

# minutes



Meeting PENSIONS ADMINISTRATION SUB-COMMITTEE

Date Thursday, 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2006 (commencing at 10.00 am)

## **membership**

Persons absent are marked with `A`

## **COUNCILLORS**

John Carter (Chair)

Darrell Pulk (Vice-Chair)

A	M J Cox		Sheila Place
A	Mrs Kay Cutts	A	Ken Rigby
	Paul Henshaw	A	Stella Smedley
A	James O'Riordan		John Stocks
	Thomas A Pettengell	A	David Taylor

## **NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**

A Councillor B Parbutt

A Mr M Evans

## **NOTTINGHAMSHIRE LOCAL AUTHORITIES' ASSOCIATION**

A Councillor Milan Radulovic

## **TRADE UNIONS**

Mr A Ackerman

Mr J Dunstan

## **PENSIONERS**

Mrs E Bradford

Mr T V Needham

## **SCHEDULED BODIES**

Vacancy

## **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr C. Tansley - UNISON

## **MINUTES**

The minutes of the last meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2005, having been circulated to all Members, were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor M. J. Cox  
Councillor Mrs Kay Cutts  
Councillor James O'Riordan\*  
Councillor Ken Rigby  
Councillor Stella Smedley  
Councillor David Taylor

\* denotes on other County Council business

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

There were no declarations of interest made by Members or Officers.

## **THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME (AMENDMENT) (NO 3) REGULATIONS 2005 – CONSULTATION DRAFT**

The Director of Resources explained the main proposals contained in the Regulations.

Members of the Sub-Committee raised the following comments to be included in the consultation process:-

- Trade Union representatives remained opposed to the proposals both in general terms and specifically with regard to the removal of the 85 year rule
- reports had now emerged that the European Union was of the view that the current arrangements in the Local Government Pension Scheme did not appear to breach any European Employment Directives and that, on the basis of this argument, there was no need to remove the 85 year rule with effect from 30<sup>th</sup> September 2006; if this was the case then further clarification and review of this aspect was required;
- clarification was also required on the tax position for any employees who made pensions contributions above 15% limit
- the proposals still seemed to penalise long serving members of the Scheme whose benefits would be revised from those that they understood were available when joining the Scheme; it was accepted that the situation for new members joining the Scheme was entirely different

- notwithstanding the Council's views it had to be accepted that other Councils had differing ones and that all views would be considered before any decision on the Scheme was made at national level.

The Chair reported that he had asked Mr. Tansley, Branch Secretary of UNISON, to present his views to the Sub-Committee. Mr. Tansley reported that he had been involved in the national negotiations on the revised Regulations. He said that it had looked at one stage as though agreement would be reached, particularly around protection issues but that, unfortunately from his point of view, LGA leaders had been able to influence discussions, particularly about the 85 year rule. He emphasised that Trade Unions were not opposed to any overhaul and review of the current scheme, which he felt could be justified on demographic and social grounds, but that they were opposed to any proposals which sought to pick out specific issues and which did not provide parity with agreements reached with regard to other public sector schemes. In conclusion, he thanked the Sub-Committee for the opportunity to talk to Members and also for the position which the Council had taken on seeking to protect the existing benefits of the Local Government Pension Scheme.

The Director of Resources provided additional information for Members to consider. He commented that the "cliff edge" effect of the proposals where an employee's situation varied depending on which side of the arbitrary line for change they stood perhaps needed further review with more flexibility on this aspect being provided. He also reported on the most up-to-date views of the Actuary on the solvency levels of the Nottinghamshire Fund in the light of recent economic developments, and on research work on the use of flexibilities in other Funds to commute part of a pension into a lump sum and the proposed commutation arrangements in the consultation paper.

Following full discussion and on a motion by the Chair, duly seconded, it was:-

**RESOLVED: 2006/001**

1. That the report be noted;
2. that a response to the draft consultation be prepared by the Director of Resources based on the views set out above;
3. that the draft referred to in (2) above be circulated to Members for any further comments and then sent to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister before 28<sup>th</sup> February 2006 and
4. that the response be submitted to the Pensions Committee at its meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2006 for endorsement and any additional views that may emerge.

**CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS AND PENSIONS**

**RESOLVED: 2006/002**

That the report be noted.

## **PENSION FUND ANNUAL MEETING – 7<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2005**

Further to the content of the minutes of the Annual Meeting and discussion at the last meeting, pensioner representatives reported that feedback from their enquiries had suggested that there was no enthusiasm for a separate meeting for pensioners. In noting this situation, it was suggested that the next edition of Nest Egg could publicise this issue.

Following discussion on the venue for this year's Annual Meeting, it was agreed that the meeting be held at County Hall.

### **RESOLVED: 2006/003**

1. That the minutes of the 2005 Pension Fund Annual Meeting, attached as an appendix to the report, be noted and
2. that arrangements be made to hold the 2006 Annual Meeting at County Hall.

The meeting closed at 10.45 am.

**CHAIR**  
m\_2Feb06