



**EAST STAFFORDSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**REPORT COVER SHEET**

<b>Title of Report:</b>	Scrutiny Review of the Mayoralty Function	To be marked with an 'X' by Democratic Services after report has been presented
<b>Meeting of:</b>	Scrutiny (Value for Money Council) Committee	
	Corporate Management Team	
	Leader and Deputy Leaders	
	Cabinet	

## Scrutiny Committee Review Final Report

---

**Title:** Scrutiny Review of the Mayoralty Function

**Scrutiny Committee:** Scrutiny (Value for Money Council) Committee

**Committee Chair:** Cllr Dr R Lock

**Sub-group Members Leading Review:**

- Cllr Dr R Lock
- Cllr S Gaskin
- Cllr R Grosvenor
- Cllr T Hadley
- Cllr A Legg

**Is the Report Confidential?** No

**If so, please state relevant paragraph from Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972:** N/a

## **SECTION 1: COMMITTEE'S REPORT**

### **1. Introduction**

#### **1.1. Background / Context**

1.1.1. At the meeting of the Scrutiny (Audit and Value for Money Council Services) Committee held on 11th February 2021, Committee Members agreed to undertake a review of the Mayoralty. A sub-group of the Committee has been made up of the councillors named above to lead the review on behalf of the Committee.

1.1.2. The Mayors of East Staffordshire covering the past six years are as follows:

- 2016/17: Cllr B Toon (Deputy Mayor: Cllr S Gaskin);
- 2017/18: Cllr S Gaskin (Deputy Mayor: Cllr C Smith);
- 2018/19: Cllr C Smith (Deputy Mayor: Cllr C Wileman);
- 2019/20: Cllr C Wileman (Deputy Mayor: Cllr P Ackroyd);\*
- 2020/21: Cllr C Wileman (Deputy Mayor: Cllr P Ackroyd);\*
- 2021/22: Cllr P Ackroyd (Deputy Mayor: Cllr P Hudson)

\*two year term due to COVID-19 implications

#### **1.2. What is the purpose of the Review?**

1.2.1. To review the relevance and value for money of the Council's Mayoral function and to investigate any other options open to the Council.

#### **1.3. What are the core questions the review is seeking to answer?**

1.3.1. The core themes of this review are as follows:

- i. To Review Budget, Expenses and Charitable Funding Generated.
- ii. To Review Mayoral Functions and Events
- iii. To Review Alternative Models

1.3.2. Further information on the specific questions within each of these three core themes is detailed within this report.

#### **1.4. What was the Scrutiny Approach**

1.4.1. The activities carried out in order to complete the review included desktop studies, review of benchmarking with partners and discussion with relevant Council officers.

#### **1.5. What is Within the Scope of the Review?**

1.5.1. All aspects of the mayoralty including cost and benefit

1.6. What is Outside the Scope of the Review?

1.6.1. Aspects not related to the mayoralty.

2. **Budget, Expenses and Charitable Funding Generated**

2.1. The financial information relating to the Mayoral Function as detailed in the Council’s approved [Medium Term Financial Strategy 2021-22 to 2023-24](#) is shown in **Table 1** below:

**TABLE 1**

2020/2021 Budget		2021/2022 Budget	2022/2023 Budget
£		£	£
24,351	Employees	24,283	24,675
43	Premises-Related Expenditure	46	47
8,578	Transport-Related Expenditure	2,742	7,532
23,712	Supplies & Services	22,422	22,422
<b>56,684</b>	<b>Civic Ceremonials</b>	<b>49,493</b>	<b>54,676</b>

  

**About the Service:**  
 The Mayor is the Civic Head of the Borough who participates in civic events and supports local charities. This includes Mayor Making in May and the Mayors Ball. The Mayor encourages visits to the Town Hall to hear about the history of the Borough and see the civic memorabilia on display.

  

**Major Changes from 2020/21 Budget:**  
 Transport expenditure has been reduced on a temporary basis pending the need to replace the existing vehicle.

  

2020/21	Cost of Service (per resident)	2021/22	2022/23
0.47	Net	0.41	0.46

2.2. Taken from the budget consultation undertaken during 2021/22, information in relation to Mayoral Activities is as below.

2.3. When asked “which services are the most important to you?”:

2.3.1. Based on the 288 respondents, who were able to tick up to 5 boxes, 1% indicated that Mayoral Activities was one of the 5 most important services for them (the lowest overall). The highest service scored 53.8%.

2.4. When asked “which of the services that the council is not required to provide by law would you most like to see protected?”:

2.4.1. Based on the 288 respondents, who were able to tick up to 2 boxes, 1% indicated that Mayoral Activities was one of the 2 most important services which the Council is not

required to provide by law that they would most like to see protected (the lowest overall). The highest service scored 53%.

2.5. This section provides details of the mayoral budget and expenses incurred for the last six years as requested from service officers:

2.5.1. Please refer to **Appendix 1** for full detail on expenditure for the Mayor and Deputy for the 2016/17; 2017/18; 2018/19; 2019/20; 2020/21; and 2021/22 financial years. N.B. Appendix 1 provides core costs of the service. It should also be noted that as a result of having a Mayor, a number of other costs are incurred which include Civic Events such as the Mayor Making Ceremony and the Secretarial support provided to the Mayor, which are included in the budget information in section 2.1.

2.5.2. The budgeted allowance for the Mayoral function in 2021/22 was £9,025, and for 2022/23 was £8,025.

2.5.3. A summary of the expenditure allocated from the Mayoral allowance can be seen in **Table 2** below:

**TABLE 2**

MAYOR							
Item	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	TOTAL
Monthly Payments	£2,100.00	£2,100.00	£2,100.00	£2,100.00	£2,100.00	£2,100.00	<b>£12,600</b>
Clothing	£616.05	£1,999.26	£271.45	£1,506.73	£0.00	£744.10	<b>£5,137.59</b>
Functions	£2,469.28	£1,561.90	£1,788.79	£1,674.12	(£65.00)	£1,222.00	<b>£8,651.09</b>
Miscellaneous Items	£1,164.81	£264.86	£190.00	£100.00	£287.85	£348.40	<b>£2,355.92</b>
<b>Total Amount</b>	<b>£6,350.14</b>	<b>£5,926.02</b>	<b>£4,350.24</b>	<b>£5,380.85</b>	<b>£2,322.85</b>	<b>£4,414.50</b>	<b>£28,744.60</b>

2.5.4. The budgeted allowance for the Deputy Mayoral function in 2021/22 was £2,757, and for 2022/23 was £2,630.

2.5.5. A summary of the expenditure allocated from the Deputy Mayoral allowance can be seen in **Table 3** below:

**TABLE 3**

DEPUTY MAYOR							
Item	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	TOTAL
Monthly Payments	£900.00	£900.00	£900.00	£900.00	£900.00	900.00	<b>£5,400.00</b>
Clothing	£1,511.01	£658.20	£685.60	£1,040.39	£0.00	1,365.00	<b>£5,260.20</b>
Functions	£190.00	£232.00	£68.00	£381.00	£0.00	240.00	<b>£1,111.00</b>
Miscellaneous Items	£0.00	£0.00	£28.00	£0.00	£0.00	0.00	<b>£28.00</b>
<b>Total Amount</b>	<b>£2,601.01</b>	<b>£1,790.20</b>	<b>£1,681.60</b>	<b>£2,321.39</b>	<b>£900.00</b>	<b>£2,505.00</b>	<b>£11,799.20</b>

2.6. Charitable funding generated through the office of mayor for the last six years:

2.6.1. The Mayoral donations to charity are as shown in **Table 4** below:

**TABLE 4**

DONATIONS TO CHARITY						
Item	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2021*	2021/2022	TOTAL
<b>Donation Amount</b>	<b>£27,956.54</b>	<b>£10,500.77</b>	<b>£4,583.85</b>	<b>£12,327.74</b>	<b>£6,379.28</b>	<b>£61,748.18</b>

\*two year term due to COVID-19 implications

### 3. Mayoral Functions and Events

3.1. How many events the Mayor has taken part in over the last six years:

3.1.1. Events attended by the Mayor and / or Deputy Mayor are detailed in **Appendix 2**. A summary of the number of events attended is included in **Table 5** below:

**TABLE 5**

EVENTS ATTENDED						
Attendee	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2021	2021/2022	TOTAL
Mayor	239	177	130	159	95	<b>800</b>
Deputy Mayor	26	24	20	26	8	<b>104</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>904</b>

3.1.2. How many take place in East Staffordshire vs externally?

3.1.2.1. The number of events attended broken down by location can be seen in **Table 6** below:

**TABLE 6**

EVENTS ATTENDED BY LOCATION						
Attendee	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2021	2021/2022	TOTAL
East Staffordshire	192 (72%)	134 (67%)	104 (69%)	141 (76%)	66 (64%)	<b>637 (70%)</b>
Other Staffordshire Area	64 (24%)	54 (27%)	40 (27%)	37 (20%)	30 (29%)	<b>225 (25%)</b>
Derbyshire	6 (2%)	10 (5%)	5 (3%)	4 (2%)	3 (3%)	<b>28 (3%)</b>
Other	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)	4 (4%)	<b>14 (2%)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>904</b>

3.1.3. How many are community focused (e.g. visiting schools/community groups) vs formal (e.g. evening dinners & drinks) vs functional (e.g. attending funerals on behalf of ESBC); how many of the events are duplicated from one year to the next; how many of the events have been attending other mayor's functions?

3.1.3.1. Appendix 2 contains information on the events attended by the relevant Mayors / Deputy Mayors.

3.1.4. How is attendance by the Mayorality at functions decided?

3.1.4.1. If people would like the Mayor to attend an event, they can [download and complete this form](#) and return it to the Council. Applications are generally from within the Borough. There is not a specific policy as such for deciding attendance. If the Mayor is available and they are 'mainly' within our borough, the invite is shared with the Mayor for them to decide (usually accepted). If the Mayor has a private/personal engagement, we then ask the Deputy. If there are two engagements on the same date and it is possible to obtain a 2nd chauffeur and hire car, then the Deputy can be asked. This not always cost effective so apologies are submitted. If the Council feels that they are being invited to the same group on a very regular basis this is sometimes declined by the Mayor, as they try to give other organisations an opportunity, and the Mayor may only pick one or two for the year.

Attendance at other authorities' Civic Services and Civic Charity Balls is generally accepted as they will in return support our Mayor at our events. If the Mayor and Deputy both have prior engagements then we will submit their apologies. Accepted/rejected engagements are recorded.

### 3.1.5. What is the social benefit / impact of these events?

3.1.5.1. On 6<sup>th</sup> September 2022, the review sub-group interviewed the current Mayor, Cllr Philip Hudson, and the previous Mayor, Cllr Patricia Ackroyd. The interview suggested high levels of citizen satisfaction from those who come into contact with the Mayoralty.

### 3.1.6. What communication is undertaken with regard to the activities of the Mayor?

3.1.6.1. The Council has dedicated [Mayor of East Staffordshire pages](#) on its website. This includes a biography of the current Mayor; information on the Mayor's charities; how to arrange for the Mayor to attend an event; and information on the appointment, role and duties of the Mayor.

3.1.6.2. The Council's Communications function will also publish press releases upon request. There were 6, 7 and 6 PRs issued during 2019, 2020 and 2021 respectively relating to Council activities involving the Mayor. However additional PR is undertaken by the partner organisations at which the Mayor is attending, who will contribute with input, comments etc as appropriate.

### 3.1.7. Establish attendance numbers for the ESBC mayor's dinner for the last six years.

3.1.7.1. The attendance numbers at the Mayor's Charity Ball can be seen in **Table 7** below:

**TABLE 7**

MAYOR'S CHARITY BALL ATTENDANCES						
2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	TOTAL
279	194	132	205	N/A*	115	925

\*A Charity Ball was not held in 2020 due to Covid-19 impacts.

### 3.2. Establish information around the Mayor's Chauffeur

#### 3.2.1. Is there a pool of Chauffeurs, and if so how many?

3.2.1.1. There is a pool of staff that act as Chauffeurs and / or Mace Bearers:

- 1x Mace Bearer
- 1x Chauffeur
- 4x Mace Bearer / Chauffeurs

#### 3.2.2. Does the Chauffeur service cater for both the Mayor and Deputy Mayor?

3.2.2.1. The Chauffeur service does cater for both the Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

#### 3.2.3. What are the costs?

3.2.3.1. The expenditure relating to Mace Bearers, Chauffeurs and the Mayoral vehicle is detailed in **Table 8** below:

TABLE 8

		<b>MACE BEARERS, CHAUFFEURS AND MAYORAL VEHICLE COSTS</b>					
		<b>2016/2017</b>	<b>2017/2018</b>	<b>2018/2019</b>	<b>2019/2020</b>	<b>2020/2021</b>	<b>2021/2022</b>
<b>Chauffeurs</b>	Salaries	£11,463.61	£4,855.40	£3,537.65	£6,207.08	£6,872.83	£1,832.44
	National Insurance	£18.25	£3.31	£0.00	£24.17	£0.00	£0.00
	Superannuation	£930.67	£465.41	£416.22	£616.56	£495.25	£278.53
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£12,412.53</b>	<b>£5,324.12</b>	<b>£3,953.87</b>	<b>£6,847.81</b>	<b>£7,368.08</b>	<b>£2,110.97</b>
<b>Mace Bearers</b>	Salaries	£6,231.31	£11,024.18	£10,443.26	£11,893.63	£12,050.37	£6,914.51
	National Insurance	£25.28	£296.22	£335.19	£449.26	£564.45	£211.49
	Superannuation	£0.00	£412.30	£393.98	£526.80	£723.08	£372.92
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£6,256.59</b>	<b>£11,732.70</b>	<b>£11,172.43</b>	<b>£12,869.69</b>	<b>£13,337.90</b>	<b>£7,498.92</b>
<b>Assistants</b>	Salaries	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£84.24	£67.64	£0.00
	National Insurance	£8.46	£0.00	£0.00	£6.26	£6.38	£0.00
	Superannuation	£15.99	£0.00	£0.00	£12.80	£9.62	£0.00
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£24.45</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>	<b>£103.30</b>	<b>£83.64</b>	<b>£0.00</b>
<b>Mayor's vehicle</b>	Maintenance costs	£3,183.95	£2,319.38	£2,760.95	£1,870.55	£1,036.51	£2,236.90
	Hire/Lease charges	£1,757.49	£4,393.13	£4,393.13	£4,782.55	£40.00	£270.83
	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£4,941.44</b>	<b>£6,712.51</b>	<b>£7,154.08</b>	<b>£6,653.10</b>	<b>£1,076.51</b>	<b>£2,507.73</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£23,635.01</b>	<b>£23,769.33</b>	<b>£22,280.38</b>	<b>£26,473.90</b>	<b>£21,866.13</b>	<b>£12,117.62</b>

3.2.4. The Mayor's vehicle is currently owned by the Council.

#### 4. Alternative Models

4.1. Investigate other potential operating models:

4.1.1. A request was submitted to the Monitoring Officers of the Council in post at the time requesting information on potential operating models. The three models identified within the information provided was:

- 4.1.1.1. Leader with Cabinet + Mayor/Chairman
- 4.1.1.2. Leader with Committees + Mayor/Chairman
- 4.1.1.3. Elected Mayor

4.1.2. In simple terms at a district council level, a borough council has a Mayor and a district council has a Chairman. Both largely undertake the same role of chairing full Council meetings, but the Mayor would normally have a larger ceremonial role in the district.

4.1.3. Under section 245 of the Local Government Act 1972 a District Council may petition Her Majesty praying for the Grant of a Charter. The decision to petition must be passed by a resolution of 2/3 of the members voting at a meeting of the Council specially convened for that purpose and with notice of the subject matter.

4.1.4. If on the advice of her Privy Council Her Majesty sees fit to do so she may grant a charter to confer on the district the status of a borough. Thereafter:

- 4.1.4.1. The Council of the District will bear the name of the Council of the Borough



4.1.4.2. The chair and vice chair of the council will be entitled to the style of Mayor and Deputy Mayor of the Borough.

4.1.5. It was indicated that the Council may need to take external legal advice to understand the implications and process for reverting from a borough to a district council.

4.1.6. An elected mayor is a different approach and to go down this route it would require a referendum of the whole borough.

4.2. Identify examples of councils in our locality that operate a different model

4.2.1. The sub-group have undertaken a benchmarking exercise to establish detail on models for operating a mayoralty function. Of the 12 responses received 7 operate a Mayoral function and 5 operate a Council Chair model. Responses are summarised in the table below, with full detail included in Appendix 3:

Council	Does your Council have a mayor?
Amber Valley	Yes
Bassetlaw	Yes
Broxtowe	Yes
Braintree	No
Cannock Chase	No
Mendip	No
Newcastle	Yes
South Staffordshire	No
Stafford	Yes
Tamworth	Yes
West Suffolk	No
Worcester	Yes

4.3. Review implications and costs associated with those alternative models:

4.3.1. As indicated above, the Council would require external legal advice to fully understand the legal implications of moving away from a Mayoral model, and as such Members are unable to ascertain the implications and costs fully. There are likely to be significant cost implications, for example if the authority moves from a borough to a district there will be significant amounts of branding etc that would need to be revised.

## 5. **Conclusions**

5.1. The role of the Mayorality within the Council is long established, and on the whole appears to work well in terms of engaging with the public, raising the profile of the council, and in supporting charitable works.

5.2. Statistical data gathered shows costs have remained relatively stable (the pandemic had noticeable temporary effects on the scale of Mayoral operations), and qualitative interview data showed high levels of citizen satisfaction from those who come into contact with the Mayorality.

5.3. The review itself was wide ranging, and has been running since February 2021. It has explored the events the Mayorality attends, the processes involved, and the costs associated. In doing so it has discussed a number of potential ways forward, from simple communication

improvements through to more radical moves such as changing to a district council model (included here purely as an example of the scope of discussions, the complexity/costs associated for this were considerable).

5.4. This review makes recommendations for the future; with the majority of the recommendations made around the theme of raising the profile of the Mayoralty, stemming from discussions around the qualitative data collection, and the public 2020/2021 budget consultation survey responses.

5.5. The review suggests that:

5.5.1. The Council Mayoralty web & social media presence be enhanced. This recommendation comes from member examination of the mayoralty webpage, qualitative interview responses from the Mayor / previous Mayors, and inference from the budget consultation survey responses, which indicated value in raising awareness of Mayoral activities. The current website is a basic one page layout and lacks the multi-media elements of imagery, videos, infographics etc necessary to engage with the younger generation. It also lacks some easily rectifiable features, such as hyperlinks to the nominated charities of the Mayor, and more easily accessible information on the types of event the mayoralty supports. It is also unclear to the public currently what the calendar appointments for the mayor are, which lowers transparency in the mayoralty.

5.5.2. The Council produce additional PR relating to Mayoral events. Qualitative interview discussions indicate a great many pictures are taken at events, however statistical analysis indicates only a subset (a subset is appropriate, the question is whether it is the right subset) of these lead to either a press release or information on a relevant webpage/social network feed. While it is not appropriate for every event to generate a press release (commercial events for example are likely to generate their own publicity managed by the organisations in question), those with special connection to the social fabric of the community could usefully be covered more.

5.5.3. The Council encourage ward members to highlight the potential benefits of Mayoral visits in discussion with relevant community groups and businesses. This recommendation came out of the qualitative discussions, and a desire to ensure that all areas benefit from the mayoralty. This could be achieved in part through a relevant statement in weekly member briefings. It would also help members in identifying gaps in the mayoral calendar if this were made public further in advance than the current updates members receive in the weekly member briefing; as discussed in 5.5.1.

5.5.4. The Council produce more detailed documentation of the cost / benefit analysis of event attendance in relation to events outside the Staffordshire/South Derbyshire County boundaries. From statistical analysis, and qualitative data collection through Mayoral interviews, it is clear that relatively few events involve travel outside these areas. However, the resource costs from such events are higher, and we would therefore encourage more detailed written cost benefit justification be provided for these events, to help in decision making, and also to ensure transparency for the public in how funds are spent.

## **6. Recommendation(s) of the Committee**

6.1. The following high level recommendations are therefore put forward:

6.1.1. To improve the Council's web & social media presence for the Mayoralty.

6.1.2. To encourage the Council to produce additional press releases relating to the events the Mayor attends.

6.1.3. For the Council to encourage ward members to highlight the potential benefits of Mayoral visits in discussion with relevant community groups and businesses.

6.1.4. To encourage more detailed documentation of the cost / benefit justification for event attendance in relation to events outside the Staffordshire / South Derbyshire County boundaries.

## **7. Appendices**

7.1. Appendix 1: Mayoral Budget and Expenditure

7.2. Appendix 2: Mayoral Engagements

7.3. Appendix 3: Benchmarking Results

## **SECTION 2: OFFICER CONSIDERATIONS**

### **8. Financial Considerations**

*This section has been approved by the following member of the Financial Management Unit:  
**Lisa Turner***

8.1. The main financial issues arising from this Report are as follows:

8.1.1. There are no significant financial issues arising from the recommendations of the Committee.

### **9. Legal Considerations**

*This section has been approved by the following member of the Legal Team: **John Teasdale***

9.1. The main legal issues arising from this Report are as follows:

9.1.1. There are no significant legal issues arising from the recommendations of the Committee.

### **10. Risk Assessment and Management**

10.1. The main risks arising from this Report and the Council achieving its objectives are as follows:

10.2. **Positive** (Opportunities/Benefits):

10.2.1. Raising the profile of the mayoralty function as a community asset could improve the social value and charitable donations.

10.2.2. Cost benefit justification can help in decision making, and also ensure transparency of how funds are spent.

10.3. **Negative** (Threats):

10.3.1. Service managers will need to ensure relevant resource to manage additional PR and web content.

10.4. The risks do not need to be entered in the Risk Register.

10.5. Any financial implications to mitigate against these risks are considered above.

## 11. Equalities and Health

- 11.1. **Equality Impacts:** The subject of this Report is not a policy, strategy, function or service that is new or being revised. An equality and health impact assessment is not required at this time.
- 11.2. **Health Impacts:** The outcome of the health screening question does not require a full Health Impact Assessment to be completed. An equality and health impact assessment is not required.

## 12. Human Rights

- 12.1. There are no Human Rights issues arising from this Report.

## 13. Sustainability (including climate change and change adaptation measures)

- 13.1. Does the proposal result in an overall positive effect in terms of sustainability (including climate change and change adaptation measures) **Not applicable**