

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL TO NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Note: Reference in this report to 'scheme' means the current Members' Allowances Scheme of Nottinghamshire County Council effective from 1 October 2003.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The previous Panel was appointed by Nottinghamshire County Council to make recommendations in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003. This Panel met during the summer of 2003. Its recommendations were accepted by the Council and the Scheme was implemented with effect from 1st October 2003. The Scheme has been in operation since that time without further review with adjustments in allowances being uprated in accordance with Local Government pay awards as proposed by the Panel.
- 1.2 A new administration was elected at the County Council elections held in May 2005 and, after a settling-in period, proposals for revised political structures in respect of the Executive and non-Executive parts of the Council are to be made. We were asked, therefore, to meet to consider the appropriateness of the current structure of allowances in the light of these proposed changes.
- 1.3 Proposals and evidence in respect of this issue are referred to later in the report. In addition to this substantive matter, the following issues were also referred to us for a recommendation or view on future practice:-
- (a) the position of the Chair of the Standards Committee;
 - (b) a change to the arrangements included in the current Scheme for information technology for Councillors;
 - (c) suggested revisions to the process for dealing with the submission of late claims for allowances;
 - (d) a Scheme for co-opted Members and

- (e) a representation received from a member of the public about the payment of allowances.
- 1.4 In addition to these issues other specific matters came to our attention during consideration of evidence presented to us and these matters are also commented on later in the report.
- 1.5 Our consideration of these issues and our recommendations are set out below.
- 1.6 Our backgrounds are as follows:-

Rodney Brooke

Rodney Brooke is Chair of the General Social Care Council. He was formerly Chief Executive of West Yorkshire County Council and the City of Westminster and Secretary to the Association of Metropolitan Authorities. He has written extensively on local government and public policy. He serves on a number of Independent Remuneration Panels.

Madi Sharma

Madi Sharma holds positions on various Boards and Taskforces for Government and the private sector. She is a member of the European Social and Economic Committee and a non-executive Director of Carlton TV (Midlands region). She has a high media profile through winning previous awards, including Asian Women of Achievement and the UKs Best Boss. She also serves on a number of Independent Remuneration Panels.

Keith Neale

Keith Neale was formerly County Treasurer of Essex for 15 years. He served as President and Secretary of the Society of County Treasurers. He was an advisor to the Association of County Councils' Policy Committee and was Chairman of the Officer Advisory Group reporting to the UKSC/Local Government Association on pensions matters. For the last 4 years he has run his own business as an Independent Pension Fund Advisor to major pension schemes. He is also a Director of the East of England Tourist Board

- 1.7 We met on 5th April 2006. We were supported in our work by Jayne Francis, Assistant Head of Legal Services and Paul Robinson, Principal Officer in the Chief Executive's Department, for whose assistance we are most grateful. We would, however, wish to make it clear that the recommendations contained in this report are entirely our own.

2. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

- 2.1 Our starting point was to undertake a full review of the existing Scheme and then consider the representations put to us, both orally and in writing.
- 2.2 In this connection, we considered the current Scheme, the level of payments provided within it and the 2004 Members' Allowances Survey compiled by the IDeA. We also received written papers on the specific issues referred to in paragraph 1.3 above.
- 2.3 We also invited any Member of the Authority who wished to address us to meet with us. We took evidence in person from Councillor David Kirkham, Leader of the County Council, Councillor Chris Baron, Cabinet Member for Culture, Councillor Joyce Bosnjak, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Partnerships, Councillor Sheila Place, Chief Whip of the Labour Group, Councillor Jim O'Riordan, Assistant Whip of the Labour Group, Councillor Pat Lally, Labour Group Secretary, Councillor Steve Carroll, Chair of a Scrutiny Committee, Councillors Jen Cole and Darrell Pulk, non-executive Members, Councillor Mrs. Kay Cutts, Leader of the Conservative Group (main minority group) and Councillor Stan Heptinstall, Leader of the Liberal Democrats Group (second minority group)(see appendix A). This appendix also lists the written representations that we received and considered. These are referred to and commented upon later in our report when dealing with specific issues.
- 2.4 As we have stated, our starting point was the current Scheme. All those presenting evidence to us felt that it had stood the test of time, was operating well and, broadly, the level of allowances and their relativity in terms of the different roles performed were acceptable. In addition, we were aware that the Council had received a 4 star ranking from the Comprehensive Performance Assessment process and was independently judged to be performing well and moving in the right direction. Indeed the Council is 1 of only 13 out of 34 County Councils to achieve this status.

- 2.5 Having considered this evidence our views on the various aspects are as follows:-

Basic Allowance

- 2.6 Basic Allowance currently stands at £12,135. We were aware from comparative data that this payment was in the top quartile of basic allowance paid by Councils in the Country. The majority of those giving evidence felt that this was a reasonable basic allowance which enabled all Councillors to perform their role and that it would not be appropriate to raise this allowance. However, there was a minority view that the allowance did not reflect the full role performed by all Councillors.
- 2.7 Having listened to the views put to us and in the absence of any real evidence to the contrary we feel, therefore, that the current arrangements should continue. We repeat the view of the previous Panel that this basic allowance covers the duties of Members such as hearing appeals and attending regulatory and ethical Committees. For this reason, we do not agree with the views expressed by some presenting evidence to us that additional allowances should be made to ordinary Members serving on the Planning and Licensing and Standards Committees.

Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA)

- 2.8 The previous Panel recommended that SRAs should be applied to a number of roles, set at different bands reflecting levels of responsibility with adjustments in line with Local Government pay awards. Currently the Leader receives a SRA of £27,303 per annum and Cabinet Members £18,201 per annum. The Leader of the Council presented detailed evidence to us on proposals to vary the political structure of the Council and we considered the implications of these proposals for the current SRAs. In summary, the proposals put to us by the Leader were as detailed below.
- 2.9 A Cabinet of 9 Members was proposed with revised Portfolios to reflect changing circumstances, in particular to respond to national requirements to establish and develop a Portfolio with specific responsibility for Children and Young People's Services and also to take local action to particularly enhance and further develop the role of the Leader and the Deputy Leader. The proposals also suggested the creation of three Deputy Cabinet Member posts to assist the Cabinet portfolio holders with the greatest responsibility. This would see two Deputies assisting the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services (this Portfolio being responsible for some 80% of the Council's Budget) and one assisting the Cabinet Member for Adult Services and Health. It was also suggested to us that this proposal would offer opportunities to develop Cabinet Member skills for non-Cabinet Members and so provide a form of career progression not currently offered

by the Cabinet and Leader model when compared to the traditional Committee system previously operated.

- 2.10 In terms of the Scrutiny function, the Leader suggested to us that currently Members involved in this function spent too much time in meetings and receiving Departmental presentations rather than being able to focus on the major issues affecting the Council. Currently Scrutiny Committees mirrored Cabinet portfolios and it was felt that this inhibited cross-cutting scrutiny. In the circumstances, it was proposed to us that the current Scrutiny system should be replaced with a new Scrutiny Overview Committee with a Chair and three Vice-Chairs. The Overview Committee would be supported by three Select Committees (chaired by the Vice-Chairs of the Overview Committee) and the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee with Nottingham City Council. The position of Chair for this latter body is rotated between the County Council and Nottingham City Council on an annual basis. It is the intention that the co-ordinating Overview Select Committee will meet more often than the current Select Committees and that there will be a new strategic responsibility for its Chair and three Vice-Chairs in terms of planning and developing a full Scrutiny programme involving all non-executive Members.
- 2.11 The Leader also commented on other proposals he had to bridge the gulf he perceived existed between Executive and non-Executive Councillors and also to bring the more important issues into the public domain by the development of Cabinet Committees and Departmental briefings. These proposals have no implications for the Members' Allowances Scheme.
- 2.12 We were advised by the Leader that a report on his proposals would be submitted to the Annual Meeting of the County Council on 18th May 2006 and, if approved, would then be implemented. He also advised us that the content of these proposals had been shared with the other two political groups on the Council who supported their implementation.
- 2.13 In looking at the payment of SRAs, and in addition to the proposals outlined above, we also took into account the following matters. As has been noted the County Council is a 4 star performing Council. It is also a large Council, which if education spending is included, employs some 27,000 people and has an annual budget of £739 million. It provides many important services to citizens of the County and, on any scale, is a big "player" in developing and moving the County area forward.
- 2.14 In addition to what we have said above, a further starting point for us in looking at the Scheme for SRAs is the position of the Leader in a large County Council. We feel that SRAs for positions below the Leader should be expressed as a percentage of his/her responsibility and ranked in that order. Our proposals in this respect attempt to achieve this. Insofar as the position

of the Leader is concerned, we have taken note of the annual salary for a backbench MP, the fact that recently the salaries for the Chairs of Primary Care Trusts have increased to a maximum of £40,000 and the fact that the Leader of the adjoining Unitary City Council is paid a SRA of £30,000. Having regard to evidence received, we are of the view that the Leader's SRA should be set at £30,000 per annum. We regard this modest increase as by no means fully reflecting the scale and importance of the job of Leader of a substantial County Council like Nottinghamshire, but have regard to the sensitivities which surround such matters at a time of fiscal austerity.

- 2.15 Having set the Leader's SRA we then propose SRAs for other posts as set out in the Schedule listed in our recommendations on pages 12 - 15 of this report expressed as a percentage of the Leader's SRA. In doing so we had regard to the levels of responsibility attached to the various roles. More bands have therefore been introduced to reflect, what in our view, are the revised roles arising from the proposals we have heard. In particular we feel that the proposals for the new role for the Deputy Leader warrant a separate band, band 2, due to the enhanced role proposed which sets it apart from other Cabinet Members. Separate bands are also proposed in respect of the proposals for scrutiny and we feel that the bands proposed at band 4, for the Chair of the Overview Scrutiny Committee, and at band 6, for the three Vice-Chairs of the Overview Scrutiny Committee and the Chair of the Joint Health Committee when chaired by a County Councillor, adequately reflect the anticipated workload. We would also draw specific attention to our proposals at band 8, with the proposed SRA for the Vice-Chairs of the three Scrutiny Committees and for the Vice-Chair of the Joint Health Committee when that position is occupied by a County Councillor (that is, when the Chair rotates to the Nottingham City Council). We are aware that in many other Authorities, the Chairs of Scrutiny Committees are shared between the various parties on the Authority. We recognise that this is not the case in Nottinghamshire but in order to encourage the inclusion of the opposition parties on the Council in the scrutiny process we have suggested a separate band in the hope that representatives of the minority parties on the Council are appointed to these positions. Other matters in the Schedule which we would wish to make reference to, for example Standards Committee issues, are dealt with later in this report.
- 2.16 We feel that it would be appropriate at this time to acknowledge the advice we received during our deliberations about the budgetary situation facing the County Council. We understand that the Council is facing a difficult financial situation and that, over the next two years, will have to reduce its budget. We further understand that part of this process will involve a number of redundancies. In these circumstances some people may, therefore, view our proposals on SRAs as inappropriate at this time. This, however, is not our view. It is essential for the future of Nottinghamshire and its County Council that able people are retained and recruited as Councillors. To

achieve this, reasonable recognition must be given to those who are responsible for that Council. We believe our proposals to be extremely modest in relation to the onerous responsibilities undertaken by Nottinghamshire County Councillors.

Chair of Standards Committee

- 2.17 We were advised that, when the Scheme was introduced in October 2003, it was the Council's practice to appoint an elected Councillor as Chair of the Standards Committee (and pay the appropriate allowance in the Scheme). The three Independent Members were elected Vice-Chairs and paid the statutory co-optees allowance, currently standing at £546 per annum. We were advised that, following the County Council elections in May 2005, the Council changed this practice and appointed one of the Independent Members as Chair of the Committee, with two Vice-Chairs then being elected, both elected Councillors. The other two Independent Members then took their places as ordinary members of the Standards Committee.
- 2.18 We were advised that the profile and workload of the Standards Committee has increased and will continue to do so in the light of the forthcoming changes to the role of the Standards Board for England. In accordance with the guidance on Local Authority allowances issued in March 2004 the Chair of the Standards Committee, whether an elected Councillor or not, should receive an allowance equivalent to the SRA considered appropriate for this role. In our view that role should be recognised at band 7 in the Schedule and we recommend accordingly. In view of the argument put forward concerning the increased workload and role for the Standards Committee, we accept that the role of the other two Independent Members on the Committee is greater than that of the other statutory co-optees appointed to the current Education and Lifelong Learning Select Committee and we propose, therefore, that they be paid an allowance equivalent to the SRA at band 11 in the Schedule in the recommendations to reflect this role.

Submissions of Late Claims for Allowances

- 2.19 The current Scheme, in its appendix on Administrative Matters, requires that claims for travel and subsistence are made within two months of duty and that any late claims are only met with the approval of the Chief Executive, following consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Standards Committee. We received details of the incidence of late claiming since 2003 and the process followed in resolving these matters. We were further reminded that the Standards Committee had powers relating to Members' Allowances issues, for example on the suspension of such allowances, and, in the circumstances, are of the view that in future late claims should be determined solely by the Standards Committee. We feel that this would provide a more transparent process, with any decisions taken fitting neatly

into the powers of the Standards Committee as referred to above.

Information Technology for Councillors

2.20 The current Scheme includes the following at part 6:-

“Any Councillor wishing to have a second telephone line or Broadband facility* installed in their homes for the sole purposes of using County Council provided IT equipment to access the Council’s IT facilities may claim the cost of installation, line rental and call charges from the County Council.

(Note: * the installation of Broadband will be considered only where secure connections are available to the satisfaction of the Council’s Head of Information Technology).”

2.21 We were advised that since 2003 the security issues associated with the use of Broadband at home to access the Council’s IT server had been satisfactorily addressed to such an extent that all Councillors are encouraged to have Broadband at home for using their County Council provided IT equipment. To facilitate this, we understand that the Council’s IT service makes all the necessary arrangements for installation and pays the charges centrally. In addition we were further advised by the Council that, due to the pace of technological change, it was likely that it may be able to permit access to its IT server by Councillors using their own PCs and Internet connections. This arrangement is currently being trialled and initial feedback has shown that it is popular as Councillors have a single connection and set of kit at home.

2.22 The Council suggests, therefore, that the Scheme could be amended to reflect arrangements that are actually in place and the following amendment was proposed to us:

“The County Council will arrange the installation, and meet the costs of the second telephone line or Broadband facility in Councillors’ homes for the sole purpose of accessing the Council’s IT facilities, either with equipment provided by the County Council, or using their own computers (subject to the agreement of the Head of IT in each case where the latter is required).”

2.23 We were reassured that the County Council has a robust policy on the acceptable use of IT equipment, which Councillors have to sign and which also specifies the limited personal use that may be made of the facilities. On this basis, we are content with this proposal.

Co-opted Members

- 2.24 The current Scheme provides for the payment of an annual allowance of £546 to statutory co-optees, previously identified as those persons statutorily appointed to the Standards Committee and the Education and Lifelong Learning Select Committee. Our attention was drawn to a proposal to be made to the County Council at its meeting on 6th April 2006 concerning the establishment of a Scheme for co-opted Members to have voting rights on Scrutiny Committees with a pool of around 20 such co-opted Members who would receive a similar allowance to that in the Scheme for statutory co-optees. The report to the County Council was circulated to us.
- 2.25 Those Councillors that appeared before us had mixed views on the desirability of such a Scheme. They were also unable to explain clearly to us how the proposed pool of co-optees would be appointed and whether all political parties on the Council would be involved in the appointment process. We also noted that current Scrutiny arrangements on the Council allowed the appointment of experts in a particular field to assist with the matter under scrutiny and that this type of arrangement could still be appropriate in respect of the revised proposals for scrutiny put to us and referred to earlier in this report.
- 2.26 Whilst we fully accept and recognise that it is both useful and appropriate to involve lay people from outside the County Council in the scrutiny process, we are not convinced that the appointment of a panel of co-optees (which is a matter for the Council) warrants the payment of a co-optees allowance. If the Council decides to appoint this panel, then we would be prepared to review the experiment after say one year's operation to see how it worked in practice and at that time reconsider the issue of whether any allowance should be attached to the role.
- 2.27 After we met we were advised that the report on this proposed Scheme was in fact withdrawn from the County Council's agenda.

3 OTHER ISSUES

Representation from a Member of the Public

- 3.1 We gave consideration to information placed before us concerning correspondence from a member of the public who raised a number of issues concerning the level of Members' allowances generally and also about the payment of SRAs in Nottinghamshire. We asked that this member of the public be advised that it was our view that it was of fundamental importance

that a major County Council, like Nottinghamshire, should be able to attract quality people to serve as Councillors and that the payments and arrangements set out in the Scheme were entirely appropriate to achieve this objective.

Role of Audit

- 3.2 The role of the Chair of the Audit Committee was previously recognised with the payment of a SRA in the current Scheme. We feel that this should still be the case and recommend that the position should attract a SRA at band 7. Since the Scheme was agreed with effect from 1st October 2003 we understand that this position has been occupied by a Cabinet Member of the majority Group.
- 3.3 We are, however, aware that in 2005 guidance was drawn up by CIPFA concerning best practice advice for the operation of Audit Committees. This advice stresses that the Audit Committee should undertake an independent role and that its "...Chair should not be, expressly, a member of the executive. A non-executive chair is important to promote the objectivity of the audit committee and to enhance its standing in the eyes of the public." This advice also says that if it is considered necessary for the membership of the Committee to be comprised of representatives of the Executive and Scrutiny functions, then this should be restricted to 1 from each. In the circumstances, we strongly urge the Council to review its arrangements for appointing the Chair of the Audit Committee and the overall membership.

Redundancy/Severance Payments

- 3.4 Our attention was drawn to the often difficult situation that Councillors find themselves in if they in effect become "redundant" through losing their seat at an election or retiring from the Council. We were aware that there is a precedent for making such severance payments both in Parliament and in Welsh Councils. We are sympathetic to the view that Councillors should have some form of recompense in these circumstances, which in many respects are outside of their control. Although we have no powers to deal with this matter, we would however urge the County Council to consider this issue and make any representations for such a scheme through the Local Government Association. We certainly support any such representations. If the Council was minded to pursue such a course of action, then we would suggest that any case put forward should base payments on a Councillor's length of service.

Members of Appeals Committee

- 3.5 We were aware that the Council has a Committee dealing with appeals against dismissal, etc where Councillors consider complex and sensitive

cases. Part of this Committee's responsibilities was to deal with a number of appeals against dismissal arising out of a process undertaken by the Council to review the pay grades of its senior officer structure. During 2005/06 this resulted in a high level of additional complex cases which led to the Appeals Committee sitting much more often than would usually have been the case. For example, Councillors on the Committee were involved in hearing cases which extended to some 50 hours during a 3 week period. This time commitment was in addition to other County Council duties and excluded preparation time and training which the Council estimates to have been a further 30 hours.

- 3.6 We accept that for those Councillors on the Appeals Committee this was a much greater workload than had originally been envisaged. However, the Regulations surrounding the payment of Members' Allowances do not allow retrospective payments to be made beyond the commencement of the financial year. We are, therefore, unable to take any action on this issue. In the light of this experience, however, we do feel that the Council should bear this matter in mind if the Appeals Committee is faced with a similar situation in the future.
- 3.7 Paragraph 5(e) of the 2003 Regulations states that a SRA can be paid to a Councillor acting as a Member of a Committee "...which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods." What we have in mind, therefore, is that if a similar situation arises in the future involving the type of time commitment set out in paragraph 3.5 above, then the ordinary Members involved receive a SRA at band 12 in the Schedule.

4. OPERATION/ADJUSTMENTS TO THE SCHEME

- 4.1 Our recommendations in respect of the matters referred to us are set out below:-
- revised Special Responsibility Allowances to be brought into operation, dependent on the approval of proposals for a revised political structure at the Annual Meeting of the County Council on 18th May 2006 which accord with the proposals outlined to us above; in the event that these proposals alter, or are not adopted, then we will need to meet again to reconsider allowances based on the actual structure adopted
 - amendments to be made to the current Members' Allowances Scheme in respect of payments to the Independent Members appointed to the Standards Committee, revised arrangements for additional telephone lines and revised procedures for the submission of late allowances claims

- the new Scheme to be implemented from 1st July 2006, subject to there being no alterations as referred to above
- with regard to future adjustments, all allowances, except the travelling and subsistence allowances, should be adjusted in accordance with future Local Government pay awards and these annual adjustments should be used to amend the Scheme for a maximum of four years or until earlier review.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 We trust that our recommendations below build on those of the Independent Panels which reported in April 2000 and September 2003 and that the County Council will accept them. They continue to be based on the principles of equity, clarity, acceptability and ease of understanding and now take into account the experience of the last 3 years in the practical operation of the Scheme. Finally, we hope that they can continue to contribute to assisting in encouraging the recruitment of suitable Councillors committed to the interests of the County.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Our recommendations are as follows:-

1. That basic allowance be unaltered and remain at its current rate of £12,135;
2. that special responsibility allowances be paid to the holders of positions as set out in the following Schedule:-

Band	% of Leader's SRA	Amount of Allowance (£p.a.)	Role
1	100	£30,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader of the Council
2	70	£21,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Leader of the Council
3	66	£20,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Members with Portfolio • Chief Whip of Majority Group (in respect of his/her management of County Council business)

Band	% of Leader's SRA	Amount of Allowance (£p.a.)	Role
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader of Minority Group (where the Group has at least 20% of the Council)
4	60	£18,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair of Overview Scrutiny Committee
5	50	£15,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairman of County Council*
6	40	£12,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Vice-Chairs of Overview Scrutiny Committee • Chair of Joint Health Committee (when chaired by a County Councillor)
7	33	£10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair of the following Committees:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning & Licensing - Appeals - Audit - Standards (whether an elected County Councillor or a Co-opted Independent Member) - Pensions • Deputy Cabinet Members (without Portfolio) • Assistant Whip of the Majority Group • Leader of the third largest Group on the Council (provided the Group meets the statutory definition of a Group)**
8	25	£7,500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice-Chairs of Scrutiny Committees "A", "B", "C", & Vice-Chair of Joint Health Committee (when this position occupied by a County Councillor)
9	24	£7,200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice-Chairman of the County Council* • Chief Whip of the main Minority Group
10	22	£6,600	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Leader of the Minority Group • Chair of the Administration Committee

Band	% of Leader's SRA	Amount of Allowance (£p.a.)	Role
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vice-Chair of the Appeals and Planning and Licensing Committees Assistant Whip of the main Minority Group Group Secretary of the Majority Group Main Minority Group Spokespersons on Cabinet Portfolios Main Minority spokesperson on the Planning and Licensing Committee
11	11	£3,300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Governors co-ordinator of the Main Minority Group
12	4	£1,200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group Whip of the second Minority Group Independent Member(s) of the Standards Committee
12	4	Amount of Allowance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ordinary Members of the Appeals Committee when undertaking work of exceptional frequency
		£1200	

* These SRAs include an element for clothing. Sections 3(5) and 5 (4) (as appropriate) of Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1972 enable the County Council to make a reasonable payment to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to enable them to meet the expenses of their office.

** Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel published on 15th September 2003.

3. that the existing Scheme be amended as referred to in the text of our report as follows:-
 - a) Part 2 of the Scheme in regard to allowances for statutory co-optees and Independent Members of the Standards Committee as set out in paragraph 2.17 above;

- b) Part 6 of the Scheme – other payments for Councillors (additional telephone lines) as set out in paragraph 2.22 above;
 - c) in the appendix on administrative matters in the Scheme in respect of the submission of late claims for allowances as set out in paragraph 2.19 above;
4. that, subject to the approval of a revised Political Structure for the Council at the Annual Meeting of the County Council on 18th May 2006, the revised Scheme be implemented with effect from 1st July 2006;
 5. that the County Council be requested to have regard to our views on proposals for a Scheme for co-opted Members as set out in paragraphs 2.24 – 2.26 above;
 6. that, with our full support, the Council be urged to make representations through the Local Government Association for the establishment of a redundancy/severance scheme for Councillors who lose their seat or retire from office and
 7. that the Council be requested to review its procedures for the appointment of the Chair of the Audit Committee and its general membership.

Rodney Brooke

Madi Sharma

Keith Neale

Note: All payments referred to are to be rounded to the nearest £3 in accordance with normal Local Government practice.

EVIDENCE/INFORMATION RECEIVED

1. BACKGROUND

- current Members' Allowances Scheme
- 2004 Members' Allowances Survey compiled by the IDeA
- reports/general information/correspondence in respect of
 - the position of the Chair of the Standards Committee
 - Information Technology for Councillors
 - submission of late claims by Members for travel and subsistence allowances
 - the political structure of Nottinghamshire County Council (including letter from the Leader with proposals, list of revised portfolio responsibilities and diary sheets for Cabinet Members)
 - a proposed Scheme for co-opted Members (including report to Council Meeting on 6th April 2006)
 - representation from a member of the public (including correspondence between the individual and the Council)

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED BY AND PROVIDED TO THE PANEL

- Nottingham City Council's Members' Allowances Scheme
- Circular from Sir William Wells, Chair of the NHS Appointments Committee

3. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED (IN ADDITION TO THOSE IN SECTION 1 ABOVE)

- Councillor Jim O'Riordan, Assistant Whip of the Labour Group, on roles and duties and diary sheets
- Councillor Mrs. Kay Cutts, Leader of the Conservative Group, responding to the Leader's report to the Panel with her Group's alternative suggestions

4. EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN PERSON

- Councillor David Kirkham, Leader of the Council
- Councillor Chris Baron, Cabinet Member for Culture

- Councillor Joyce Bosnjak, Cabinet Member for Community Services and Partnerships
- Councillor Sheila Place, Chief Whip of the Labour Group
- Councillor Jim O’Riordan, Assistant Whip of the Labour Group
- Councillor Pat Lally, Labour Group Secretary
- Councillor Steve Carroll, Chair of a Scrutiny Committee
- Councillors Jen Cole and Darrell Pulk, non-Executive Members
- Councillor Mrs. Kay Cutts, Conservative Group Leader
- Councillor Stan Heptinstall, Liberal Democrat Group Leader
- Ms P Holt-Murphy, Head of Members’ Services.

APPENDIX A – April 2006.doc