to other models of local government leadership as it is to mayors.

The two aspects of this issue that might legitimately be related to mayors specifically are: first, whether councillors are likely to be less influential under this type of leader; and, second, whether mayors are more likely to overrule the majority will of a council. The experience of the early cohorts of mayors does not appear to bear out either suggestion.

The current system pivots around a distinction between a cabinet, appointed by the council leader or mayor, and a majority of backbench councillors, who are now tasked with performing scrutiny and oversight roles. There is nothing intrinsic to the mayoral model that is more likely to deny backbench councillors a role. The question of what ought to be the focus and role of councillors under this revised system is now a generic issue for all forms of executive leadership within local government (Report of the Councillors Commission 2007). And clearly any strengthening of the executive capacity needs to be matched by an increase in resource and profile for scrutiny processes.

The localist case for mayors

Perhaps the strongest current argument in favour of mayors is that their widespread introduction throughout England could herald a more radical shift in powers from central to local government. The rationale for this argument is three-fold.

Firstly, ministers are likely to be more willing to devolve powers and responsibilities to those councils that can demonstrate sustained and continued improvement, and that have the political leadership and capacity to deliver effective local governance. In both of these areas, the mayoral model scores highly.

Secondly, in providing more visible and accountable leadership, mayors may be the key to overcoming one of the biggest barriers to greater localism, namely the problem

of public perceptions of who is responsible when things go wrong.

The post-war trend towards the greater concentration of powers in central government, combined with an active national media focused almost exclusively on politics in Westminster, has ingrained a view within English political culture that central government is responsible for a swathe of micro- as well as macro-policy, delivery and coordination issues. Ministers remain reluctant, therefore, to decentralise significant powers while they are held responsible by the public for the performance of the entire public service delivery chain. This would amount to accountability without control.

Conversely, however, ministers are more inclined to devolve power where lines of accountability are much clearer, as in the case of the London mayor, where central government has released important powers over, for instance, planning and housing. The method of direct election and the clarity of powers that are associated with this process mean that there is much greater likelihood that local publics will come to view a well-known local figure with clear executive authority as the person with whom the buck stops. Mayors have real potential to make local government more accountable, and can, therefore, contribute significantly to the introduction of greater local autonomy.

The third reason is that a group of mayors acting in concert could form a powerful voice within local government for demanding new responsibilities from the centre. At present, debates are developing about how public services, such as policing, can be made more accountable to the public. Locally elected mayors are likely to be important voices articulating a strong case for the granting of greater powers back to the local level. In summary, the introduction of more mayors should be seen as a gateway to the kind of far-reaching programme of devolving greater responsibility for revenue generation, public service management and economic development that many national politicians are beginning to envisage.

Why so few mayors?

Given the compelling evidence in favour of mayors, it is worth asking why we have so few of them. Following the Local Government Act of 2000, which forced authorities to choose between different executive arrangements, just three per cent (12 local authority mayors, plus the Mayor of London) opted for elected mayors. The main reasons for such a low take-up were, firstly, that, with a few exceptions, local political elites (across all parties) were actively opposed to them, and, secondly, the process of implementation attached to this policy was flawed. Indeed these factors are intimately linked. A highly cautious Labour government was reluctant to override the strongly negative feelings of local parties on this issue.

When the idea of elected mayors gained ground in the mid 1990s, the overwhelming majority of councillors were hostile

When the idea of elected mayors gained ground in the mid 1990s, the overwhelming majority of councillors were hostile. A poll conducted in 1999 found that only three per cent supported it (Stoker 2004b). Many parties, politicians and activists believe that mayors will diminish their influence and status. As Gerry Stoker points out, this model was perceived to offer a fundamental challenge to the traditional patterns of party politics at the local level (2004b).

Observing the principle that 'turkeys don't vote for Christmas', the vast majority of councils – 81 per cent – went for the option of least change, and adopted the leader and cabinet model.² The Act did

require councils to consult with their local electorates on the choices available but, as Stoker reports, 'The consultation exercises were in many instances exemplars of how to ensure that an official position on a decision was not seriously challenged' (2004b).³

The architects of the Local Government Act fatefully decided to make a majority 'Yes' vote in a local referendum the pre-condition for the introduction of a mayor. This procedural device has now become a major obstacle to the wider introduction of mayors.

The holding of a referendum in a given authority can be triggered in two ways: a vote by a majority of councillors, or a petition signed by a minimum of five per cent of the electoral roll. The first scenario has emerged as an unlikely one, given the negative view of most councillors towards mayors. Just 22 councils have gone down this path – the last of which was initiated in 2002. This has thrown particular weight onto the petitioners' route.

Given the steep decline in local election participation across the country, the figure of five per cent (which would, for instance, require the assent of 36,000 voters in Birmingham) has come to look too ambitious, representing only a slightly smaller figure than turns out to vote in many wards. Not surprisingly, given these pre-conditions, the trickle of referendums has flowed almost to a halt – though some vibrant campaigns in favour of mayors in cities like Liverpool and Birmingham continue.

Most of the referendums (the proportion is approximately 2:1) that have been held have produced votes against the introduction of mayors. Reasons for this vary, but a generic feature has been the success of 'No' campaigners, often led by local party activists who have deployed their political experience and contacts in leading opposition to reform (Stoker 2004b).

2. The remainder of councils – those serving populations of 85,000 or less – were allowed to choose a reformed committee system without a distinct executive.
3. Conscious of the fact that councils might not present the case for and against each model sufficiently impartially, the Government took the precaution of retaining the power to review consultation exercises, and, if appropriate, to impose a referendum on the authority. The Government only used this power once, in Southwark. It did consider forcing referendums in other authorities, including Birmingham, but, according to Stoker, decided not to, largely because Labour did not have credible candidates in place to fight in these localities (Stoker 2004b).

Although opinion polls indicate overwhelming support for the idea of mayors, the public have proved reluctant to turn out and vote for them in local referendums. This should not come as much of a surprise. These referendum campaigns often attracted little publicity and failed to capture the public's imagination. The reliance on local ballots provided a bulwark against the possibility of a more concerted campaign in favour of the concept of elected mayors. And, given that the minister in charge of this area of policy, Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott, was himself sceptical, it is perhaps not surprising that so little political energy was invested in this proposal from the centre.

Breaking the deadlock: two new approaches to implementation

If far more of England's towns and cities are to be allowed to benefit from this leadership model, it is clear that a new implementation strategy is needed. Government clearly recognises the merits of the office of elected mayor – it emerges as the 'strongest leadership model' in its 2006 White Paper (DCLG 2006) – but has conspicuously failed to address the political obstacles that stand in the way of their further introduction.

Below, we sketch two different approaches that could provide the core of such an implementation strategy.

1. *A national day of local referendums*

The first approach accepts the principle contained in the Local Government Act that requires a referendum as a precondition for the introduction of this office, but modifies it in two important ways. Firstly, to ensure that most of England's towns and cities get the opportunity to hear a bal-

anced and serious debate about elected mayors, we suggest that a mayoral referendum be made a mandatory requirement for all urban authorities.⁴ At a stroke, this would overcome the problems associated with passing the initiative to councils to initiate referendums, and the problem associated with achieving the five per cent threshold for a petition to trigger a referendum.

Secondly, these referendums should then be held on the same date, allowing for the development of a high-profile national day of debate and deliberation in relation to this issue. This is the most likely way of galvanising interest in this question, and would permit a much fuller airing of the case for and against this post.

This deliberative innovation would also help level the playing field for campaigners who favour this office, faced with well-networked and organised local political opposition. With a national referendum day in place, a concerted and coordinated campaign (for and against) could be waged. For politicians worried about being regarded as indifferent to the views of local people, the attractions of this proposal should be apparent. Equally, there is a good democratic case for a debate on this important political innovation being heard more widely. Under such circumstances, it seems likely that a much greater number of authorities would opt for the mayoral model.

2. *Directly elected mayors – a constitutional change*

The second reform option would involve the Government seizing the initiative on this issue and moving decisively to abandon the referendum requirement enshrined in the Local Government Act and bring in new legislation that would introduce elected mayors in all urban authorities.⁵ This ought to include the option for the mayoral model to be revoked after a four-year term if a sizeable portion of the local electorate is

4. Our definition of urban authorities includes all unitary councils and metropolitan district councils (82 in total). There is a strong case, too, for considering extending this option to non-metropolitan district councils that map onto urban centres, for instance towns like Oxford.

5. In terms of deciding which non-metropolitan district councils this policy should be applied to, we would envisage the involvement of an independent authority, perhaps the Boundary Commission, in determining which authorities would be appropriate for this method of governance, based on a range of criteria, for instance population size.

actively opposed to it. But on this proposal, elected mayors would become the default position for most urban local authorities within England. Opponents of this office would then be required to trigger a referendum either through a two-thirds majority vote by the local council, or a petition by a small percentage of the local electorate.

The major advantage of this approach would be the achievement of a welcome degree of institutional uniformity across many of England's towns and cities – an important consideration, given that a sense of confusion and ignorance about local political structures and the roles of office-holders is one factor behind disenchantment with local politics.

We also believe that part of this policy's appeal lies in the fact that it would give a large part of the electorate a democratic right to vote for an elected mayor in their locality. The departure from a validating referendum could be justified on the grounds that, until the Local Government Act, central government undertook many major reforms of local administration without using referendums. It is also worth observing that in Italy and Germany, mayors were introduced by central government in this way.⁶ Clearly such a policy would be given extra legitimacy if it were a manifesto commitment endorsed by the electorate.

Mayors, we believe, are an attractive and plausible means of unlocking a greater shift of powers from central to local government

Such a proposal is likely to encounter strong resistance from those opposed to mayors, particularly within parts of the local government community, who may well portray this as a further exercise of central clout and a violation of the principle of local political diversity. In response, we would

6. We are indebted to Gerry Stoker for this observation.

reassert one of the central arguments of this paper, which is that, paradoxically, such an act of centralisation is needed to deliver greater local autonomy in the future.

Mayors, we believe, are an attractive and plausible means of unlocking a greater shift of powers from central to local government. The proposals we advance here are, therefore, inherently localist in their ambition.

Such an idea would undoubtedly encounter opposition in each of the main parties. And we do not wish to underplay the political risks attached to it. But, as we have suggested above, introducing more mayors is very likely to yield a range of civic and democratic benefits, and would most likely create new incentives for local parties to find strong candidates and communicate with local electorates more effectively.

Urban-only mayors?

There is clearly an urban bias to our recommendations, which reflects a presumption that mayors make most sense as representatives of densely populated towns or cities that possess reasonably cohesive identities and clear boundaries. This is not, however, to foreclose debate about the merits of this system in rural or mixed authorities. A transparent review process would certainly need to be developed to handle further applications for eligibility.

Conclusion

Without resort to approaches like these, the prospects for more directly elected mayoral leaders are, at present, remote. And, yet, if politicians at the centre really are serious about rejuvenating politics and reviving interest in local government, they need to discover the political will and energy to push ahead with this agenda.

Local politicians, too, should consider seriously the benefits of this model of leadership and become advocates for it.

Introducing more elected mayors would

constitute an important break from the centralised system of governance that prevails in England, and would most likely unleash further devolutionary momentum. Mayors represent a potentially important means of reanimating local democracy, of improving the leadership of England's urban places, and providing a sufficiently legitimate and robust system of leadership for the centre to feel able to devolve greater decision-making powers to local government.

It is time that the case for more mayors became the subject of national, as well as local, debate. It is only when the main political parties take seriously the challenge of developing a coherent vision of how England can be governed in a far less centralised fashion that there will be a real sense that politics matters in places and at levels far removed from Westminster. As such, the mayoral agenda has the potential to form an important part of a broader programme of democratising the governance of England.

Michael Kenny is a visiting research fellow, and Guy Lodge a senior research fellow, at ippr. The authors would like to thank Rick Muir for his help in developing this argument.

Audit Commission (2008) *Comprehensive Performance Assessment – single tier and county councils* London: Audit Commission. Available at: www.audit-commission.gov.uk/cpa/stcc/index.asp

- Bleas H (2008) *A New Deal for Local Devolution?* Speech to the NLGN, 22 January. Available at: www.communities.gov.uk/speeches/corporate/localdevolution
- Cameron D (2007) *Empowering local communities can heal our broken society* Speech to the Local Government Association, 5 July. Available at: <http://lga.gov.uk/lga/aio/34160>
- Cities Renaissance (2007) *Cities Renaissance: creating local leadership* London: Submission to the Shadow Cabinet Cities Taskforce
- Department for Communities and Local Government (2006) *Strong and Prosperous Communities – the Local Government White Paper* London: DCLG
- Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2001) *Survey of Public Attitudes to Directly Elected Mayors* London: HMSO. Available at www.localodpm.gov.uk/research/summ.pdf
- Dhillon K (2006) (ed) *Mayors Making a Difference* London: New Local Government Network
- Katz B (2005) 'Elected mayors – Lessons from the US' Speech to the Centre for Cities 'City Mayors' event 19 May 2005. Available at www.centreforcities.org/assets/files/pdfs/cfc/events/2005/05-25%20Bruce%20Katz%20speech.doc
- Marshall A and Finch D with Urwin C (2006) *City Leadership: giving cities the power to grow* London: Centre for Cities at ippr
- Randle A (2004) *Mayors Mid-term: lessons from the first eighteen months of directly Elected Mayors* London: New Local Government Network
- Report of the Councillors Commission (2007) *Representing the Future: Report of the Councillors' Commission* London: DCLG
- Stoker G (2004a) 'Introduction' in Parker I and Randle A (eds) *Beyond SW1: Elected Mayors and the Renewal of Civic Leadership* London: New Local Government Network: 13-14
- Stoker G (2004b) *Transforming Local Governance: From Thatcherism to New Labour* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Stoker G, Gains F, Greasley S, John P and Rao N (2007) *The New Council Constitutions: the Outcomes and Impact of the Local Government Act 2000* London: DCLG, available at: www.elgnc.org.uk/docs/main_report_13_07_07.pdf
- Wilson DJ and Game C (2006) *Local Government in the United Kingdom* 4th edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan