

**BASINGSTOKE & DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION  
PANEL**

**DECEMBER 2014**

**1. Introduction.**

The Independent Remuneration Panel was asked to undertake a full review of Members' Allowances, the last review having been conducted in 2011. Previous reviews had been carried out in 2003, partially in 2005 and in 2007.

We met on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2014 and 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and membership of the panel was:-

Pamela Heyfron, Local Resident Serving the Community in the Voluntary Sector  
John Marsh, (Chairman) Accountant and former Local Authority Director  
John Smith, Retired Mathematics Teacher and Local Businessman, Basingstoke  
Stewart Smith, Local Business Owner.

Bearing in mind the poor response rate to our 2011 questionnaire we decided, on this occasion, to undertake our investigations by interview alone. All Council Members were invited to meet the Panel or to make written submissions to us. As a result we interviewed eleven Councillors and had a written submission from one.

We are grateful to those Members we interviewed and we have taken account of the views expressed to us by them and would like to thank them for their assistance in this review.

We were briefed by Tony Curtis, (Chief Executive), Kevin Jaquest (Head of Resources), Laura Taylor, (Corporate Director, Governance and Commissioning) and Melanie O'Sullivan, (Deputy Monitoring Officer) all of whom advised on any queries we had regarding the Council's operations. In addition we were assisted by Julia Leavey, (Committee Services Team Leader) and Peter Edwards, (Interim Governance Manager) both of whom we thank for their invaluable help and support.

As with previous reviews, we have had cognisance of the current Regulations and Guidance for Members' Allowances and Independent Remuneration Panels.

Other information at our disposal included the 2007 and 2011 reports of the Independent Remuneration Panels, the Council's Constitution and the current Scheme of Members' Allowances.

We have had the benefit of a survey of Members' Allowance Schemes for Borough and District Councils in the south east which gave useful comparative data.

On this point, we heard from a number of Members some concerns that Members' Allowances in Basingstoke and Deane are at the higher end of those for south east authorities. Whilst this may well be the case we believe that this is justified as the authority has one of the highest populations, it is governing an area which is both vibrant and growing and our recommendations are based on a sound and well tried methodology. Our recommendations, however, should go some way to addressing members' concerns on this point.

## **2. Terms of Reference.**

Our Terms of Reference for this review were to:-

- A) Undertake a review of the levels and appropriateness of the Basic Allowance as currently paid to Members including for travel, subsistence and dependents.
- B) Undertake a review of all Special Responsibility Allowances
- C) Undertake a review of the Mayoral Allowance
- D) To consider the Co-optees' Allowance
- E) To have regard to the following principles:-
  - That the recommended allowances should be of a sufficient level that they would allow most people to consider becoming an elected member without suffering undue financial hardship while not being at such a level that allowances would become the primary reason for standing for Council
  - That the allowances should be seen as a contribution and recognition of the time and skills of councillors but not seen as equivalent to a formal job evaluation exercise and salaries
  - That the review of allowances be considered in light of the current economic climate and although the Panel's independent view is sought a second proposal should be prepared that does not exceed the current budget for members' allowances plus 1%
  - That a healthy and resourced opposition is important in maintaining an appropriate balance within local democracy
  - That the allowances should be based on a logical and transparent construction and arrived at in a way that is simple to understand

- As far as possible any convened panel will abide by the precedent and approach of previous reviews except where there is a clear and prescient case not to do so
- The sensitivities of cost of implementation of any recommendations should be borne in mind.

### **3. The Deliberations of the Panel.**

Having been briefed on the Council's financial situation we noted that the recommendations of the 2011 report had been largely implemented and we were told that there had been no subsequent increase in Members' Allowances until 2014/2015.

Bearing in mind the principle that "as far as possible we should abide by the precedent and approach of previous reviews except where there is a clear prescient case not to do so" we have examined the methodology used in previous reviews and are happy that, by and large, that used in 2007 and again in 2011 represents a valid and satisfactory way of assessing Members' Allowances.

We have, therefore, largely used the same methodology as used in those reviews.

### **4. Basic Allowance.**

In 2011 this was assessed using the median hourly earnings for Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council area as a place of residence. This information is published by the Office for National Statistics each November as part of its National Statistics of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) and in 2011 the figure was £12.82 per hour. The latest available information for this puts that figure at £13.47 and this is the figure we have used for our recommendation of Basic Allowance. We have also built into our calculation an uplift of 1%, this being the increase in staff pay agreed for 2015/16.

The figure of 18 hours per week identified in 2007 and confirmed in 2011 as the average hours a backbench Member typically spends on Council business remains, as we have heard no evidence to suggest that this has changed since then. Although there were differences ranging from 25% to 100%, the highest number of respondents to our questionnaire in 2011 considered that 35% should represent the level of "Public Service Discount" i.e. the element of a Member's activities which should be given voluntarily.

However, as the recommendations of the 2007 report were not implemented the level of "Public Service Discount" had effectively risen to 45% by 2011. It currently stands at 47%.

We have calculated Basic Allowances for 35% and 47% Public Service Discounts and, based on these figures, the levels of Basic Allowance for Members of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council for 2015/16 can be calculated as 18 hours X 52 weeks X £13.47 per hour X 65% X 101% giving a Basic Allowance of £8276 at 35% and 18 hours X 52 weeks X £13.47 per hour X 53% X 101% giving a Basic Allowance of £6749 at 47%.

As our Terms of Reference have requested additional figures for an increase in the levels of Members' Allowances of no more than 1% for 2015/16 adding 1% to the current Basic Allowance gives a figure of £6736 for Basic Allowance for 2015/16.

This figure is very close to that achieved from our calculation using the current 47% for "Public Service Discount" and, in order to preserve the integrity of the methodology we would recommend that for 2015/16 the Basic Allowance for Members of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council be £6749 which would require Members to accept a "Public Service Discount of 47%..

**We RECOMMEND that Basic Allowance for Members of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council for 2015/16 be £6749.**

### **5. Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs).**

We have largely used the same methodology for our calculations for these as those used in the 2007 and 2011 reviews.

As the majority of SRAs are based on the SRA paid to the Leader of the Council which, in turn, is based on multiples of the Basic Allowance, we set out in Appendix "A" various levels of SRAs using a "Public Service Discount" of 35% and 47% and uplifting current allowances by 1%.

However, as a result of decisions taken in the past, (probably as the Council did not accept the recommendations of the Panel which sat in 2007), the SRA for the Leader of the Council does not comply with the 2007 and 2011 methodologies which our terms of reference have asked us to follow. We strongly **RECOMMEND** that the Council takes this opportunity to bring the SRA for the Leader of the Council back into line, both to protect the integrity of the methodology and because the majority of other SRAs rely on it.

We illustrate this option in column 4 of Appendix "A" to our report and point out that were the Council to adopt this course of action a number of SRAs would fall below their current values.

Alternatively, in order to preserve these SRA at around their current values that for the Leader of the Council would need to carry a multiplier of Basic Allowance X 3.3 rather than X3 and, whilst we would not necessarily see this as an unreasonable course of action, it too would have some knock on effects. Overall this option should be within the Council's budget for 2015/16 and would have the significant advantage of maintaining the integrity of the methodology.

For completeness we set out in column 6 of Appendix "A" the results of this option but do not recommend it for adoption by the Council as it would result in some quite

significant increases in the SRAs for the Deputy Leader of the Council and for Cabinet Members.

As with the SRA for the Leader of the Council the SRAs for the Deputy Leader of the Council and those for Cabinet Members do not currently conform to the methodology we have been asked to follow.

Having said that, we have had no evidence to suggest altering the relationships between the SRA for the Leader of the Council and those for the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Members and we would not recommend doing so.

On balance, therefore, it is the figures in column 4 to Appendix “A” which we would **RECOMMEND** for adoption by the Council for 2015/16. Where a SRA is reduced by adopting the figures in Column 4 it would, of course, be possible to protect the current post holder’s SRA on a personal basis although were this to continue for any length of time it would, again, have the effect of distorting the methodology. For that reason and because a similar suggestion in 2011 was not accepted we do not recommend this course of action.

#### **5a. Chairman of Development Control Committee.**

We have heard evidence that this committee, as would be expected, is both one of the most important and one of the busiest.

Based on 30% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council the SRA for the Chairman of this committee is greater than that for any other committee. We believe that there is a valid case for this to continue and consequently **RECOMMEND** accordingly.

#### **5b. Vice-Chairman of Development Control Committee.**

In 2007 and 2011 the Independent Remuneration Panels assessed the SRAs for all Vice-Chairmen at 10% of that of the equivalent Chairman.

In 2011 the Panel heard contrary arguments about the roles of Vice-Chairmen from “doing little or nothing” on the one hand to “mirroring the Chairman” on the other. We are aware that the roles of Vice-Chairmen can depend on a number of factors including the relationship between them and the chairmen, personalities and the pure volume of work of the committees.

We have, therefore, again on balance, decided to follow the methodology of the 2007 and 2011 IRPs and based the SRAs for all Vice-Chairmen on 10% of that of the equivalent Chairman.

As one of the busier committees we consider that any additional workload for the Vice-Chairman of the Development Control Committee over that of any other Vice-Chairman is accounted for by the fact that the SRA for the Chairman of this committee (and

therefore the SRA for the Vice-Chairman) is at a higher level (30% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council) than that of Chairmen of other committees (25% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council).

Accordingly, we **RECOMMEND** that the SRA for the VICE-Chairman of the Development Control Committee be 10% of the SRA for the Chairman.

#### **5c. Chairman of Licensing Committee.**

The IRP which met in 2005 to specifically consider licensing following the transfer of certain functions from magistrates courts to local authorities recommended a SRA for the Chairman of Licensing based on 15% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council.

In 2007 the IRP was persuaded that “the level of work of the Licensing Committee was now comparable with the majority of other committees at Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council”. In light of this the 2007 IRP recommended a SRA for the Chairman of the Licensing Committee based on 25% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council.

In 2011 the Panel again concurred with the view that the SRA for the Chairman of the Licensing Committee should be set at 25% of that of the Leader of the Council. We have now been advised that the work of this committee in no way mirrors that of committees such as Policy and Overview and Scrutiny and, accordingly, we assess the SRA for the Chairman of the Licensing Committee at an equivalent of 15% of that of the Leader of the Council and we **RECOMMEND** accordingly.

#### **5d. Vice-Chairman of Licensing Committee.**

In assessing this, along with SRAs for all Vice-Chairmen, we **RECOMMEND** that the SRA for the Vice-Chairman of the Licensing Committee be set at 10% of that for the Chairman

#### **5e. Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Human Resources Committee.**

The 2007 IRP report recommended a SRA for the then Chairman of the Personnel Committee based on 9% of the then Leader of the Council’s SRA. That recommendation was not implemented.

In 2011 the panel was mindful that the personnel/human resource function plays an important role in any organisation and that in the then current financial and economic situation this role attracted even greater significance.

On that basis the Panel considered that the Chairman of the Personnel Committee merited a SRA based on 25% of that of the Leader of the Council. In line with all other Vice-Chairmen the Panel based its recommendation for the SRA for the Vice-Chairman of the Personnel Committee at 10% of that of the Chairman.

We have now been advised that the work of this committee has been substantially less than was anticipated in 2011 and, on that basis, although we still recognise the importance of the role, we **RECOMMEND** that the SRAs for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this committee should equate to that recommended for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Licensing Committee i.e. 15% of that for the Leader of the Council for the Chairman and 10% of the Chairman's SRA for the Vice-Chairman.

#### **5f. Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Policy Committees.**

We have been advised of the revised arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny and the introduction of two Policy Committees and there appear to be high hopes within the Council that this new system will be a vast improvement on that which it succeeds. Whilst it is still early in the operation of the new system we have been given evidence of the expected workloads of these committees and consequently of their Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen.

As the new system is still bedding down we do not feel it would be appropriate to vary the basis for SRAs for the respective Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of these bodies from those previously recommended for the former Overview and Scrutiny Committees (25% of the SRA payable to the Leader of the Council for the Chairmen and 10% of the Chairmen's SRAs for the Vice-Chairmen) and we **RECOMMEND** accordingly..

We are aware of the recommendation of the Government's Communities and Local Government Select Committee for a Parliamentary Inquiry into the effectiveness of scrutiny arrangements in councils and trust that, should such an inquiry take place, Basingstoke and Deane's new system of overview and scrutiny will stand the council in good stead.

#### **5g. Manydown Policy Committee.**

We have been advised further of the work of the Manydown Overview Committee in that, whilst dealing with an important new development within the Borough, the workload for Members is considerably less than that of either the new Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the two new Policy Committees.

Accordingly, whilst recognising that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this committee do merit SRAs, we assess them at this stage as being equivalent to those being recommended for the Licensing Committee and the Human Resources Committee i.e. 15% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council for the Chairman and 10% of the SRA for the Chairman for the Vice-Chairman and we so **RECOMMEND**.

#### **5h. Audit and Accounts Committee.**

We were told that the role of the Audit and Accounts Committee has reduced slightly given that its responsibilities for ethics and standards have transferred to a new Standards

Committee. Notwithstanding this, we understand that the workload of the Audit and Accounts Committee has not altered very much as a result and we therefore see no reason for altering the basis on which its Chairman and Vice-Chairman are remunerated.

Hence, we **RECOMMEND** that the SRA for the Chairman of the Audit and Accounts Committee continues to be assessed at 25% of that of the Leader of the Council and its Vice-Chairman at 10% of that of the Chairman.

#### **5i. Standards Committee.**

As set out above, the responsibility for ethics and standards has been transferred from the former Audit, Governance and Accounts Committee to a new Standards Committee with an Independent Member (i.e. non-Councillor) as Chairman.

We have been advised that, in Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, the Standards Committee, despite its limited role, currently has quite a busy workload.

The present non-councillor Chairman of the Standards Committee receives a SRA in line with those for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Policy Committees. Whilst we are aware that the committee's workload is dictated by events and could, therefore, vary over time it does appear to us that the limited role of this committee suggests that it would be more appropriate to equate the SRAs for its Chairman and Vice-Chairman with those of the Licensing and Human Resources Committees i.e. 15% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council for the Chairman and 10% of the Chairman's SRA for the Vice-Chairman and we so **RECOMMEND**.

Bearing in mind that the Chairman is from outside the Council it might not be expedient to reduce the SRA whilst the current incumbent is in office but we would **RECOMMEND** that this be achieved when a new Chairman is appointed.

#### **5j. Principal Opposition Leader, Other Group Leaders and Independent Forum Co-ordinator.**

Currently Group Leaders and the Independent Forum Co-ordinator are paid on the basis of 15% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council. The Leader of the Principal Opposition Party receives a SRA double that of other Group Leaders.

In our discussions it was suggested to us that with Basingstoke and Deane's current political composition there was no one Group Leader who could be considered to be leading the opposition to the major political group.

It was further suggested to us that with the groups varying in number from 29 on the one hand to 2 on the other there seemed no logic in paying most Group Leaders the same SRA.

We have rehearsed the arguments about Leaders of larger Groups having more people to manage and therefore a greater workload and that of Leaders of smaller Groups having to “keep up to speed” with everything that is happening in the Council and therefore having fewer people with whom to share the work.

On balance we believe that these arguments carry equal weight and have, therefore concluded that all Group Leaders, irrespective of the numbers in a particular group, should receive a SRA of the same amount. We therefore **RECOMMEND** that for 2015/2016 each Group Leader be allocated the same SRA being equivalent to 15% of the SRA for the Leader of the Council.

We are further conscious that in times when the electorate appears to be questioning its will to vote for the major political parties there is always the possibility of a proliferation of smaller groups, a situation over which the Council has no control. Although probably unlikely the most extreme case is that the Council could have thirty groups!

We believe that, where reasonably practical, the Council should be in a position to control its own budget and that in order to do so the sum available to be shared amongst Group Leaders should be capped. For 2015/2016 we suggest this cap should be based on the current political composition and the level of SRA the Council decides for Group Leaders and that this figure should be shared amongst Group Leaders the amount per Group Leader being recalculated should there be any change in the number of political groups on the Council. We **RECOMMEND** accordingly.

We believe that this system will provide a more equitable way of remunerating Group Leaders whilst at the same time maintaining the integrity of this particular budget head.

#### **5k. Co-optee’s Allowance.**

We have been asked to look at the SRA paid to Co-opted Members.

We understand that it is only the Standards Committee which has Co-opted Members and we believe that such Members should be allocated a SRA. In 2007 and 2011 the Panels recommended that Co-opted Members receive a SRA based on 20% of that for the Chairman of the Standards Committee and we have received no evidence to suggest any change in this basis.

We therefore **RECOMMEND** that the SRA for Co-opted members for 2015/16 be based on 20% of that for the Chairman of the Standards Committee.

#### **5l. Mayoral Allowance.**

On this occasion we have been asked to look at the Mayoral Allowance and we have been pleased to do so.

We are aware of the importance of the Mayoral role and the pleasure the Mayor brings to very many inhabitants by attending individual functions and performing his/her duties on a number of civic occasions throughout the Municipal Year.

We have been advised that whilst it is possibly adequate the current allowance does not cover the necessary expenditure needed to fulfil the office satisfactorily and requires a personal contribution from the incumbent.

The Mayoral Allowance falls outside the system of SRAs paid to Members but, given the dignity of the office, the Mayor must look the part and both he and his/her escort must dress appropriately in fulfilling their duties.

As with SRAs the Mayoral Allowance is subject to income tax, reducing its worth still further, and so, whilst the Regulations on Members' Allowances clearly sets out the situation relating to both tax and national insurance, we have asked the Head of Resources to explore with the Inland Revenue the possibility of a proportion of the Mayoral Allowance being treated as expenses and thus as a tax free reimbursement.

In the event that the response from the Inland Revenue is negative we do not hesitate to **RECOMMEND** that the Mayoral Allowance for 2015/16 be uplifted by a further £1000 above the 1% inflation figure provided in the budget.

## **6. Dependents' Carers' Allowance.**

The Council currently offers a Dependents' Carers' Allowance of up to £5.25 per hour subject to a number of conditions.

Our research has shown that current local rates for child care are now banded by age and whilst most nurseries are not prepared to take on ad hoc bookings there are some which will and there are also registered childminders. An average taken of nine local nurseries and childminders would suggest a new hourly rate for childminding should be £6 per hour. This, however, is below the "Living Wage" and we **RECOMMEND** that the hourly rate for Dependents' Carers' Allowance for child care should be set at the current Living Wage or the actual expenditure whichever is the less.

In regard to adult care, again rates are now banded into day, evening and weekend rates. Averaging a range of local adult care providers suggests a day rate of £19 per hour, an evening rate up to 9p.m. of £21 per hour and an after 9 p.m. and weekend rate of £23 per hour and we **RECOMMEND** that these rates, or, if less, the actual expenditure incurred, should be applied as the Dependents' Carers' Allowance for 2015/16.

We have noted that the Chief Executive has power to increase these rates in exceptional circumstances and we would not wish to interfere with that arrangement.

Evidence of actual expenditure should continue to be required and the Council should police this aspect of Members' Allowances to ensure that the conditions of the scheme are being complied with.

### **7. Pensions for Councillors.**

We understand that there is currently provision for the Basic Allowance and SRAs to be pensionable where Members elect to opt into the scheme and we **RECOMMEND** that this should continue to be the case. This provision would not apply to the Mayoral Allowance.

### **8. Travel and Subsistence.**

The Council currently pays car mileage, motor cycle and pedal cycle allowances to Members based on the Inland Revenue agreed rates and we **RECOMMEND** the continuation of this arrangement. Whilst the Inland Revenue rates are by no means generous any increase above these rates could cause Members to incur an additional tax liability.

We understand that, although they are rarely claimed, subsistence allowances are paid to Members on the same basis as those for staff and we **RECOMMEND** that this basis should continue to be used.

### **9. Index Linking.**

The Council currently indexes annual uplifts in Basic Allowance and SRAs to the rate of increase in staff salaries and this is an index adopted by a large number of local authorities. We **RECOMMEND** that this continues to be the basis on which Basic Allowance and SRAs are indexed.

To maintain the integrity of the methodology index linking for the Basic Allowance should be geared to staff salary increases. Other SRAs should be assessed using the formulae in column 5 of Appendix "A" to our report.

For Dependents' Carers' Allowances we believe that the Living Wage at any particular point should be the basis for reimbursement for child care and that the retail price index should be used when indexing the three bands we recommend for adult care.

### **10. Conclusions.**

We have said, (see paragraph 3 above) that it is our role to recommend to the Council a Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances which reflect the time commitments and responsibilities of Members in fulfilling their particular duties. We have calculated and set out a number of options (including one increasing current allowances by 1%) and these are set out in Appendix "A" to our report.

As stated in paragraph 5 above our favoured option is that in column 4 of Appendix “A” We believe that not only will this be within the figure allowed in the 2015/16 budget for Members’ Allowances but it will also rationalise a number of inconsistencies in the current scheme. It does, however, require an acknowledgement by Members that the “Public Service Discount” is 47%.

(Pamela Heyfron, John Marsh, John Smith, Stewart Smith, December 2014)

APPENDIX "A"						
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	CURRENT ALLOWANCE £	CALCULATED ALLOWANCE 2015/16 35% Free £	CURRENT ALLOWANCE (with recommended SRA %age changes) PLUS 1% £	CALCULATED ALLOWANCE 2015/16 47% FREE £	RATIONALE BASED ON 2007 & 2011 METHODOLOGY	CALCULATED ALLOWANCE 2015/16 47% FREE LEADER'S SRA 3.3 X BASIC
BASIC ALLOWANCE	6669	8276	6736	6749	2014 ASHE (provisional)	6749
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL	22238	24828	22460	20247	3 X BASIC ALLOWANCE	22272
DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL	14816	18621	14964	15185	75% OF LEADER	16704
CABINET MEMBERS	11119	14897	11239	12148	60% OF LEADER	13363
C/M OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	6671	7448	6737	6074	30% OF LEADER	6681
V/C OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	667	745	674	607	10% OF CHAIRMAN	668
C/M OF LICENSING	5559	3724*	3369 *	3037	25% OF LEADER 2011 15% LEADER 2015	3341
V/C OF LICENSING	556	372*	337 *	304	10% OF CHAIRMAN	334
C/M OF HUMAN RESOURCES	5559	3724*	3369 *	3037	25% OF LEADER 2011 15% LEADER 2015	3341
V/C OF HUMAN RESOURCES	556	372*	337 *	304	10% OF CHAIRMAN	334
C/M OF AUDIT (GOVERNANCE) & ACCOUNTS	5559	6207	5615	5062	25% OF LEADER	5568
V/C OF AUDIT (GOVERNANCE) & ACCOUNTS	556	621	561	506	10% OF CHAIRMAN	557
C/M OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE & POLICY COMMITTEES	5559	6207	5615	5062	25% OF LEADER	5568
V/C OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE & POLICY COMMITTEES	556	621 621	561	507 506	10% OF CHAIRMAN	557
C/M MANYDOWN POLICY COMMITTEE	5559	3724*	3369	3037	EQUIVALENT TO C/M LICENSING & HUMAN RESOURCES	3341
V/C MANYDOWN POLICY COMMITTEE	556	372*	337	304	EQUIVALENT TO VICE C/M LICENSING & HUMAN RESOURCES	334
C/M OF STANDARDS	5559	3724*	3369 *	3037	CURRENTLY 25% OF LEADER 15% ON	3341

					APPOINTMENT OF NEW CHAIRMAN	
<b>V/C STANDARDS</b>	N/A	372*	337 *	304	10% OF CHAIRMAN	334
<b>CO-OPTES</b>	444	744	674	608	20% OF CHAIRMAN OF STANDARDS	668
<b>PRINCIPAL OPPOSITION LEADER</b>	6671	3724	3369	3037	15% OF LEADER	3341
<b>LEADERS OF POLITICAL GROUP</b>	3336	3724	3369	3037	at current political composition 15% OF LEADER	3341
<b>IND'T FORUM CO - ORD'R</b>	3336	372	3369	3037	at current political composition 15% OF LEADER	3341

\* Recommendation to reduce SRAs for Chairmen from 25% to 15% of that for the Leader of the Council.

OTHER SOUTH EAST LOCAL AUTHORITIES/BASINGSTOKE & DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL IRP REPORT DECEMBER  
2014

APPENDIX “B”

AUTHORITY	POPULATION	NUMBER OF MEMBERS	BASIC ALLOWANCE £	LEADER'S SRA £	OPPOSITION GROUP LEADER £	OTHER GROUP LEADERS £
ASHFORD	118000	43	4422	11464	N/A	222
AYLESBURY VALE	180000	59	5388	16164	5388	5388
BASINGSTOKE & DEANE	172000	60	6669	22238	6671	3336
MAIDSTONE	157000	55	4666	23326	5831	2331
NEW FOREST	173700	60	5897	18794	7048	NIL
SOUTH OXFORDSHIRE	128100	48	2900	10000	NIL	NIL
SWALE	138000	47	4784	18180	9090	1818
TEST VALLEY	116000	48	6313	11968	2820	N/A
TONBRIDGE & MALLING	121000	53	5127	17841	2301	-
WEALDEN	149000	55	4300	12580	355	1000
WYCOMBE	177000	60	4560	15958	2394	VARIES

Source:- South East Employers Members' Allowance Survey November 2014

- **RECOMMENDED levels for Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances for the municipal year 2015/16 with a "Public Service Discount" of 47% are shown in Column 4 of Appendix "A"**
- Levels of Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances for the municipal year 2015/16 with a "Public Service Discount" of 35% are shown in Column 2 of Appendix "A" (paragraphs 4 – 5j) **NOT RECOMMENDED**
- Levels of Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances for the municipal year 2015/16 based on a 1% uplift in the budget for Members' Allowances are shown in Column 3 of Appendix "A" (Paragraphs 4 – 5j) **NOT RECOMMENDED**
- A number of Special Responsibility Allowances should be reduced for the municipal year 2015/16 and beyond namely for Licensing, Human Resources and Standards Committees. (Paragraphs 5c, 5d, 5e and 5i.)
- All Group Leaders should receive the same SRA and the budget for these SRAs should be capped and individual SRAs for Group Leaders recalculated in the event of a change in the number of groups. (Paragraph 5j.)
- Index linking for the Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances should continue to be geared to staff salary increases. (Paragraph 9)
- There should be different levels of Dependents' Carers' Allowances for child care and adult care. (Paragraph 6)
- Index linking for Dependents' Carers' Allowances should be on the basis of the Living Wage in the case of children and the Retail Price Index in the case of adults. ( Paragraph 9)
- There should be no change to the current arrangements for Allowances being pensionable. (Paragraph 7)
- Travel and subsistence allowances should be paid according to Inland Revenue and staff rates respectively. (Paragraph 8)
- The Head of Resources is asked to explore with the Inland Revenue the possibility of a proportion of the Mayoral Allowance being treated as expenses and thus as a tax free reimbursement. (Paragraph 5l.) In the event of a negative response from the Inland Revenue the Mayoral Allowance be increased by £1000 effective from the start of the 2015/16 municipal year.

