

2. 11. 2011

BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD

**SUBMISSIONS COMMITTEE
2 NOVEMBER 2011**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Submissions Committee
held on Wednesday 2 November 2011 at 12noon
in the Meeting Room, Shirley Service Centre, 36 Marshland Road.**

PRESENT: Tim Baker (Chairperson), David East, Linda Gorman, Tim Sintes and Linda Stewart.

APOLOGIES: An apology for lateness was received and accepted from Tim Sintes who arrived at 12.50pm.

The Committee reports that:

PART C – DELEGATED DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE BOARD

1. REMUNERATION AUTHORITY – REVIEW OF LOCAL AUTHORITY REMUNERATION SETTING – BOARD SUBMISSION

At its meeting on 17 October 2011, the Board resolved to grant the Committee power to act to prepare a Board submission on the Remuneration Authority's Review of Local Authority Remuneration setting.

The Subcommittee **resolved** that the attached Board submission be made on the Remuneration Authority's Review of Local Authority Remuneration Setting Discussion Document.

The meeting concluded at 2.15pm.

SUBMISSION TO: Remuneration Authority

ON: Review of Local Authority Remuneration Setting – Discussion Document

BY: Burwood/Pegasus Community Board, Christchurch City Council

CONTACT: Linda Stewart
Chairperson
423A Bower Avenue
Christchurch 8083

027 4053257
linda.stewart@ccc.govt.nz

1. INTRODUCTION

The Burwood/Pegasus Community Board appreciates the opportunity provided to respond to the discussion document on the Review of Local Authority Remuneration Setting.

The Board understands that a separate response on this proposal has been made to the Remuneration Authority by the Chairpersons of the community boards in Christchurch.

2. BOARD FEEDBACK

The feedback below follows the general layout of the questions to which responses are sought in clause 8, page 18 of the discussion document.

1. Preferred Approach?

Of the two options proposed, the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board supports the **Specified Salary Approach**.

The Board submits that as the Remuneration Authority is the statutory agency responsible for setting the remuneration of elected members in local government it should fulfil this task in totality and not call on Council's to have to make recommendations on their own salary levels as an input into the resulting determinations.

The Board considers that if the specified salary approach was adopted and implemented across the sector, then this would finally remove a long standing perception in the community including the media, that it is the Council which decides its own levels of remuneration when clearly this is not so.

Within the framework of its preference for the Specified Salary option, the Board supports this being operated using two separate payment pools, namely, a pool for councillors and another pool for the community boards.

Under this method the Board notes the suggested base salary criteria of using the population of a community board and the level of delegation granted by the Council.

The Board assumes that in this respect population equates to workload and includes the **representation** and **advocacy** legs in section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002?

2. **The best ways of establishing relativities between local authorities?**

No comment.

3. **Appropriate local authorities to use as a representational sample?**

The Board endorses the inclusion of the Christchurch City Council and its community boards in the samples schedule. The rationale for having a mix of local authorities is understood and supported.

4. **Proportion full time appropriate for local authorities of differing sizes?**

No comment.

5. **Should meeting fees be allowed?**

Having established the specified salary as the basis of remuneration, the Board does not support having meeting fees as an 'add on' payment to the base salary.

The Board accepts that this form of payment is difficult to administer and from the recollection of some long serving members, has the potential to be open to abuse.

6. **Should allowance be made for the extra work generated by planning reviews etc?**

Yes, refer 8.(b) below.

7. **Amended Pool approach?**

The Board does not support this option.

8. **If the specified salary approach is chosen:**

(a) **Should standard salaries reflect the existence of community boards (i.e. be reduced if there are community boards)?**

The Board supports the view expressed by Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) on this point, namely, no as community boards are a separate level of governance.

(b) **How much extra money should be allowed for additional responsibilities?**

The Board again concurs with the position of LGNZ which is that the equivalent of 5% of the total salary bill should be available for extra responsibilities.

A case in point is the increased role and involvement of community boards in their respective areas (wards) in the post earthquake environment that will continue to have its impacts on Christchurch for many years to come.

The Board would submit that a payment mechanism for elected members is required that takes account of the realities during both the immediate response phase and the long term recovery period following a natural disaster.

Should the specified salary option find favour and there is a confirmed need for job sizing, the Board is willing to participate in any timesheet and/or activity recording.

- (c) **Should the RA set standard salaries and job descriptions for positions of responsibility?**

Yes, the Board agrees with this approach.

In this regard, the Board would mention the generic role descriptions developed for the positions of chairpersons, deputy chairpersons and community board members by the New Zealand Community Boards' Executive Committee in the mid 2000's, the details of which are on LGNZ's website.

- (d) **Should standard salaries be adjusted for abnormal population growth or decline?**

The Board does not support this approach.

The Board considers that the impacts of population changes are already considered by a Council when conducting representation reviews.

- (e) **What is the best way to recognise the additional responsibilities of unitary councils?**

No comment.



Linda Stewart
Chairperson
BURWOOD/PEGASUS COMMUNITY BOARD

9 November 2011

DOCUMENT: 11/624210