

Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

Councillors' Allowances

Created: January 2022
Independent Remuneration Panel

The City of Wolverhampton Council Independent Remuneration Panel was established under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 to provide advice and recommendations to the Council on amounts to be paid under its Councillors' Allowances scheme.

Members of the Panel are appointed by the Council and are independent members of the local community.

The Independent Remuneration Panel has reviewed the Councillors' Allowances scheme and, on behalf of the Panel, I present the report and recommendations for the payment of Members' Allowances for 2022/23- 2025/26. This report is required by the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003.

In conducting this review, the Independent Remuneration Panel has had regard to the 2006 `Statutory Guidance on Members Allowances and representations made to it.

The Council is required to have regard to our recommendations in deciding what allowances to pay Councillors. Additionally, the Council must also publish the Independent Remuneration Panel recommendations and conclusions, together with the approved scheme.

Reverend David Wright
Chair of the Independent Remuneration Panel

1. Panel Membership

1.1 The Panel composed of three members:

- Mr Miceal Barden – Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Wolverhampton University
- Mrs Sylvia Parkin– Formerly Deputy Lieutenant
- Reverend David Wright – The Rector of St. Peters Church Wolverhampton (Chair)

2. How the Panel Approached the Review

2.1 The Panel chose the following means of gathering evidence.

- **Consideration of relevant legislation and guidance**

Councillor's allowances are paid in accordance with Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Local Government Act 2000. Section 18 of the 1989 Act, as amended by Section 99 of the Local Government Act 2000 makes provision in relation to basic, special responsibility and childcare and dependants' carers' allowances for members of local authorities. Section 100 of the 2000 Act allows the Secretary of State to make provision in relation to travel and subsistence allowance for members of local authorities and an allowance for non-councillors who are members of a council's committee or sub-committee.

The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 ("the 2003 Regulations") were made under these provisions. The Regulations provide that it is for each local authority to decide its scheme and the amounts to be paid under that scheme.

Councils are required to establish an Independent Remuneration Panel which will provide the local authority with advice on its scheme and the amounts to be paid. The Council must have regard to this advice from the Panel.

- **Consideration of the current scheme of allowances**

The Panel were required to review the range of allowances currently paid to members of Wolverhampton City Council. Details of the current schedule of the allowances are included at **Annex 1**.

- **Review of comparative allowances**

In looking at the allowances paid we sought to understand the level of allowances paid to Councillors performing similar roles at similar sized Councils. As with the previous report we have used the Councils in the CIPFA family group and particular attention has been paid to the allowances paid by the other three other Black Country authorities. The Panel also received comparative data for the West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and County

Councils in the West Midlands.

- **Survey on Councillor Allowances**

To understand the views of Councillors a survey was sent to all Councillors on Councillor allowances. 40 Councillors responded to the survey, which is 66% of Councillors. The Panel looked at the responses received by Councillors to understand the views of Councillors and time commitment involved for various roles.

3. Scope of the Report

- 3.1 The report sets out the Panel's recommendations to enable the Council to agree a new Councillors' Allowances Scheme.
- 3.2 These recommendations take account of the Council's current political composition and political management arrangements. Recommendations should be applied from the start of the 2022 - 2023 municipal year.
- 3.3 The Panel reviewed the Council's scheme of Councillors Allowances and Expenses in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations and its terms of reference covered:

Review of allowances:

- Review the level of Basic Allowance
- Review all Special Responsibility Allowances
- Decide whether the level of allowances are to be determined according to an index and if so which and for how long
- Review of Dependent Carers' Allowance
- Review Travelling and Subsistence Allowances
- Review Co-optees Allowances

4. Background Information – City of Wolverhampton Council

- 4.1 The City of Wolverhampton Council has 60 Councillors representing 20 wards. The current political composition of the Council is:

Party	Number of Seats
Conservative	16
Labour	46
Vacancy	1

- 4.2 The Council operates a Leader and Cabinet model of governance. The Cabinet is currently made up of the Leader of the Council, Deputy Leader of the Council and eight other Cabinet Members. Each of the 10 members of the Cabinet has a specific portfolio of responsibilities.

- 4.3 The Council currently has six themed Scrutiny Panels and an overarching Scrutiny Board whose role is to hold the executive to account, contribute to policy development, carry out reviews and monitor the performance of the Council.
- 4.4 The Council also appoints a number of other Committees to exercise its regulatory functions and other functions that are not the responsibility of the executive.

5. The Basic Allowance

- 5.1 Legally the Council must pay a basic allowance to each Councillor. On the basis of the law this cannot be linked to attendance at meetings or Council business. The basic allowance is intended to recognise the time commitment of all Councillors for calls on their time including meetings with council employees, meetings with constituents, attendance at political group meetings, attendance at council meetings and incidental costs such as the use of their homes. The amount of the basic allowance is set by the Council, but in so doing it must have regard to the Panel's recommendations and any national guidance.
- 5.2 The Panel noted that the national guidance states that it is important that some element of the work of Councillors continues to be voluntary – that some hours are not remunerated. This must be balanced against the need to ensure that financial loss is not suffered by elected members and to ensure that despite the input required people are encouraged to come forward as elected members and that their service to the community is retained.
- 5.3 It is a requirement of the regulations that a basic allowance be paid to all Councillors in an authority and paid at the same level for all Councillors.
- 5.4 The basic allowance in Wolverhampton has been operating for some years. Between May 2018 and April 2022, any increase in the allowance was aligned to increases in the nationally agreed pay scales for local authority employees.
- 5.5 Of the 40 Councillors who responded to the Panel's survey, 20% said that they felt that the allowance was about right while 76% said they felt it was too low. Comments made throughout the survey recognised the need to remunerate the role appropriately in order to recognise the significant time commitment involved and to ensure that people were encouraged to seek to become and remain Councillors, while recognising the challenges of the financial situation facing the Council and how any increase would be perceived.
- 5.6 The Panel compared the basic allowance paid in Wolverhampton with those paid by neighbouring authorities in the region and authorities in the recognised groupings of comparable authorities as well as population per Councillor data. It also looked at local and regional wage rates and considered the element of public service discount expected in the role.

- 5.7 The Panel's view is that the level of the current basic allowance of £9,793 is lower than nearly all of the comparator authorities. In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £11,500.

Recommendation 1: That the Basic Allowance for Councillors be Increased to £11,500.

6. Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA)

- 6.1 Each local authority may also make provision in its scheme for the payment of SRAs for those Councillors who have significant responsibilities over and above the generally accepted duties of a Councillor.

- 6.2 The responsibilities remunerated under Wolverhampton's current Scheme of Allowances are:

- Leader
- Deputy Leader
- Lead of the Main Opposition Group
- Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group
- Cabinet Member
- Chair – Scrutiny Board
- Chair – Scrutiny Panel
- Chair – Planning Committee
- Chair – Licensing Committee
- Chair – Pensions Committee
- Chair – Audit Committee
- Chair – Governance and Ethics Committee
- Vice-Chair – Scrutiny Board and Panels
- Vice-Chair – Planning Committee
- Vice-Chair – Licensing Committee
- Vice-Chair – Pensions Committee
- Vice-Chair – Audit Committee
- Vice Chair – Governance and Ethics Committee
- Leader of a Minority Opposition Group *
- Councillor Champions
- Mayor
- Deputy Mayor

*Special Responsibility Allowance for the Leader of a Minority Opposition Group to be paid only if a Minority Opposition Group comprises five or more Councillors

- 6.3 In reviewing the SRAs, the Panel carefully considered the relevant law and the national guidance which explains that they may be paid to those Councillors of the council who have significant additional responsibilities over and above the generally accepted duties of a Councillor. The guidance states that it does not necessarily follow that particular responsibilities given to a particular Councillor is a significant additional responsibility for which a special allowance should be paid. Such duties may not lead to a significant extra workload for any one particular Councillor above another and that they should be recognised as time commitment to council work which is acknowledged within the basic allowance and not responsibilities for which an SRA should be recommended.

The relevant legal provision, Regulation 5 of the 2003 Regulations lists a number of roles that are entitled to a SRA these are listed in sub-paragraphs (a) – (h), which includes Leader, Leader of the Opposition, Cabinet Members, Committee Chairs and other roles and beyond this also allows for a SRA to be paid where:

*carrying out 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 in sub-paragraphs (a) to (h) (whether or not that activity is specified in the scheme).***

- 6.4 The Panel noted that its responsibility is limited to considering whether any roles should be remunerated under the scheme, not the content and structure of any roles which the Council may choose to establish.
- 6.5 Like many other authorities, Wolverhampton's scheme recommends that only one SRA can be claimed by those Councillors who hold two or more different roles each entitled to an SRA and the Panel supported maintaining this approach.
- 6.6 The framework for SRAs in Wolverhampton has been operating for some time and is not increased by the same index as the basic allowance.
- 6.7 The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities involved and considered benchmarking information. It was noted that most of the roles remunerated by Wolverhampton are remunerated by other comparator authorities and the levels of allowances paid by Wolverhampton are at or around the average or significantly higher or lower for certain roles. However, in its consideration, a number of issues were identified which the Panel believes should be addressed and these are set out below.

Leader of the Council

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £25,000 is slightly lower than a number of the comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel is clear that being Leader of the Council requires a full time commitment and certainly precludes employment in the normal sense. Pre Covid the Leader attended the Civic Centre most days and even when not in the Leader has to be available to talk to or email Officers and other Members from early morning until late evening.

The Panel is aware there are also external demands on the Leader's time which increased particularly at the regional and sub-regional level with the West Midlands Combined Authority and devolution rolling out.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £27,000.

Recommendation 2: That the SRA for the Leader of the Council be increased to £27,000.

Deputy Leader of the Council

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £20,000 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 3: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Deputy Leader of the Council.

Leader of the Main Opposition Group

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £15,000 is significantly higher than most the comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel recognised that local democracy benefits from effective opposition and that the Leader Opposition needs to invest significant time and effort in keeping abreast of the work of Cabinet, Scrutiny and the Council as a whole and are invited to attend formal and informal meetings in that capacity. The role is therefore significant, constitutional and integral to the democratic checks and balances within the Council. We also acknowledged that managing a political group of Councillors places demands on them to participate in activities that support the effective running of the council.

However, the Panel considers that the level of allowance should not be equivalent to that of a Cabinet Member given the latter's decision-making responsibilities.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan

Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £12,000.

Recommendation 4: That the SRA for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group be decreased to £12,000.

Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £2,500 is notably lower than most the comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel recognised that local democracy benefits from effective opposition and that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will work closely with the of the Leader of the Main Opposition Group to ensure the opposition is effective and deputise on their behalf as and when required.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £5,500.

Recommendation 5: That the SRA for the Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group be increased to £5,500.

Cabinet Member

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £15,000 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 6: That no change should be made to the SRA for a Cabinet Member.

Chair – Scrutiny Board

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £15,000 is significantly higher than most the comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel acknowledges that each council will arrange its scrutiny function in a slightly different way and therefore direct comparisons with the work of other scrutiny chairs are more difficult to achieve.

The panel also acknowledged the increasingly important role that the council wishes to place on increasing scrutiny's influence over the development of new policies and decisions.

There was evidence to show that there was a difference in time commitment between the Cabinet Member role and the Scrutiny Chair role. However, it noted that the role is not comparable to that of a Cabinet Member which is also remunerated at the same level and the latter also has decision making responsibilities. The Panel noted with the exception of one authority in the comparative data no other authority remunerated a chair of scrutiny at the same rate as a Cabinet Member.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £10,000.

Recommendation 7: That the SRA for the Chair – Scrutiny Board be decreased to £10,000.

Chair – Scrutiny Panel

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £10,000 is higher than most the comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel acknowledges that each council will arrange its scrutiny function in a slightly different way and therefore direct comparisons with the work of other scrutiny chairs are more difficult to achieve.

The panel also acknowledged the increasingly important role that the council wishes to place on increasing scrutiny's influence over the development of new policies and decisions.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £8,500.

Recommendation 8: That the SRA for the Chair – Scrutiny Panel be decreased to £8,500.

Chair – Planning Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £15,000 is significantly higher than most the comparator authorities.

The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. The Panel noted that the Chair carries out a quasi-judicial function. The Panel were aware of the need for the Chair to know the planning process and framework as well as planning case law and legislation to ensure sound decision-making.

The Panel are also aware that all members must abide by the Planning Code

of Practice and be aware of potential conflicts of interest.

The Panel's view is that the time commitment and responsibilities of a Planning Committee Chair is not comparable to that of a Cabinet Member which also attracts the same rate of remuneration. The Panel also noted that in recent years the number of Planning Committee meetings had significantly decreased as has the business that goes to the Chair (and to the Committee), at least in part, as a result of the increase in matters that no longer require formal planning permission (and are covered by permitted development legislation).

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £11,000.

Recommendation 9: That the SRA for the Chair of Planning Committee be decreased to £11,000.

Chair – Licensing Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £15,000 is significantly higher than most the comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel are aware the Licensing Committee has been split into two separate committees a Statutory Licensing and Regulatory Committees each with their own remit, but the membership of each committee is the same, they also have the same Chair and Vice-Chair.

The Panel are aware Statutory Licensing Committee deals with matters relating to the Licensing Act 2003 (which came into force on 24 November 2005) and essentially deals with the sale of alcohol and premises from which alcohol is sold, including any appeals against applications to vary licensing conditions, etc., e.g., extended licensing hours. Most of this work is carried out via Licensing Sub-Committees which meet on average about 15-30 times per year and the Chair of the Statutory Licensing Committee is always asked to chair these sub-committees in the first instance and in fact does actually chair the vast majority of them, with other members stepping in when required.

The Panel is aware the Regulatory Committee deals with other regulatory issues, entertainment, and other general licensing issues. At most only one or two sub-committee meetings are required.

The Panel recognised the volume of work undertaken by the Chair.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £12,500.

Recommendation 10: That the SRA for the Leader of the Chair – Licensing Committee be decreased to £12,500.

Chair – Audit and Risk Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £10,000 was slightly higher to comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel are aware the Audit and Risk Committee also have oversight of the final accounts for the West Midlands Pensions Fund. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 11: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Chair – Audit and Risk Committee.

Chair – Pensions Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £10,000 was slightly higher compared to other similar roles. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel noted that the work of the Pensions Committee is very specialised and so requires the members of it to be trained and briefed on the key issues regarding the administration of the pension fund.

The Panel recommend that due to the specialist nature of the work involved in chairing this meeting and in keeping abreast of pension issues, that the SRA for the Chair of the Pensions Committee should not be changed.

Recommendation 12: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Chair of Pensions Committee.

Chair Governance and Ethics Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £10,000 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 13: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Chair Governance and Ethics Committee.

Vice-Chair – Scrutiny Board

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £2,500 was notably lower than comparator authorities. The Panel reviewed

evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The panel also acknowledged the increasingly important role that the council wishes to place on increasing scrutiny's influence over the development of new policies and decisions.

In recommending an appropriate level of remuneration, the Panel considered the average for neighbouring authorities, West Midlands Metropolitan Authorities and comparator authorities and recommended it be remunerated at £4,000.

Recommendation 14: That the SRA for the Vice-Chair of Scrutiny Board be increased to £4,000.

Vice-Chair – Scrutiny Panels

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £2,500 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 15: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair – Scrutiny Panels.

Vice-Chair – Planning Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £5,000 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 16: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair – Planning Committee.

Vice-Chair – Licensing Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £5,000 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 17: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair – Licensing Committee.

Vice-Chair – Audit Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £2,500 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 18: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair of Audit Committee.

Vice-Chair – Pensions Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £2,500 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 19: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair of Pensions Committee.

Vice Chair - Governance and Ethics Committee

The Panel's view is that the level of the special responsibility allowance of £2,500 was aligned to comparator authorities and remains reasonable. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role. In the light of this has decided not to propose any change.

Recommendation 20: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice Chair of Governance and Ethics Committee.

Councillor Champion

The Panel noted that none of the comparator authorities remunerates this or an equivalent role and that it does not appear in any of the other West Midlands Metropolitan authority schemes of allowances. The Panel reviewed evidence about the time commitment and responsibilities for the role.

The Panel noted that some Councillor Champions may be expected to chair an advisory group meeting, the role is not as demanding on time as that of other roles nor does it have any decision-making responsibility.

The Panel noted no comments were made in the survey in relation to Councillor Champions.

The Panel did, however, recognise the benefit of the role and the opportunity for development and succession planning.

The Panel's view is that all Councillors should champion priority areas of the Council and should further consideration of an issue be required it should be escalated to the relevant committee or scrutiny panel for consideration.

In making its recommendations, the Panel reiterates its responsibility is limited to considering whether any roles should be remunerated under the scheme, not the content and structure of any roles which the Council may choose to establish. In the light of the evidence, while recognising the validity of the role in the structure of Councillor appointments, the Panel recommends that these

posts should no longer receive remuneration.

Recommendation 21: That the SRA for a Councillor Champion be removed.

Mayor and Deputy Mayor

The allowances paid to the Mayor and Deputy Mayor are not paid under the scheme provided by the Local Government Act 2000 but are classed as civic dignitaries' allowances under the Local Government Act 1972. As such, they fall outside of the Members Scheme of Allowances being considered here.

However, bringing the allowances under the remit of the IRP and publishing them as part of the Council's Allowances Scheme, albeit identifying them separately, aids transparency. In addition, while the Mayor is primarily engaged in civic duties, the Mayor holds an important function within the Council structure in terms of chairing Council meetings.

This Panel, respects the work undertaken by the Mayor and recognises the significant time commitment that is involved in the civic role of promoting the city, encouraging inward investment and supporting local communities. They would not want to see the position diminished.

The Panel recommends that no change should be made to the level of remuneration.

Recommendation 22: That no change should be made to the level of remuneration for the roles of Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

7.0 Annual Adjustment of Allowances

- 7.1 The Panel noted that the regulations governing schemes of allowances allow for adjustments to the level of allowances in line with an index. The Panel can recommend which index should be used and for how long the index should apply, subject to a maximum of four years. After this period, the regulations require that the issue of indexation should be reviewed. The terms of reference for this review asked the Panel to decide whether an index should be applied to the scheme of allowances, and if so which and for how long.
- 7.2 Wolverhampton's scheme of allowances has included provision for the basic Councillor allowance to rise by an index linked to local authority employees' pay. This has meant that Councillor basic allowance has risen in line with the pay increases made to local government employees. However the SRAs have not been index linked.
- 7.3 The Panel supported the principle of increasing basic allowance and special responsibility allowances by an appropriate index to reflect increases in costs of living and inflation over a four year period. Several Councillors strongly supported this approach in responses to the survey. The Panel considered

carefully the different types of index that could be applied, looking at national options such as the consumer price index or linking adjustments to changes in pay in the city. On balance they felt that the current index, namely a link to the local authority employees' pay was the most appropriate and recommend that this be applied for the four year period of the scheme.

Recommendation 23: That the Basic and Special Responsibility be increased each year by any percentage increase in pay agreed for local government employees.

8.0 Carers' Allowances

- 8.1 The Panel concluded that no change should be made to the current carers' allowances.

Recommendation 24: That no change should be made to the current Dependant Carers' Allowance.

9. Travel expenses and Subsistence Allowances

- 9.1 The Panel concluded that no changes should be made to the current travel expenses and subsistence allowances.

Recommendation 25: That no change should be made to the current Travelling and Subsistence Allowances.

10. Co-optees Allowances

- 10.1 The Panel noted that a number of authorities now make payments to the Independent Person appointed by the Council to consider issues relating to conduct matters following an extension of their role under recent legislation so that they must be part of the Panel in relation to disciplinary proceedings against the Head of Paid Service, the s.151 officer or the Monitoring Officer.
- 10.2 The Panel noted that other authorities have allowed a payment of £750 per annum please reasonable expenses. The Panel also noted that this will address the challenges of recruiting appointees to these important roles. Other than the above it is proposed that no change should be made to the current Co-optee allowances.

Recommendation 26: That an allowance of £750 plus reasonable expenses is paid for Independent Person appointed by the Council

11. Recommendations of the Panel:

1. Recommendation 1: That the Basic Allowance for Councillors be Increased to £11,500.
2. Recommendation 2: That the SRA for the Leader of the Council be increased to £27,000.
3. Recommendation 3: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Deputy Leader of the Council.
4. Recommendation 4: That the SRA for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group be decreased to £12,000.
5. Recommendation 5: That the SRA for the Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group be increased to £5,500.
6. Recommendation 6: That no change should be made to the SRA for a Cabinet Member.
7. Recommendation 7: That the SRA for the Chair – Scrutiny Board be decreased to £10,000.
8. Recommendation 8: That the SRA for the Chair – Scrutiny Panel be decreased to £8,500.
9. Recommendation 9: That the SRA for the Chair of Planning Committee be decreased to £11,000.
10. Recommendation 10: That the SRA for the Leader of the Chair – Licensing Committee be decreased to £12,500.
11. Recommendation 11: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Chair of Audit and Risk Committee.
12. Recommendation 12: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Chair of Pensions Committee.
13. Recommendation 13: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Chair Governance and Ethics Committee.
14. Recommendation 14: That the SRA for the Vice-Chair of Scrutiny Board be increased to £4,000.
15. Recommendation 15: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair – Scrutiny Panels.
16. Recommendation 16: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair – Planning Committee.
17. Recommendation 17: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair – Licensing Committee.
18. Recommendation 18: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair of Audit Committee.
19. Recommendation 19: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice-Chair of Pensions Committee.
20. Recommendation 20: That no change should be made to the SRA for the Vice Chair of Governance and Ethics Committee.
21. Recommendation 21: That the SRA for a Councillor Champion be removed.
22. Recommendation 22: That no change should be made to the level of remuneration for the roles of Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

- 23. Recommendation 23: That the Basic and Special Responsibility be increased each year by any percentage increase in pay agreed for local government employees.
- 24. Recommendation 24: That no change should be made to the current Dependant Carers' Allowance.
- 25. Recommendation 25: That no change should be made to the current Travelling and Subsistence Allowances
- 26. Recommendation 26: That an allowance of £750 plus reasonable expenses is paid for Independent Person appointed by the Council.

Annex 1

Schedule of Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances

Basic Allowance (All Councillors) – £9,793

Description	From
Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA)	
Leader	25,000
Deputy Leader	20,000
Leader of the Main Opposition Group	15,000
Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group	2,500
Cabinet Member	15,000
Chair – Scrutiny Board	15,000
Chair – Scrutiny Panel	10,000
Chair – Planning Committee	15,000
Chair – Licensing Committee	15,000
Chair – Audit Committee	10,000
Chair – Pensions Committee	10,000
Chair – Governance and Ethics Committee	10,000
Vice-Chair – Scrutiny Board and Panels	2,500
Vice-Chair – Planning Committee	5,000
Vice-Chair – Licensing Committee	5,000
Vice-Chair – Audit Committee	2,500

Vice-Chair – Pensions Committee	2,500
Vice-Chair – Governance and Ethics Committee	2,500
Councillor Champion	2,500
Ceremonial Mayor (inclusive of £2,500 clothing allowance)	20,000
Ceremonial Deputy Major (inclusive of £1,250 clothing allowance)	5,000