

Cumberland

Personal Details:

Name: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Postcode: [REDACTED]
Organisation Name: (Member of the public)

Comment text:

The business case presented for more councillors is weak. While the reduction in the committee structure is welcome there is no discussion on how this benchmarks against other similar large rural governance organisations either at home or abroad. In comparison to large multi national companies with complex operations and bigger workforces the number of oversight committees does seem high. It is noted that the councillor ratio is at the upper end of the distribution but no discussion is offered as to why Richmond is worse or indeed might be more efficient. Councillor workload is described as high without any data on workload, caseload, committee hours or even miles driven, which I am sure is well documented for expenses. Councillor attendance and productivity is not discussed. How many councillors do not attend half of the meetings ? What is the distribution of attendance at sub committees? Do a small number undertake a large proportion of the work? Is there an issue of quality v quantity? This is not discussed.

Significant risks have not been identified or assessed, costs and benefits have not been estimated. The productivity and efficiency of the organisation and its existing councillors is not assessed.

Any organisation proposing a large increase in staff should present a robust business case. The proposal is poorly presented.

Attached Documents:

None attached