

Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

January 2007



Contents

Introduction	2
The panel	3
The task	4
Principles	4
Recommendations and reasoning	6
Appendix A – list of recommendations	17
Appendix B – documents list	19

References

All references in the text refer to the source's number in the documents list.

Contact

If you'd like more information about this report, please contact Dan Hyslop, Senior Committee Manager on 020 8891 7275 or d.hyslop@richmond.gov.uk

Introduction

None of us as panel members have been involved in Council work whether as councillors or officers though we do have considerable experience in voluntary work. When we started, we had not appreciated the level of allowances that were being paid and the associated complexities.

Bearing in mind that trustees of charities today carry considerable responsibility and accountability and are not allowed to receive any benefit from their trusteeship, we were particularly interested in understanding the basis on which allowances were paid to councillors.

From the papers that we reviewed and from the interviews, it was generally agreed that a proportion of the time committed by councillors should be considered as voluntary and that this had been taken into account in setting the current allowances.

All those interviewed volunteered that they had not decided to stand for election because of the allowance that they would receive, though a few said that with the knowledge they now had of the time commitment, they would not be able to stand without receiving some financial allowance.

We were very struck by the great disparity between allowances paid by London boroughs. For almost all posts, Richmond allowances were well below the average – and very near to the lowest for many.

The more people we interviewed, the more difficult it became to reach a logical and fair judgment because there were no job descriptions and no times set for doing the jobs and a very wide range of figures were suggested. A number of people said they were giving the equivalent of what would be a full working week to their roles. Was this because they had to or because they wanted to? If they did not have capital, alternative income or a partner bringing in a good income could they afford to do the job? What was the basis on which the allowances should be set? How important is it that we should have diversity amongst our councillors?

In the interest of fairness to councillors and to the electorate – who provide the money to pay allowances through their council tax – we became convinced that these questions needed to be answered. If it should be payment for a job done, then what should be the comparative basis? If a proper reward, it would cost very considerably more.

This, in our view, is a decision for the council and potentially one that could evoke strong reactions from the electorate, but that is the responsibility of political leadership.

Once the decision as to the basis of payment is made, we consider that it should then be up to the council to approve the job descriptions and minimum times needed and to propose a budget for payment – by position and in total – and to submit this to an independent panel for review. It may well be that in doing this a consultation with the electorate be considered as part of the process. This again is for the council to decide.

On behalf of the panel, I would like to thank all the councillors who came to see us and

who completed the questionnaires and made submissions.

We found it a very interesting and challenging assignment. We appreciate having been given the responsibility to do this work. We are very aware that what we are recommending may prove to be politically controversial but we believe that in everyone's interests it must be done.

Finally, I would like to thank Dan Hyslop, who with assistance from other staff in Democratic Services, has co-ordinated our work, supplied us with the many documents that we have reviewed and found the information that we have requested, for his support, advice and good humour throughout.

Nick Tarsh (chair)
January 2007

Jo Gumb

Jenny Hilton

The panel

Nick Tarsh (chair) is now retired having worked for 34 years in the tourism business. He has spent the last 12 years with a variety of local and national charities including Relate, Richmond, Kingston and Hounslow, SPEAR, Richmond CVS and Richmond Parish Lands Charity. He is the current national chairman of Relate. He has lived in the borough for 46 years and was awarded an OBE for services to Relate, charity and the community in Richmond.

Baroness Jenny Hilton spent 34 years in the Metropolitan Police and another 15 as a Labour Peer in the House of Lords. She is chair of the Teddington Society and has lived in the borough for 35 years.

Jo Gumb is a publisher and editor of 20 years experience. She works for Newsquest (London) Ltd, which publishes the Richmond and Twickenham Times Series among other titles.

The task

1. The panel was established by the council's Cabinet in July 2006 and asked to make recommendations on:
 - The amount of basic allowance which should be paid to all members
 - The categories of members who should receive special responsibility allowances and the amount of such allowances
 - The amount of the childcare and dependent carers' allowances
 - Travelling and subsistence allowances
 - Co-optees' allowances
 - Allowances for the independent chair and members of the Standards Committee
2. The panel met on four occasions in December 2006 and January 2007. It reviewed a huge number of documents as well as commissioning a variety of information for its own use (see appendix B). Councillors and co-optees were surveyed with response rates of 41% (22) and 95% (21) respectively. Three submissions were received from members of the public.
3. By far the most useful part of the review was a series of interviews with 16 councillors and three co-optees. The panel would like to thank them all for their time and the interest they showed in its work.

Principles

Key principles

4. The panel was guided by the following three principles throughout its work:
 - It does not consider it its responsibility to set the overall budget for allowances; this is a political decision. The panel's recommendations are based on the current structure of allowances.
 - The panel set time and responsibility as its guiding principles in determining levels of the basic allowance and SRAs. It also wished to take into account the encouragement of diversity among council members and co-optees.
 - The panel considers it unfortunate that job descriptions with time commitments, levels of responsibilities and standards of performance do not exist.

London Councils

5. The panel is required to have regard to the recommendations of the Independent Panel to London Councils. It was very pleased to consider all its reports, particularly the 2006 version which was published during the panel's existence¹⁴.

6. London Councils recommend payments for many of the special responsibility allowances at such high levels to suggest they believe the posts are full time jobs. The panel feels London Councils' report should be treated with care until the issues around job descriptions and time spent as councillor are resolved in Richmond upon Thames.
7. Finally, the proposed figures are unrealistic within the context of the council's budget and the growing financial constraints faced by local authorities.

Recommendations and reasoning

8. The panel's recommendations come in three parts. The first sets out some fundamental points, which prevent it from making a truly accurate assessment of how much councillors should be paid. The report explains what needs to change.
9. The second part lists the amendments the panel feels should be made to allowances, based on the evidence it has gathered.
10. The final part deals with minor payments and recommendations.

Job descriptions

11. The panel spent considerable time trying to conclude a simple question: what is it councillors actually do? As this was gradually understood, it prompted further questions. Do they and others know what they do? Is there any way to ensure they do what they're supposed to?
12. These are fundamental when considering allowances, as without answers, the panel cannot be certain what the council would be paying councillors to do.
13. Equally, not all parts of a job deserve the same remuneration. As one of the interviewees explained, he felt the payment was for representing his constituents, not pursuing his political hobby-horses. Also, in spite of repeated questions, the panel never really found out from its interviewees what the minimum requirement was for their posts.
14. Detailed job descriptions will provide much needed clarity, not only for a future independent panel, but for councillors themselves, officers and the public.
15. Recommendation one covers all posts, whether receiving a special responsibility allowance (SRA) or not. This includes vice chairs of scrutiny committees, the mayor and so on.
16. Recommendation eight discusses what the council should do if councillors do not fulfil the requirements of their job.

RECOMMENDATION 1

There should be detailed job descriptions for all specially remunerated posts as well as those covered by the basic allowance. These job descriptions should detail specific responsibilities and time requirements. A basic job description should also be drawn up for all councillors and co-optees.

Why should allowances be paid?

17. The panel believes there is widespread uncertainty both within the council and nationally about the reason why allowances are paid. This was evidenced not only in the interviews, but also in the wide range of recommendations for allowances submitted in response to the survey questionnaire.
18. Traditionally, councillors' allowances were akin to those claimed (or not) by school governors or magistrates, which are clearly a token acknowledgement for important voluntary service. As the responsibilities of councillors increase, this must be reconsidered and the fundamental question addressed of whether the role has substantially changed from one of pro bono community service, to one which is closer to a salaried role.
19. Another important consideration of the panel was diversity. It is pleased that Richmond's councillors are generally more representative of the local population than either London or English councillors²⁵, but there is more to diversity than this.
20. The panel hopes that the allowances scheme can be changed to open up more posts to more councillors. If increased remuneration means a talented member can give up part or all the time allotted to their job and devote more time to being a councillor, it could be a good thing and of benefit to the borough.
21. It is widely accepted that almost no-one becomes a councillor for the money, in fact none of the panel's interviewees admitted to knowing what the basic allowance was when they agreed to stand.
22. There was an interesting argument put forward that time is a much bigger limiting factor on diversity than money²⁰. This is quite possibly true and is a fundamental argument at the heart of the allowances debate, which the council must resolve itself and take into account in deciding the job descriptions (see above).
23. The panel heard conflicting evidence about the role of councillors during the interviews. There seems to be a divide within the council about whether they are merely decision makers and policy setters or have wider management responsibilities. This needs to be settled.
24. The panel did reach a conclusion on the role of the leader and believes that this is a full time position and should be paid at a rate closer to the London average. Its reasoning is set out in full below.

RECOMMENDATION 2

The council should reach a conclusion as to the basis of payment of allowances.

Are allowances?

- 1) intended as wages for a full or part-time job**
- 2) intended as compensation for loss of potential earnings**
- 3) a recognition for additional voluntary work on behalf of the community, or,**
- 4) a combination of the above, or paid on some other basis**

Future review

25. Given the lack of clarity about the role, responsibilities and time commitment of councillors, the panel considered it would be irresponsible and wrong to pluck numbers out of the air for posts where there is no clear evidence of what work is required for the payment.
26. Once the council has decided the basis for paying allowances and written appropriate job descriptions – with minimum time requirements – the whole area should be reviewed again.

RECOMMENDATION 3

There should be another review of allowances in time for the 2008 budget, taking into account the additional information available from the detailed job descriptions – with minimum time requirements – and the council's views on recommendation two.

Basic allowance

27. All the evidence the panel had was overwhelmingly in favour of no change to councillors' basic allowance^{20and 21}. This is also one of very few positions where Richmond pays above the London average.²³
28. While it is clear that there is a substantial difference in the time that councillors put in (amounts of between 10 and 30 hours a week were quoted at the interviews), this doesn't justify any change, even for the hardest workers. Job descriptions and a clawback scheme should deal with any member not putting in sufficient time.
29. The panel was particularly impressed with the attitude of the backbench councillors interviewed who all felt quite strongly that minor posts and committee responsibilities were part of the basic allowance.

Leader of the Council

30. The panel believes it can make a long-term recommendation on the leader's allowance without the detailed job description that it feels is essential for all other posts (although the panel considers that a detailed job description should still be drawn up).
31. This is a full time post. While there were arguments against it being full time, they were backed up with little hard evidence. The range of formal and informal meetings with other councillors, officers and residents, representing the council at partner organisations and other bodies in and outside the borough as well as all the associated planning and administration, makes the leader's job full time.
32. On top of the time commitment, the post has vast personal responsibility and is accountable to the public for a large organisation spending more than £200 million

a year. The responsibility is considerably more than any other councillor and it is right that the leader is remunerated appropriately.

33. The panel notes that Richmond's leader is one of the lowest paid in London²³ and also receives substantially less than the local average.²⁸ He does not do any less work or have any less responsibility than his opposite numbers in boroughs paying double Richmond's allowance – and more.
34. The London average allowance for leaders is just above £35,000²³. The panel recommends a staged increase of £5,000 per year for the next three years.

Deputy Leader

35. The panel is unclear how the deputy leader's role differs greatly from other cabinet members. The leader will delegate some of his functions, but until the council has job descriptions setting out which these are and how long they take, major changes to the allowance cannot be recommended.
36. Despite this, the disparity between the deputy leader and other cabinet members is too small, which is why the panel supports a slight increase at this time, pending recommendation three.

Cabinet Members

37. This role has had the greatest change in recent years and continues to evolve as the cabinet system develops. It is the most in need of a job description and the panel took some time to be really clear what a cabinet member does and how that differs from the role of senior officers. It seems that this job can be done in different ways taking different amounts of time, with different models of cabinet member.
38. Some cabinet posts have less work than others. Instinctively the panel is against different allowances for the same job, but job descriptions may make this advisable in the future.
39. The present allowance was considered appropriate and in line with the current structure, based on the levels of time and responsibility.

Leader of the Opposition

40. The panel considered this to be the second most important job in the council after the leader. In the interests of local democracy, it is essential that the post be remunerated sufficiently to give the postholder time to do the job thoroughly.
41. When discussing the leader's allowance, the importance of status was mentioned. The status of the leader of the opposition should be no less than that of the deputy leader, which is why their allowances have been made the same.

42. Some councils vary the payments to their opposition leaders according to the number of councillors in their groups²⁸. The panel considered that this is wrong, as the importance of the role is always the same. If anything, the opposition's role becomes more important, the larger the majority of the ruling group.

Deputy Leader of the Opposition

43. While acknowledging this is also an important position, as with the deputy leader of the council, the buck stops elsewhere.
44. The responsibility and time commitment is considerably less than a scrutiny chair, which justifies a distinction. While a reduction was considered, on balance, the allowance is appropriate and in line with current structure based on levels of time and responsibility.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Co-ordinating Group Chair

45. The panel agrees this should continue to be paid at the same rate as cabinet members to uphold the important status of scrutiny.
46. In the past, this post has been held by the vice chair of a scrutiny committee⁴ and it is suggested that the council amends its constitution so it is only held by a chair. As the postholder herself acknowledged, the work involved with the co-ordinating group itself is not great. It is only reasonable to pay this level of allowance if the chair is also running their own committee.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) Chairs

47. Almost everyone the panel spoke to or consulted supports an increase to this allowance^{20 and 21}, with many feeling it should not have been cut in 2006. The panel agrees.
48. Like the role of opposition, the role of scrutiny in a democracy is vital and the allowance should reflect this.
49. The point about status is one to which it is worth returning. OSC chairs have a different kind of responsibility from cabinet members and there is a perception that the recent reduction in their allowance means they are not always treated with the respect they're due, particularly by officers. An increased allowance will go some way to indicating their important place in the council's structure.
50. While the panel considered making this allowance identical to cabinet members, the lower time commitment of OSC chairs, as demonstrated at the interviews, justifies a smaller payment.

Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee

51. The chair of the Planning Committee has the greatest level of responsibility outside the cabinet. The post can also be incredibly stressful, dealing as it does with frustrated members of the public. It requires considerable knowledge of planning law and involves considerably more meetings than any other committee.
52. The panel considers that this post is rightly paid at the same rate as a cabinet member.
53. While the vice chair has less responsibility, unlike other vice chairs, the postholder will always have to chair some meetings, which justifies the allowance.

Chair of the Majority Group

54. From the panel's understanding of this role (it would have been helpful had the postholder been interviewed), it is both a whip and a representative of the majority group's leadership to its backbenchers. This means it is a political role, which the taxpayer should not be paying for.
55. In the interviews, many councillors said they did not expect to be remunerated for political duties. The panel agrees and believes this should include political work inside the council, as well as active campaigning amongst the electorate.
56. The panel might revise its opinion were it to see a job description proving otherwise, but without one, it cannot see how this allowance is justified.

Chair of Standards Committee

57. The chair was one of the most impressive people the panel interviewed and it applauds the work she and her committee are doing.
58. While the actual time spent on the four annual standards committee meetings is small, the chair does a considerable amount of additional work, attending meetings and training, and ensuring the council takes a proactive line on standards issues. This in itself reduces the number of complaints to the committee. The increased allowance is dependent on this work continuing.
59. Chair of Standards is also an incredibly responsible post, requiring considerable specialist knowledge and a legal mind. Changes to the way complaints are dealt with mean the time commitment is likely to increase as more are dealt with locally.

Chair and Vice Chair of Regulatory Committee

60. This committee's main role is to form sub-committees to determine licensing applications as well as a variety of other duties.

61. The chair's allowance is appropriate and in line with the current structure based on levels of time and responsibility.
62. The allowance to the vice chair is no longer justified. While the postholder will occasionally chair licensing sub-committees, there are few of these now, compared to the flood of meetings in 2005. Equally, it is unclear what additional responsibility the post has beyond a scrutiny committee vice chair or an assistant cabinet member.

Chairs of Investment and Audit Committees

63. The panel is disappointed that neither chair was interviewed, as it would have helped the panel members reach a better understanding of their roles.
64. While both committees have a small number of meetings, they do have important responsibilities, running the pension fund and providing input into the audit process respectively. On balance, the allowances are appropriate and in line with the current structure based on levels of time and responsibility.

Assistant Cabinet Members (ACMs)

65. While the panel is appreciative of the work of the ACM who came to be interviewed and explained his role, it does not believe on current evidence that these posts should be remunerated.
66. Whenever interviewees were asked which allowances – if any – should be cut, ACMs were the most popular choice. Few councillors even seem to understand what they do.
67. It is perverse to expect all non-SRA members to do identical amounts of work. It should be accepted that small bits of additional responsibility are taken on free to help develop the councillor or pursue a particular interest.

Co-optees

68. The panel's second recommendation does not apply to co-optees, as it is clear theirs is a voluntary role. The allowance is an acknowledgement of the very useful contributions they make and the time they put in.
69. Given this voluntary nature, the panel supports a small increase to bring the council more into line with other boroughs²⁸.
70. Some co-optees, including those interviewed, felt the payment should be per meeting. While sympathetic to this, the small amounts concerned do not justify the extra cost in administration. Regular non-attendance should be dealt with through the clawback recommendation.

Other posts

71. The panel discussed whether any additional posts should be remunerated. From the survey²¹ and interviews, there were three suggestions: the mayor, scrutiny vice chairs and members of adoptions panels.
72. The mayor is the public face of the borough and while this is undoubtedly a time consuming post, all the ex-mayors the panel met said it was incredibly enjoyable. Given the many day time commitments, the role can't be done by a working person. Many other boroughs pay their mayors, in some cases quite generously, but the panel feels this is the final vestige of the voluntary councillor. To be mayor is a privilege needing no further remuneration.
73. The panel feels scrutiny vice chairs share many of the characteristics of assistant cabinet members, being useful posts for teaching newer councillors the scrutiny process, or as a foil for the chair. As the panel argued regarding ACMs, it's impossible for all non-remunerated posts to do the same amount of work and scrutiny vice chairs should not be entitled to an SRA.
74. There was the greatest sympathy for members on adoptions panels, which are long and emotionally difficult daytime meetings and require some specialist knowledge. On balance, the panel has increased the responsibilities subsumed by the basic allowance and does not feel the duties of adoptions panel members warrant an SRA.

RECOMMENDATION 4

The following changes be made to the current allowances scheme:

Post	Current allowance	Recommended allowance
Basic allowance	£9,415	No change
Leader	£20,000	£25,000, rising to £35,000 by 2010
Deputy Leader	£15,000	£16,000
Cabinet Member	£10,000	No change
Leader of the Opposition	£10,000	£16,000
Deputy Leader of the Opposition	£5,000	No change
O&S Co-ordinating Group Chair	£10,000	No change
Other OSC Chairs	£5,000	£7,500
Chair of Planning Committee	£10,000	No change
Vice Chair of Planning Committee	£2,500	No change
Chair of Majority Group	£5,000	£0

Chair of Standards Committee	£2,500	£5,000
Chair of Regulatory Committee	£5,000	No change
Vice Chair of Regulatory Committee	£2,500	£0
Chair of Investment Committee	£2,500	No change
Chair of Audit Committee	£2,500	No change
Assistant Cabinet Members	£1,000	£0
Scrutiny co-optees	£300	£450
Standards co-optees	£200	£300

Travel allowances

75. Councillors have claimed less than £1,500 in travel allowances in the previous three years^{2, 3 and 4}, so their cost is hardly burdensome on the council. Some interviewees also said they don't make small claims.
76. The bicycle allowance is supported, but given the limitations on claiming, even large increases are unlikely to encourage uptake.
77. A number of surveys commented on the vehicle allowances seeming to reward high polluting machines²¹. The panel agrees there should be a single rate to encourage use of fuel efficient vehicles, but supports a slight increase on the lower figures as these allowances have not been increased for some time and are well below the Inland Revenue's approved rates.

RECOMMENDATION 5
Travel allowances be set as follows:
Bicycle: 50p per mile (no change)
Motorcycle: 10p per mile flat rate
Car: 38p per mile flat rate

Subsistence allowances

78. Councillors have claimed no subsistence allowances in the previous three years^{2, 3 and 4}. The rate is the same as for staff and the panel recommends this continue permanently.

RECOMMENDATION 6
Subsistence allowances be fixed at the staff rate.

Dependent carers' allowance

79. The lack of cover for childcare or other relatives can put people off becoming councillors and this allowance encourages diversity amongst members by offering a greater opportunity for those with dependents to be active in council business.
80. Some basic research for the panel into rates for carers shows the present rate of £7 per hour is reasonable for a babysitter but not a professional carer. The council is charged £15 per hour by care agencies for their services and the panel feels this is reasonable and in line with market rates²⁶.
81. When a carer or babysitter is needed, it will be for the entire time the councillor is away, not the present, arbitrary, four-hour limit. This should be abolished.
82. The panel believes co-optees should also be allowed to claim dependent carers' allowance. Two of the three co-optees interviewed have caring responsibilities and it is wrong they should be out of pocket while sharing their expertise with the council.

RECOMMENDATION 7

Dependent carers' allowance be set as follows:

- **Baby-sitting rate to stay at £7 per hour**
- **Higher rate to be introduced for carers of £15 per hour, in line with care agency rates**
- **Maximum of four hours per claim should be removed**
- **Co-optees should be allowed to claim**

83. This allowance was introduced in 2006 for the first time and there have been no claims to date. Only 45% of councillors who responded to the survey are aware of it²¹, which is disappointingly low. As part of the process of informing co-optees they can now claim, the council should also encourage take-up by councillors.

RECOMMENDATION 7a

The allowance be publicised in order to encourage diversity and take-up.

Clawback

84. When asking for job descriptions for councillors and co-optees (recommendation one), the panel is conscious there's very little compulsion for them to do their duties. The sole legal requirement for a councillor to claim their allowance is to attend one committee meeting every six months. The allowance can only be withdrawn if the Standards Committee or Standards Board suspends them¹.
85. The panel notes the comments of one of its interviewees who doesn't support a clawback scheme, arguing councillors who don't work hard won't be promoted or re-elected, but it feels something more official is needed.
86. The panel is aware of one council's scheme where members who don't attend a sufficient proportion of their meetings in a given period are required to explain

themselves to the standards committee and can be asked to give up a portion of their allowance voluntarily³⁵. The council should consider introducing a more sophisticated version of this, once job descriptions have been written.

RECOMMENDATION 8

The council should consider introducing a clawback system for allowances should members not meet the minimum standards of performance set down in their job descriptions.

Refreshments and Data Protection Charges

87. The panel noted with surprise a total of £85 is taken from every councillor's allowance to pay for refreshments after council meetings and a registration fee for inclusion on the data protection register. This seems like unnecessary bureaucracy and the panel supports its cessation.

RECOMMENDATION 9

Refreshments/data protection charges should be included within the basic allowance in the interests of minimising bureaucracy.

List of recommendations

1. There should be detailed job descriptions for all specially remunerated posts as well as those covered by the basic allowance. These job descriptions should detail specific responsibilities and time requirements. A basic job description should also be drawn up for all councillors and co-optees.

2. The council should reach a conclusion as to the basis of payment of allowances. Are allowances?

- 1) intended as wages for a full or part-time job
- 2) intended as compensation for loss of potential earnings
- 3) a recognition for additional voluntary work on behalf of the community, or,
- 4) a combination of the above, or paid on some other basis

3. There should be another review of allowances in time for the 2008 budget, taking into account the additional information available from the detailed job descriptions – with minimum time requirements – and the council's views on recommendation two.

4. The following changes be made to the current allowances scheme:

Post	Current allowance	Recommended allowance
Basic allowance	£9,415	No change
Leader	£20,000	£25,000, rising to £35,000 by 2010
Deputy Leader	£15,000	£16,000
Cabinet Member	£10,000	No change
Leader of the Opposition	£10,000	£16,000
Deputy Leader of the Opposition	£5,000	No change
O&S Co-ordinating Group Chair	£10,000	No change
Other OSC Chairs	£5,000	£7,500
Chair of Planning Committee	£10,000	No change
Vice Chair of Planning Committee	£2,500	No change
Chair of Majority Group	£5,000	£0
Chair of Standards Committee	£2,500	£5,000
Chair of Regulatory Committee	£5,000	No change
Vice Chair of Regulatory Committee	£2,500	£0
Chair of Investment Committee	£2,500	No change
Chair of Audit Committee	£2,500	No change
Assistant Cabinet Members	£1,000	£0
Scrutiny co-optees	£300	£450

Standards co-optees	£200	£300
---------------------	------	------

5. Travel allowances be set as follows:

Bicycle: 50p per mile (no change)

Motorcycle: 10p per mile flat rate

Car: 38p per mile flat rate

6. Subsistence allowances be fixed at the staff rate.

7. Dependent carers' allowance be set as follows

- Baby-sitting rate to stay at £7 per hour
- Higher rate to be introduced for carers of £15 per hour, in line with care agency rates
- Maximum of four hours per claim should be removed
- Co-optees should be allowed to claim

7a. The allowance be publicised in order to encourage diversity and take-up.

8. The council should consider introducing a clawback system for allowances should members not meet the minimum standards of performance set down in their job descriptions.

9. Refreshments/data protection charges should be included within the basic allowance in the interests of minimising bureaucracy.

Documents list

The panel reviewed the following documents. Links are attached where available.

Statute

1. Statutory Instrument 2003 no. 1021 The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2003/20031021.htm>

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames publications

2. Members' allowances paid between April 1 2003 and March 31 2004
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/members_allowances_paid_03-04.pdf
3. Members' allowances paid between April 1 2004 and March 31 2005
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/members_allowances_paid_04-05.pdf
4. Members' allowances paid between April 1 2005 and March 31 2006
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/members_allowances_paid_in_2005_6.pdf
5. Members' Allowances Scheme 2005/2006
[http://cabnet.richmond.gov.uk/Published/C00000173/M00001150/AI00008338/\\$MembersAllowancesScheme20056clean.doc.pdf](http://cabnet.richmond.gov.uk/Published/C00000173/M00001150/AI00008338/$MembersAllowancesScheme20056clean.doc.pdf)
6. Members' Allowances Scheme 2006/2007
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/members_allowances_scheme.pdf
7. Members' Handbook (excerpts)
8. Members' Protocol
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/constitution_part_5_members_protocol.pdf
9. The Members' Code of Conduct
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/constitution_part_5_members_code_of_conduct.pdf
10. Proposed Establishment of Independent Remuneration Panel – report to Cabinet – July 17 2006
[http://cabnet.richmond.gov.uk/Published/C00000163/M00001516/AI00010975/\\$IRPCabinetJuly06.doc.pdf](http://cabnet.richmond.gov.uk/Published/C00000163/M00001516/AI00010975/$IRPCabinetJuly06.doc.pdf)

Publications of other public bodies

11. Councillors, Officers and Stakeholders in the New Council Constitutions, October 2006, Department for Communities and Local Government (excerpts)
http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/110/CouncillorsOfficersandStakeholdersintheNewCouncilConstitutionsFindingsfromthe20y_id1504110.pdf
12. Local Government Young at Heart? December 2006, New Local Government Network
<http://www.mirandagrell.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/01/nglnyoungatheart.pdf>
13. Making Allowances a new report by the Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Councillors in London, August 2001, London Councils
<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/doc.asp?doc=15117&cat=1791>
14. The Remuneration of Councillors in London: 2006 Review a report by the Independent Panel to London Councils, December 2006, London Councils
<http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/upload/public/attachments/936/Remuneration%20councillors%202006.pdf>
15. Member job profiles, LB Havering
16. National Census of Local Authority Councillors in England 2004, Employers Organisation for Local Government and the IDeA, (excerpts)
<http://www.idea-knowledge.gov.uk/idk/aio/5541443>

Consultation

17. Additional submission from the leader of the council and the leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, December 2006
18. Additional submission from one councillor giving examples of casework and time spent on council duties
19. Completed surveys from 22 councillors and 21 co-optees (excerpts)
20. Members' Allowances London Borough of Richmond upon Thames a submission on behalf of the Conservative Group, December 2006
21. Summary of results of the co-optees' and councillors' allowances surveys
22. Three submissions from members of the public

Information produced for the panel

23. Comparison of the basic allowance and SRAs for leaders, deputy leaders, cabinet members and chairs of scrutiny committees (originally produced by London Councils but updated for the panel)
24. Diagram of LB Richmond's committee structure
25. Diversity statistics comparing LB Richmond councillors to London councillors, English councillors and the borough's population
26. Pay rates for babysitters and carers
27. Summary of allowances schemes for five public bodies (school governors, Metropolitan Police Authority, magistrates courts, London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority and Primary Care Trusts)
28. Summary of allowances schemes at Richmond's neighbours – LBs of Hammersmith and Fulham, Hounslow, Kingston and Wandsworth and Surrey CC
29. Summary of councillors' attendance at committee meetings May 9 2006 – December 31 2006
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/councillors_attendance_statistics?mgl=mgUserAttendanceSummary.asp&XXR=0&DR=09%2F05%2F2006%2D31%2F12%2F2006&ACT=Go

Documents not seen by the panel but used by its support staff include:

30. Independent Remuneration Panel report, November 2004, Horsham DC
http://www.horsham.gov.uk/Files/IRP_2004.pdf
31. Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel, March 2006, Horsham DC
http://www.horsham.gov.uk/Files/IndRemunerationPanel_complete.pdf
32. Members' Allowances Review 2006/07 – report to Council – September 2006, LB Enfield
[http://governance.enfield.gov.uk/Published/C00000108/M00004560/AI00003936/\\$mswpcouncilreportSeptember2006.docA.ps.pdf](http://governance.enfield.gov.uk/Published/C00000108/M00004560/AI00003936/$mswpcouncilreportSeptember2006.docA.ps.pdf)
33. Local Government Act 2000 <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/Acts/acts2000/20000022.htm>
34. Members' Allowances Scheme 2006/07 amendment – report to Council – November 2006, LB Lambeth
[http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov/Published/C00000142/M00000264/AI00001140/\\$11MemAllowreport021106.docA.ps.pdf](http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/moderngov/Published/C00000142/M00000264/AI00001140/$11MemAllowreport021106.docA.ps.pdf)
35. Members' Attendances May 2003 – June 2004 – report to General Purposes Committee – October 2004, Crawley BC
http://www.crawley.gov.uk/stellent/idcplg?IdcService=SS_GET_PAGE&ssDocName=004031&ssSourceNodId=409&ssTargetNodId=409&
36. National Prosperity Local Choice and Civic Engagement a new partnership between central and local government for the 21st century, May 2006, Lyons Inquiry
<http://www.lyonsinquiry.org.uk/docs/20060504%20Final%20Complete.pdf>
37. The Neighbourhood Agenda and the Role of the Elected Member, November 2005, IdeA
<http://www.lgiu.host.cimex.com/admin/images/uploaded/IDEANeighbourhoods.pdf>