

The Remuneration of Councillors in London 2014

Report of the Independent Panel



Introduction

The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 ('the Regulations') authorise the establishment by the Association of London Government (now London Councils) of an independent remuneration panel to make recommendations in respect of the members' allowances payable by London boroughs. Such a panel ('the Panel') was established and reported in 2001, 2003, 2006 and 2010. It has been re-constituted and now comprises Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL (Chair), Steve Bundred and Anne Watts CBE.

The Regulations require a review of the scheme every four years as a minimum. The current Panel has therefore completed a review of remuneration for councillors in London. We present our findings and recommendations in this report.

As a preparation for our work, we invited all London boroughs to give their views on the operation of the existing scheme. We also invited comments from the Leaders' Committee of London Councils. We are grateful for the feedback, which confirms that the existing London scheme of members' allowances is still fit for purpose. We make recommendations accordingly.

The role of elected members

In our previous reports we reflected on the importance of the role of elected members. We repeat at Appendix B the job profile for councillors which we included in our 2010 report. In that report, we quoted the Government-appointed Councillors' Commission. The Commission took the view (which we continue to share) that: 'Allowances should be set at a level that enables people to undertake the role of councillor while not acting as an incentive to do so. Allowances are not shown by polls to be something which influences councillors to take on the role, though they are instrumental in making it possible for some people to do so. If it is important that there are no financial incentives to being a councillor, it is equally important that there should not be a financial disincentive.'

It is clearly desirable that service as a councillor is not confined to those with independent means. We do not repeat the arguments for appropriate remuneration for councillors which we have set out in our previous reports. We believe them to be self-evident. But we do repeat our belief in the importance of local democracy and the role of councillors within it. Each London Borough is responsible for services crucial to its residents. Each is responsible for a revenue budget of between £1.3bn and £3.3bn.

The responsibilities placed on local authorities continue to increase. The Localism Act 2011 devolved services to the boroughs, though, it was complained, without the resources to discharge them. From April 2013 London boroughs assumed the major new responsibility for health and wellbeing. Financial austerity brings substantial and further challenges to councillors: local authorities are required to make substantial cuts in their spending. Changes to the welfare system (particularly acute in London) give residual discretionary powers to local authorities. Councillors are faced with unenviable choices. Demand for local authority services continues to grow. In particular, there is exponential growth in the number of old people and a corresponding increase in demand for social care. The strain on and competition for resources increase the demands made on elected members.

Pensions

In the Panel's first report we recommended that councillors should be eligible for pensions. Councillors are often retired and currently have an average age of 60. It is increasingly desirable to attract a younger cohort of people to serve on councils. Access to a pension scheme is one way of achieving this. Councillors – especially those with lead responsibilities – must surrender earning potential elsewhere, earning potential which would normally be pensionable. It seems perfectly reasonable that allowances attracted by service as a councillor should be pensionable.

The Government agreed with this view and the Regulations introduced the potential for councillors' allowances to be pensionable upon the recommendation of the relevant Independent Panel. Accordingly the Panel recommended that all London borough councillors under the age of 75 be eligible to join the local government pension scheme. Twenty two of the 32 London boroughs have accepted that recommendation.

In March 2014 the Government laid before Parliament Regulations which would end the right of councillors to enter the local government pension scheme. These Regulations would extend not only to councillors but also to elected mayors (including the Mayor of London) and members of the Greater London Assembly, though Police and Crime Commissioners would retain their right of access to the pension scheme.

Councillor Sir Merrick Cockell, Chairman of the Local Government Association and Chair of London Councils from 2006 until 2010, responded: 'The government's decision isn't about saving money, it is fundamentally about undermining the role of a councillor and undermining the role of local democracy'. He added: 'Fair remuneration is important so that people from all walks of life can afford to stand for office. Otherwise we risk local government becoming the exclusive preserve of a privileged few who have the luxury of time and money to spare.' His remarks were endorsed by Cllr Gary Porter, Leader of the Local Government Association's Conservative Group, who pointed out that 'councillors are spending more time supporting their constituents and working with external organisations such as GPs, schools, police, local businesses and voluntary organisations. Secondly, recruitment and retention is becoming increasingly difficult... the commitment involved can be a deterrent when set against a possible loss of earnings and a potentially negative effect on their careers.'

We believe that access to a pension scheme can be an important factor in making service as a councillor financially possible for a wider range of people. It is particularly important for those who, like elected mayors, leaders and portfolio holders, give most or all of their time to service in local government and lose the opportunity to contribute to a pension scheme elsewhere. We would very much like the Government to reconsider this decision.

The current financial and political climate

Our 2010 report made no recommendations for increasing the levels of members' allowances other than continuing provision for annual adjustments in accordance with the annual local government pay settlement. As the Government-appointed Councillors' Commission pointed out in their 2007 report, the recommendations of the London Panel had led to substantial convergence of members' allowances across London. Indeed, the Councillors' Commission recommended a similar system for the country as a whole. Following our recommendations, there is now considerable congruity in the basic allowance made by London boroughs. However, most London boroughs have not adopted our recommendations in their entirety.

Our recommended allowances are tied to the annual local government pay settlement. Because of the current financial climate, the local government pay settlement has been frozen in three of the last four years. In 2013/14 there was a 1% pay award. Acutely sensitive to the current financial austerity, only two boroughs increased members' allowances by that percentage. Indeed nine boroughs have reduced members' allowances since the date of our last report.

We are acutely aware that now is not the time to increase allowances made to councillors, though we continue to recommend that members' allowances be pegged to the annual local government pay settlement. Such pegging will ensure that councillors can receive annual increases which are in line with those received by staff. We fully accept that, in the current financial climate, it would be entirely inappropriate to increase members' allowances (beyond the annual updating). Nevertheless we hope that in the longer term the financial situation will permit further convergence of members' allowances around our recommendations. We continue to believe that the scheme we propose is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the different political management arrangements of different London boroughs. Our view is confirmed by the general response from the London boroughs.

Consultation with the boroughs

Level of allowances

In our consultation with the London boroughs we asked a number of questions. We enquired whether it was believed that the salary of an MP remains a sound comparator to fix the remuneration of a borough leader. [Our recommendations for other special responsibility allowances are related to that recommended for Leaders.] Members of Parliament currently receive a salary of £66,396, now rather more than our updated recommendation for the allowance for Leaders.

Though there was dissent from one Borough, another asserted that the Leader's allowance should reflect the total remuneration package paid to Members of Parliament. A different borough pointed out that whereas a Member of Parliament represented an electorate of 70,000 people, a leader was responsible for the delivery of a wide range of services to a population of 300,000 – an electorate of 220,000 across an area three times as large as a parliamentary constituency. Indeed, 'it is arguable that the responsibilities of some cabinet portfolio holders are greater than the local responsibilities of an MP' but 'on balance the salary of an MP is about as sound a comparator as is likely to be found'.

In considering the responses, we also took into account the remuneration payable to chairs and members of other public bodies. We continue to believe that the allowances we have recommended are suitable. In particular, we think it appropriate that Leaders should receive an allowance approximating to the salary of a Member of Parliament.

External paid appointments

There has been some controversy over councillors accepting paid appointments in other public bodies, given their cumulative remuneration. We asked the boroughs whether allowances should be adjusted to take into account external payments from other public bodies. One authority thought it reasonable to 'consider the balance of benefit to the local area before determining whether 'home' remuneration should be reduced accordingly'. Other boroughs disagreed.

We believe that if members take on extra work and responsibilities through undertaking external appointments, then they should be entitled to retain the remuneration attracted by those responsibilities. Of course the borough might reflect on the extent to which the external duties are compatible with the time required to discharge duties within the borough and adjust responsibilities accordingly.

Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board

These new bodies govern commissioning decisions across health, public health and social care. They must develop with commissioning groups a shared understanding of the health and wellbeing needs of the community. They must undertake a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and develop a joint strategy for how these needs can be best addressed. This will include recommendations for joint commissioning and integrating services across health and social care. The Boards must drive local commissioning of health care, social care and public health and create a more effective and responsive local health and care system. They must also address other services that impact on health and wellbeing such as housing and education.

It was recommended to us that the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board should receive a special responsibility allowance in Band Three, that designed for Cabinet members. We entirely agree: this is a statutory post conferring personal statutory responsibility. The role is of major importance to local government and should be remunerated accordingly where they are councillors. In practice we imagine that Chairs of Health and Wellbeing Boards will be members of the Cabinet and have been remunerated within Band Three since their creation.

Lead Member for Children's and Adult Services

It was suggested to us that the Lead Member for Children's Services should receive a special responsibility allowance higher than other Cabinet Members: 'The enhanced duty of safeguarding for the role of lead member for Children's Services and the time required to fulfil it makes the post a special case for an enhanced banding between the current bands three and four.'

We well understand the heavy responsibility on the lead member for Children's services and the consequences of any failure in the system. We are entirely sympathetic to the view that the responsibility might warrant a higher special responsibility allowance than other Cabinet members. In our 2010 report we specifically contemplated the different weight of responsibilities of different portfolios and suggested that they might justify different allowances. Our recommended Band Three for Cabinet Members has a range of over £6,000 and we believe that this is sufficient to enable boroughs to differentiate between the different weights of portfolios should they so decide.

It has also been suggested to us that the lead member responsible for adult safeguarding has a degree of responsibility equal to that of the lead member for children's services. We are not convinced of the comparison.

Given the different allocation of responsibilities in different boroughs, we do not make specific recommendations on differentiating special responsibility allowances for Cabinet members within Band Three.

Dependants' Carers' Allowance

The Regulations authorise the payment to councillors of an allowance ('the Dependants' Carers' Allowance') in respect of the expenses of arranging for the care of children or dependants when the councillor attends meetings or is engaged in other official duties. We received representations that the Allowance should be not less than the living wage.

We strongly believe that the boroughs should make a dependants' carers' allowance available to their members. Access to a dependants' carers' allowances can make it possible for a wider range of people to serve on their councils. Specifically by payment of dependants' carers' allowance, boroughs can attract some who would not normally expect to become councillors. 26 of the 32 boroughs provide in their allowances scheme for payment of dependants' carers' allowances. In those boroughs which do make a payment, allowances vary from £5.27 to £9.26 per hour (in one case £15 per hour for specialised care).

We recognise the need for payments to pay regard to local circumstances and the nature of specialist care. We believe that ordinary care should be remunerated at not less than the London living wage of £8.60 per hour; and (on presentation of proof of expense) payment should be made at a higher rate when specialist nursing skills are required.

Sickness, maternity and paternity leave

This issue has again been raised with us. We adhere to our recommendations in the 2006 report, repeated in 2010, namely that councils should make arrangements in their members' allowances schemes to allow the continuance of special responsibility allowances in the case of sickness, maternity and paternity leave in the same terms that the council's employees enjoy such benefits (that is to say, they follow the same policies).

Members of social care and health scrutiny panels and corporate parenting panel

One borough suggested that service on the Social Care and Health Scrutiny Panels and the Corporate Parenting Panel should be placed within Band One because of the risk profile of those roles.

We continue to recommend that the responsibility allowance payable under Band One should include membership of committees, sub-committees and adoption panels where membership requires attendance with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods. If a Council believes that such memberships are substantially more onerous than service on other committees, then we agree that they would be appropriately remunerated on Band One.

Travel and subsistence allowances

We have been asked to give advice on travel and subsistence allowances. We continue to believe that the Basic Allowance should cover all reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred by councillors, including intra-borough travel costs and expenses, though councils may consider that there are circumstances where it may be appropriate for a scheme to provide payment for the cost of transport, e.g. journeys home after late meetings, and for people with disabilities. We also continue to believe that, where travel and subsistence allowances are payable, they should be in accordance with the current scheme for travel and subsistence applicable to the Borough's staff; and that travel allowances should extend to travel by bicycle.

Update for inflation

We continue to recommend that the allowances we recommend should be updated annually in accordance with the headline figure in the annual local government pay settlement.

Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL

Steve Bundred

Anne Watts CBE

London

1 June 2014

Appendix A

Basic allowance £10,703

Special responsibilities – beyond the basic allowance

The case for special allowances

The reasons for payment of additional special responsibility allowances should be clearly set out in local allowances schemes. Special allowances should come into play only in positions where there are significant differences in the time requirements and levels of responsibility from those generally expected of a councillor.

Calculation of special allowances

The proposed amounts for each band are a percentage of the figure suggested for a council leader depending upon levels of responsibility of the roles undertaken and are explained below. We believe that the SRA, which the previous panel recommended for the leader of a London council (updated), continues to be appropriate.

Categories of special allowances

The regulations specify the following categories of responsibility for which special responsibility allowances may be paid:

- Members of the executive where the authority is operating executive arrangements
- Acting as leader or deputy leader of a political group within the authority
- Presiding at meetings of a committee or sub-committee of the authority, or a joint committee of the authority and one or more other authorities, or a sub-committee of such a joint committee
- Representing the authority at meetings of, or arranged by, any other body
- Membership of a committee or sub-committee of the authority which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods
- Acting as spokesperson of a political group on a committee or sub-committee of the authority
- Membership of an adoption panel
- Membership of a licensing or regulatory committee
- Such other activities in relation to the discharge of the authority's functions as require of the member an amount of time and effort equal to or greater than would be required of him by any one of the activities mentioned above, whether or not that activity is specified in the scheme.

Local discretion

It is for the councils locally to decide how to allocate their councillors between the different bands, having regard to our recommendations and how to set the specific remuneration within the band. They must have regard to our recommendations. We believe these should have the merits of being easy to apply, easy to adapt, easy to explain and understand, and easy to administer.

BAND ONE

The posts we envisage falling within band one include:

- Vice chair of a service, regulatory or scrutiny committee
- Chair of sub-committee
- Leader of second or smaller opposition group
- Service spokesperson for first opposition group
- Group secretary (or equivalent) of majority group
- First opposition group whip (in respect of council business)
- Vice chair of council business
- Chairs, vice chairs, area committees and forums or community leaders
- Cabinet assistant
- Leadership of a strategic major topic
- Acting as a member of a committee or sub-committee which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods
- Acting as a member of an adoption panel where membership requires attendance with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods
- Leadership of a specific major project.

Remuneration

We propose that band one special responsibility allowances should be on a sliding scale of between 20 – 30 per cent of the remuneration package for a council leader.

This would be made up as follows:

Basic allowance: £10,703

Band one allowance: £2,392 to £8,941

Total: £13,095 to £19,644

BAND TWO

The types of office we contemplate being within band two are:

- Lead member in scrutiny arrangements, such as chair of a scrutiny panel
- Representative on key outside body
- Chair of major regulatory committee e.g. planning
- Chair of council business (civic mayor)
- Leader of principal opposition group
- Majority party chief whip (in respect of council business).

Remuneration

We propose that band two allowances should be on a sliding scale between 40 – 60 per cent, pro rata of the remuneration package for a council leader.

This is made up as follows:

Basic allowance £10,703

Band two allowances: £15,486 to £28,581

Total: £26,189 to £39,284

BAND THREE

We see this band as appropriate to the following posts:

- Cabinet member
- Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board
- Chair of the main overview or scrutiny committee
- Deputy leader of the council

Remuneration:

We propose that band three allowances should be between 70 – 80 per cent pro rata of the remuneration package for a council leader.

This is made up as follows:

Basic allowance: £10,703

Band three allowance: £35,128 to £41,675

Total: £45,831 to £52,378

BAND FOUR

Leader of cabinet, including a strong leader.

This is a full-time job, involving a high level of responsibility and now includes the exercise of executive responsibilities. It is right that it should be remunerated on a basis which compares with similar positions in the public sector, while still retaining a reflection of the voluntary character of public service.

Remuneration:

We propose that the remuneration package for a council leader under band four of our scheme should be £64,824.

This is made up as follows:

Basic allowance: £10,703

Band four allowance: £54,769

Total: £65,472

BAND FIVE

Directly elected mayor

A directly elected mayor is a full-time job with a high level of responsibility and exercises executive responsibilities over a fixed electoral cycle. It is right that it should be remunerated on a basis which compares with similar positions in the public sector, while still retaining a reflection of the voluntary character of public service. However we believe this post remains different to that of the strong leader with cabinet model. The directly elected mayor is directly elected by the electorate as a whole. The strong leader holds office at the pleasure of the council and can be removed by the council. We believe that the distinction is paramount and this should be reflected in the salary level.

Remuneration:

We propose that a band five directly elected mayor should receive a remuneration package of 25 per cent higher than that recommended for a council leader and that it should be a salary set at **£81,839**.

Appendix B

On behalf of the community – a job profile for councillors

Purposes:

1. To participate constructively in the good governance of the area.
2. To contribute actively to the formation and scrutiny of the authority's policies, budget, strategies and service delivery.
3. To represent effectively the interests of the ward for which the councillor was elected, and deal with constituents' enquiries and representations.
4. To champion the causes which best relate to the interests and sustainability of the community and campaign for the improvement of the quality of life of the community in terms of equity, economy and environment.
5. To represent the council on an outside body, such as a charitable trust or neighbourhood association.

Key Tasks:

1. To fulfil the statutory and local determined requirements of an elected member of a local authority and the authority itself, including compliance with all relevant codes of conduct, and participation in those decisions and activities reserved to the full council (forexample, setting budgets, overall priorities, strategy).
2. To participate effectively as a member of any committee or panel to which the councillor is appointed, including related responsibilities for the services falling within the committee's (or panel's) terms of reference, human resource issues, staff appointments, fees and charges, and liaison with other public bodies to promote better understanding and partnership working.
3. To participate in the activities of an outside body to which the councillor is appointed, providing two-way communication between the organisations. Also, for the same purpose, to develop and maintain a working knowledge of the authority's policies and practices in relation to that body and of the community's needs and aspirations in respect of that body's role and functions.
4. To participate in the scrutiny or performance review of the services of the authority, including where the authority so decides, the scrutiny of policies and budget, and their effectiveness in achieving the strategic objectives of the authority.
5. To participate, as appointed, in the area and in service-based consultative processes with the community and with other organisations.
6. To represent the authority to the community, and the community to the authority, through the various forums available.
7. To develop and maintain a working knowledge of the authority's services, management arrangements, powers/duties, and constraints, and to develop good working relationships with relevant officers of the authority.
8. To develop and maintain a working knowledge of the organisations, services, activities and other factors which impact upon the community's well-being and identity.
9. To contribute constructively to open government and democratic renewal through active encouragement of the community to participate generally in the government of the area.
10. To participate in the activities of any political group of which the councillor is a member.
11. To undertake necessary training and development programmes as agreed by the authority.
12. To be accountable for his/her actions and to report regularly on them in accessible and transparent ways.

Appendix C

The independent panel members

Sir Rodney Brooke has a long career in local government, including as chief executive of West Yorkshire County Council, Westminster City Council and the Association of Metropolitan Authorities. He was knighted in 2007 for his contribution to public service and is currently chairman of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Steve Bundred was chairman of Monitor, chief executive of the Audit Commission and chief executive of the London Borough of Camden.

Anne Watts CBE has an extensive career in equality and diversity that spans the private, voluntary and public sectors with organisations including the Open University, the Commission for Equality and Human Rights and Business in the Community. She chaired the NHS Appointments Commission.

