

The Remuneration of Councillors in London 2018

Report of the Independent Panel



Contents

Introduction	p3
The role of elected members	p3
Recruitment of councillors	p4
The current financial and political climate	p4
Level of Basic Allowance	p4
Special Responsibility Allowances	p5
Interpretation of the scheme	p5
Training and support	p6
Barriers to being a councillor	p6
Travel and Subsistence Allowances	p6
Allowances for Mayor or Civic Head	p6
Update for Inflation	p6
Appendix A	p7
Special responsibilities – beyond the basic allowance	
Appendix B	p10
On behalf of the community – a job profile for councillors	
Appendix C	p11
The independent panel members	

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, 2010 and 2014. It 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 are grateful for the feedback, which confirms that the existing London scheme of members' allowances is still fit for purpose. We make recommendations accordingly (**recommendations throughout the report are in bold type**). However, where issues have arisen from the comments we received, we have addressed them in this report.

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 originally included in our 2010 report. The feedback we have received is that it continues to be appropriate.

The Local Governance Research Unit, based at Leicester Business School, recently launched a Councillor Commission as an independent review of the role and work of the councillor. The Commission's report points out that councillors oversee million-pound budgets, balancing complex financial pressures at a time of severe cutbacks in local authority spending, making decisions which will affect their areas for decades to come. In London each Borough Council is responsible for services crucial to its residents. Each has a revenue budget of up to £1.4bn as well as a substantial capital programme. The scale of their turnover and other financial activities are in many instances comparable with those of large publicly quoted companies.

Councillors are faced with unenviable choices. Demand for local authority services continues to grow. In particular, there is rapid growth in the number of old people with a corresponding increase in demand for social care. London itself faces acute housing problems. Councillors have an increased responsibility for health. Thus the strain on and competition for resources increase the demands made on elected members. The responsibilities and accountabilities are made clear after a tragedy like the Grenfell Tower fire.

The evidence we received confirms that the workload and responsibilities of councillors continue to increase and that their role has become more complex, and not only in the areas of social care, housing and health. There has been growth in the number of sub-regional meetings, partnerships and joint bodies (such as Boards for Health & Wellbeing and Safer Neighbourhoods) which require the commitment and time of leaders, cabinet members and front-line councillors. Partnership engagement makes great demands on councillors. There has been a marked increase in informal meetings, such as working groups, forums and community gatherings as well as formal meetings like local authority companies. The expectations of the public continue to rise.

While valuable to democracy, the use of social media adds to the pressure on councillors by increasing demands from their constituents in several different ways. Communication with councillors is not only easier but immediate. The public expects a speedy response, so that it is now more difficult for councillors in employment to deal with concerns as quickly as voters expect. Not only do social media make it easier for their constituents to get hold of councillors, but they also enable an isolated concern to become an organised campaign.

Recruitment of councillors

We received evidence that it is increasingly difficult to recruit people of quality who are prepared to stand for office as councillors. Though the low level of allowances was mentioned as a reason for this, a major disincentive is the time commitment required of a councillor. That time commitment (as well as finance) can make it difficult to combine the role with a job and a family life. As one councillor commented to the Leicester Business School Commission, 'Serving on outside bodies means that I am working every day of the week, weekends too'. As was pointed out in responses we received, the problem is exacerbated in London, where councillors are on the whole younger than in other parts of the country and often in employment. They also face substantially higher costs of living.

Though the time commitment may be the main disincentive to service as a councillor, it is important that, as far as reasonably possible, financial loss does not prevent people from becoming councillors. 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. 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. 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.

Since our last report the Government has removed the possibility of councillors joining the local government pension scheme. We believe that access to the pension scheme can be an important factor in making service as a councillor financially possible for a wider range of people. It is particularly significant 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. Loss of access to a pension scheme imposes a further financial penalty on councillors.

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.

The current financial and political climate

Because of the current financial climate, the local government pay settlement in recent years has been severely limited. Since our last report there have been three awards of 1%. Acutely sensitive to the current financial austerity, some boroughs have frozen members' allowances and failed to apply the pay awards to them. Indeed some boroughs have even reduced members' allowances.

Our recent reports have 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 has led to some 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 and there remain substantial differences in the amount of special responsibility allowances. We fully recognise that now is not the time to contemplate a general increase in councillors' allowances. Nevertheless we hope that in the longer term the financial situation will permit further convergence of members' allowances around our recommendations.

Level of Basic Allowance

In our last report we recommended that there should be a Basic Allowance paid to every councillor of £10,703. Updated for the local government staff pay awards since then, the figure is now £11,045. Given the loss of pension rights; growth in the volume and complexity of the work of councillors; and the limited increase in the Basic Allowance since our last report, we believe that there is a strong case for considering a larger increase. The basic allowance is now less than the allowances paid by many similar authorities outside London. In Wales, for example, the government-

appointed commission sets the basic allowance at £13,400 for members of local authorities with populations which are generally substantially lower than those of London boroughs.

However we reluctantly accept that, in the current financial climate, it would be inappropriate to recommend a general increase in members' allowances (beyond the annual updating). Pegging an annual increase to staff pay awards will ensure that councillors can receive annual increases which are in line with those received by staff. **We therefore recommend that the Basic Allowance be set at £11,045.** We believe that it remains sensible to frame recommendations which are common across London.

Special Responsibility Allowances

Given the extent of the responsibilities of leaders of London boroughs, the Panel's first report in 2001 recommended that their remuneration should equate to that of a Member of Parliament. [Our recommendations for other special responsibility allowances are related to that recommended for leaders.]

Since then the increase in the remuneration of Members of Parliament has substantially exceeded the annual local government pay increase to which we tied the special responsibility allowance for the leader of a London borough. At the time of our last report an MP received a salary of £67,060 while our recommendation for a borough leader (increases having been restricted to the local government staff pay increases) was for total remuneration of £65,472, a difference of £1,588. Updated for the local government pay awards, our recommendation for the current total remuneration of a London borough leader would be £68,130. Meanwhile the salary of MPs has increased to £76,011, a difference of £7,881. Moreover MPs continue to be entitled to a pension as well as to sundry other benefits (such as termination payments) which are not available to leaders.

In our current consultation we enquired whether the remuneration of an MP remains a sound comparator to fix the remuneration of a borough leader. In general the responses agreed that the comparator was appropriate and, if anything, that the Leaders of London boroughs warranted a higher remuneration than an MP, because they had greater financial responsibility and legal burdens, and especially given the differential pension arrangements. Indeed one respondent authority suggested that the direct responsibilities of a Leader should command the salary of a Junior Minister.

We sympathise with the responses. Certainly the way in which MPs' remuneration has outpaced that of leaders would prompt a review of the Leaders' allowances had the Panel not had regard to the current stringent economic circumstances. For the same reasons which prompt us to peg the Basic Allowance, **we recommend that the special responsibility allowance for a Leader should be in accordance with our former recommendation, plus the subsequent local government staff pay awards, ie £57,085. We recommend the maintenance of its relation to other special responsibility allowances, as set out in the Appendix to this report.** Nevertheless we hope that parity of the remuneration of the Borough leaders with the remuneration of Members of Parliament will be restored when the economic situation eases and that the other Special Responsibility Allowances will then be adjusted accordingly.

Interpretation of the Scheme

The responses from the boroughs generally indicated no problems with interpretation of our recommendations, though many had adopted lower figures, especially for special responsibility allowances. We continue to believe that the scheme we propose is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the varying political management arrangements of different London boroughs. Specifically, we were asked for guidance on what percentage of councillors should receive a special responsibility allowance. **We reiterate our view that no more than 50% of councillors should receive a special responsibility allowance. We also continue to believe that no member should receive more than one special responsibility allowance though we accept that there might exceptionally be special circumstances where allocation of more than one Special Responsibility Allowance might be justified, eg where members undertake a number of different time-consuming roles such as sitting on licensing hearings.**

We were asked to give more detailed guidance on the roles allocated to different bands and whether these could be tied to the time commitment required of a role, expressed as a percentage of the time commitment of the Leader. However, we believe that the percentages we identify should be tied not only to time commitment but also to levels of responsibility.

Training and Support

The responsibilities of councillors are substantial, extensive and complex. We have mentioned the Grenfell Tower tragedy as a chilling instance of those responsibilities. **We believe that every borough should have an ongoing programme of member training and development and that members should be expected to participate. We believe that members should be provided with logistical and clerical support to help them deal with their workload.**

Barriers to being a councillor

It is important that obstacles to becoming a councillor should be removed wherever possible. Child care costs can be a significant deterrent to service as a councillor. **We repeat our strong view that in appropriate cases when they undertake their council duties, councillors should be entitled to claim an allowance for care of dependents. The dependents' carers' allowance should be set at the London living wage but (on presentation of proof of expense) payment should be made at a higher rate when specialist nursing skills are required.**

We also repeat our belief that members' allowances schemes should 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).

Travel and Subsistence allowances

We continue to believe that the Basic Allowance should cover basic out-of-pocket expenses incurred by councillors, including intra-borough travel costs and expenses. The members' allowances scheme should, however, provide for special circumstances, such as travel after late meetings or travel by councillors with disabilities. The scheme should enable councillors to claim travel expenses when their duties take them out of their home borough, including a bicycle allowance.

Allowances for Mayor or Civic Head

Many councils include the allowances for the mayor (or civic head) and deputy in their members' allowance scheme. However these allowances do serve a rather different purpose from the 'ordinary' members' allowances, since they are intended to enable the civic heads to perform a ceremonial role. There are separate statutory provisions (ss 3 and 5 of the Local Government Act 1972) for such allowances and councils may find it convenient to use those provisions rather than to include the allowances in the members' allowance scheme.

Update for inflation

We continue to recommend that for a period of four years the allowances we recommend should be updated annually in accordance with the headline figure in the annual local government pay settlement.

We have been asked whether it is necessary for the annual updating to be formally authorised by the council each year. The Regulations do seem to make this obligatory.

Sir Rodney Brooke CBE DL

Steve Bundred

Anne Watts CBE

London, January 2018

Appendix A

Basic allowance £11,045

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: £11,045

Band One allowance: £2,582 to £9,397

Total: £13,627 to £20,442

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 £11,045

Band two allowances: £16,207 to £29,797

Total: £27,252 to £40,842

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: £11,045

Band three allowance: £36,917 to £43,460

Total: £47,962 to £54,505

BAND FOUR

Leader of cabinet

This is a full-time job, involving a high level of responsibility and 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 £68,130.

This is made up as follows:

Basic allowance: £11,045

Band four allowance: £57,085.

Total: £68,130

BAND FIVE

Directly elected mayor

A directly elected mayor has 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 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 **£85,162**.

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 (for example, 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 CBE DL had 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.

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 and governance that spans the private, voluntary and public sectors with organisations including the Open University, the University of Surrey, the Commission for Equality and Human Rights and Business in the Community. She chaired the Appointments Commission.

