

A Review

Of the

Basic Allowance

And

**Special Responsibility Allowances
for Executive Members appointed
to the Commercial Sub-
Committee and Vice Chairs of
Scrutiny Panels**

For

Slough Borough Council

A Report by the

Independent Remuneration Panel

**Fred Ashmore
Pat Davis
Dr Declan Hall (Chair)**

July 2020

A Review of the Basic Allowance

And

Special Responsibility Allowances

For

Executive Member appointed to the Commercial Sub-Committee

And

Vice Chairs of Scrutiny Panels

For

Slough Borough Council

A Report

By the

Independent Remuneration Panel

The Regulatory Context

1. This report is a synopsis of the proceedings and recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel (the IRP) for Slough Borough Council to advise the Council on its current Members' allowances scheme, with particular reference to the Basic Allowance, Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) for the Cabinet Members on the Commercial Sub-Committee and Vice Chairs of the Scrutiny Panels.
2. On this particular occasion the IRP was convened under *The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 1021)* (the 2003

Regulations). These regulations require all local authorities to set up and maintain an Independent Members' Remuneration Panel to periodically review and provide advice on Members' allowances. All Councils are required to convene their Remuneration Panel and seek its advice before they make any changes or amendments to their allowances scheme and they must 'pay regard' to the IRP's recommendations before setting a new or amended Members' Allowances Scheme.

3. As such, since the Council is seeking to consider the appropriateness of changing the Members' Allowances Scheme in response to changes in governance structures in particular, the IRP has been reconvened the IRP under the following *2003 Regulations [19. (1)]*, (the duty to have regard to recommendations of Panels clause) which states:

Before an authority referred to in regulation 3(1) (a), (b), or (c) makes or amends a scheme, the authority shall have regard to the recommendations made in relation to it by an independent remuneration panel.

Terms of Reference

4. Following the Group Leaders meeting on 19th February 2020 the IRP was given a specific terms of reference, namely to make recommendations on the following, namely to consider:
 - i Whether the current benchmarking supports any change to the Basic Allowance
 - ii Whether the current approach in setting Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) for the Leader and Lead Members is still appropriate taking into account the establishment of the Commercial Sub-Committee
 - iii Whether there should be a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) for Vice Chairs of the three Scrutiny Panels
5. The IRP may make further recommendations with respect to Members' Allowances as it sees fit.

The IRPP and Process

6. The Council reconvened its IRP (as a 'virtual' Panel) consisting of the following members:
 - Fred Ashmore: Retired senior police officer (Thames Valley), former independent (co-opted) Chair of Slough Borough Council Standards Committee and former Slough Borough Council Independent Person appointed under Localism Act 2011

- Pat Davis: A solicitor and local businesswomen
- Dr Declan Hall (Chair): A former academic at the Institute of Local Government, The University of Birmingham and currently an independent consultant specialising in Members' Allowances and support.

Process and Methodology

7. As befitting the current times the IRP carried out this supplementary review as a "virtual" IRP. Although the *Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility) of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 (SI No. 392)*, which permit the Council to meet remotely in the time of this coronavirus lockdown they do not specifically apply to the IRP. However, there is no prescription for the IRP to meet physically. As such, it met remotely in the spirit of the Regulations 2020/SI392 as they apply to Councils on the following occasions:
 - 29th April 2020
 - 4th May 2020
 - 7th May 2020
8. Prior to the remote meetings all IRP Members were sent the relevant information to inform their meetings with Members and Officers. Subsequently, the Chair of the IRP took the lead in formulating recommendations and in writing the first draft of the report for comment and further amendment by other IRP members. When all IRP members agreed on the recommendations it was only then that the report was submitted to the Council for consideration.

Timescale

9. The IRP was asked to convene (remotely) as soon as possible (after the Leaders meeting on 19th February 2020) with a view to its report being submitted to the Council as soon as practicable but by July 2020 at the latest. However, in view of the current Covid-19 situation – November Council was agreed as the revised date for the report.

Information considered by the IRP

10. The IRP was asked to take into account *inter alia* the following range of evidence:
 - Relevant information on Slough Borough Council including previous IRP reports, the schedule of meetings for the Council, committees and sub committees and their terms of reference,

- The views of Members, both oral and written
 - Officer briefings on the developments in Council structures and to answer factual questions from the IRP
 - The range and level of allowances payable in the comparator group of authorities utilised for benchmarking purposes, namely
 - * The Unitary Councils that replied to the annual allowances survey by the South East Employers (SEE) for 2019/20
 - * The 5 other Berkshire Unitary Councils
 - * As a third benchmarking group was raised with the IRP it also benchmarked against Slough's 10 'Nearest Neighbours' (2014 model) as defined by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance Accountancy (CIPFA)
 - Other relevant supporting material such the 2003 Members Allowances Regulations, 2006 Statutory Guidance on Members Allowances, and advice of the Panel Chairman on issues and options to consider when reviewing allowances.
11. For further details on the information reviewed by the IRP and the Members who met with and/or made written submissions and Officers who provided factual briefing to the IRP see the following appendices:
- Appendix 1: full list of evidence and information received and reviewed by the IRP
 - Appendix 2: list of Councillors who met remotely with the IRP and made written submissions
 - Appendix 3: Officers who provided briefings to the IRP
 - Appendix 4: summary of the benchmarking carried out by the IRP

The Panel's Recommendations – the Basic Allowance

Recalibrating the Basic Allowance 2020

12. The basis of the current Basic Allowance (£7,779) is rooted in the 2010 review when the IRP reset it in accordance with the advice laid out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance (paragraph 67) which states that when an IRP is arriving at the recommended Basic Allowance it should consider the following:

Having established what local councillors do, and the hours which are devoted to these tasks the local authorities will need to take a view on the rate at which, and the number of hours for which, councillors ought to be remunerated.

13. This paragraph is broken down into three variables

- I. Time required to undertake roles associated with the Basic Allowance
 - II. Element that should be discounted to recognise the voluntary principle, often known as the ‘Public Service Discount’ and conceptualised as the time spent working with constituents and local communities
 - III. Rate of remuneration, in other words what a Councillor’s time is worth
14. In the 2010 review the IRP assigned the following values to these three variables:
- I. Time – 2 days per week/104 days per year (arrived at primarily through Councillor Interviews)
 - II. Public Service Discount – 1/3 or 35 days per year (Councillor Census 2010 showed this to be the element spent on constituent issues) leaving 69 remunerated days per year
 - III. Rate of remuneration - £102.65 per day (based on Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings – ASHE – Table 8.7a Slough Median annual salary of £26,689 2009)
15. The IRP then utilised the following formula to arrive at the 2010 recommended Basic Allowance:
- 104 days per year minus 35 days for the public service discount
 - = 69 remunerated days X £102.65 per day
 - = £7,083 which the IRP rounded up to £7,100
16. The current Basic Allowance of £7,779 has been arrived at through annual indexation, based on the annual percentage increase awarded to local government staff.
17. The IRP has recalibrated the Basic Allowance by applying the most up to date values to the three variables as follows
- I. Time – 22 hours (2.75 days) per week/143 days per year (based on email to IRP Chair Stephen Richards from Local Government Association 21st October 2019 that shows the amount of time spent on all Council duties broken down by positions held and types of Council)
 - II. Public Service Discount (PSD) – 45 per cent or 65 days (based on Local Government Association – LGA – Councillors Census 2018 that shows for all Councillors/all Councils that the mean amount of time spent on “engaging with constituents, surgeries, enquiries” and “working with community groups”¹ was just over 45 per cent of total reported inputs)
 - III. Rate of Remuneration – £108.17 per day (based on ASHE 2019 Table 8.7a, median Slough Salary of £28,125 divided by 260 working days)

¹ “Working with community groups” was added to the questionnaire in 2013 thus increases the element of the Public Service Discount, which the IRP has always conceptualised as part of Councillors duties spent on ward, constituent and community matters.

18. Thus by applying the formula as set out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance it arrives at a recalibrated Basic Allowance as follows:

- (143 days per year – 65 days PSD) X £108.17 per day
- = 78 remunerated days X £108.17 per day
- = £8,438

Benchmarking the Basic Allowance

19. In accordance with the its terms of reference the IRP the benchmarked the allowances under consideration against

- I. Other Berkshire Unitary Councils
- II. Unitary Councils in the South East that replied to the South East Employers Members' Allowances Survey 2019 (adjusted to remove the zero value entries)

20. As it was raised in the representation made to the IRP it also used a third benchmarking groups namely:

- III. Slough's 10 Nearest Neighbours as defined by CIPFA (2014 model)

21. Benchmarking the Basic Allowance shows the mean values in the three benchmarking groups

- | | |
|---|--------|
| I. Other Berkshire Unitaries (mean) | £8,052 |
| II. SEE Survey (mean) | £9,522 |
| III. CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours (mean) | £9,853 |

22. Benchmarking clearly shows that the Slough Basic Allowance has fallen behind that paid in peer councils.

Representation received

23. As a third point in the triangulation process in arriving at a recommended Basic Allowance the IRP has taken into account the views of the Members. The general view was that the Basic Allowance should not be out of sync with peer authorities, which it clearly is.

The recommended Basic Allowance

24. The IRP has chosen to recommend the recalibrated Basic Allowance (£8,438) as

- It is methodologically robust and replicates and updates the original basis of the current Basic Allowance
- While it is less than the benchmarked mean Basic Allowance in the SEE Survey and CIPFA benchmarking groups and somewhat higher than the

mean paid in the other Berkshire Unitary Councils it is approximately mid-way between the two Berkshire Councils comparable to Slough, namely Bracknell Forest (£8,687) and Windsor and Maidenhead (£8,143)

25. The IRP recommends that the Basic Allowance is set at £8,438.

Members appointed to the Commercial Sub-Committee

26. In June 2019 the Cabinet agreed to form a new Commercial Sub-Committee, with the aim to maximise existing and future commercial and business development opportunities within the Council.

27. The full remit of the Commercial Sub-Committee is

- I. Implement a Commercial Strategy and develop an Action Plan that brings together all existing commercial activities including (but not limited to) Slough Urban Renewal (SUR), the Strategic Acquisition Board (SAB), the Council's Housing Companies (including DISH), the proposed Environmental Services Trading Company and other new commercial activities that arise.
- II. Oversee the 'commercial' strand of the Council's on-going Transformation Programme to ensure it complies with the Committee's Guiding Principles'.
- III. Consider business plans and business cases linked to new commercial activities and make recommendations to Cabinet or full Council, as appropriate.
- IV. Monitor and review agreed performance targets from each commercial function and recommend action as required.
- V. Review proposed land acquisition and/or property investment proposals, taking into account the extent to which the proposition fulfils the Council's policy objectives against a set of agreed criteria.
- VI. Make strategic land acquisition decisions on behalf of the Council in line with processes agreed via the Strategic Acquisition Board (SAB).
- VII. Report acquisitions to Cabinet.
- VIII. Oversee the development, and monitor progress, against the Council's 15-year financial plan.

28. The meetings are chaired by the Leader and it comprises of three additional Cabinet Members, appointed by the Leader. There are four scheduled meetings each municipal year. The Sub-Committee will produce a bi-annual report and an annual report each year for consideration by the full Council. It will also develop a Commercial Strategy and Action Plan subject to approval by the Council.

29. The establishment of the Commercial Sub-Committee reflects the rapidly changing nature of Slough, much of which centres around regeneration, urban development and renewal and commercial investments (including joint and commercial companies). The Commercial Sub-Committee seeks to align or in

certain instances replace the initiatives undertaken by the existing and new strands of commercial activity while enhancing accountability in a rapidly expanding area.

30. While the IRP has been asked to specifically consider the impact of the Commercial Sub-Committee on the workload and responsibilities of members appointed to it the IRP heard that it is a reasonable expectation for all Cabinet Members to sit on and occasionally chair outside bodies, partnership organisations and other stakeholder bodies. Moreover, while the Commercial Sub-Committee is responsible for focusing on and overseeing the Council's commercial activities the broader risk is being held by the whole Cabinet.
31. The IRP recognises that there may well be discrepancies in the workloads and responsibilities held by individual Cabinet Members but it also recognises that some of this is a case of swings and roundabouts – what may be a smaller portfolio currently could become larger in the future depending on central government priorities for local government and the fallout of the on-going Coronavirus crisis. As such, the Panel has taken the view that the SRAs for all the Executive Members needs revising and have addressed this below.

The Leader of the Council

32. The Leader's current SRA (£20,224) was originally arrived at in 2010 by following an approach set out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance paragraph 76 which states

One way of calculating special responsibility allowances may be to take the agreed level of basic allowance and recommend a multiple of this allowance as an appropriate special responsibility allowance for either the elected mayor or the leader.

33. This is known as the factor approach. In 2010 the IRP arrived at the recommended SRA for the Leader by multiplying the recommending Basic Allowance by a factor of 2.6. This factor was chosen as it was the mean factor in both the Berkshire Councils and the SEE Survey benchmarking groups.
34. The IRP has decided to maintain this approach as well as maintain the factor of 2.6 times the recommended Basic Allowance as it is broadly in line with the mean factor of the mean Basic Allowance and mean Leaders SRA in the three benchmarking groups:
- Berkshire Councils mean Leaders' SRA as factor of mean BA 2.7
 - SEE Survey mean Leaders' SRA as factor of mean BA 2.5
 - CIPFA Nearest Neighbours mean Leaders SRA as factor of mean BA 2.6
35. When the recommended Basic Allowance (£8,438) is multiplied by a factor of 2.6 it produces a tentative Leaders' SRA of £21,939.

36. The three benchmarking groups show the mean Leaders' SRA as follows:
- Berkshire Councils Leaders' SRA mean £21,891
 - SEE Survey 2019 Leaders' SRA mean £23,983
 - CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours Leaders' SRA mean £25,343
37. The IRP notes that tentative Leader's SRA of £21,891 is aligned with the Berkshire mean Leaders' SRA rather than the mean Leaders' SRA for the SEE Survey and CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours benchmarking groups. However, the latter two benchmarking figures are higher as they include councils whose Leaders are deemed to be full time equivalent e.g., Brighton and Hove with a Leader's SRA of £32,505 and total package of £45,507 and Thurrock with a Leader's SRA of £32,207 and a total package of £41,409.
38. The Slough IRP, while recognising that the role of Leader regardless of the individual holding the post precludes full time day time employment as it is normally understood, has never concluded it demands a full time commitment. Therefore, the IRP is content that an SRA of £21,939 for the Slough Leader is appropriate. It maintains the SRA for the Slough Leader on par with peers in other Berkshire Unitary Councils
39. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Leader is set at £21,939.**

The Deputy Leader

40. In arriving at the other SRAs the IRP has always employed an approach set out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance (paragraph 76) which states:
- A good starting point in determining special responsibility allowances may be to agree the allowance which should be attached to the most time consuming post on the Council (this maybe the elected mayor or the leader) and pro rata downwards for the other roles which it has agreed ought to receive an extra allowance.
41. This is known as the 'pro rata' approach. In effect, the Leader, with the greatest workload and responsibility, is by definition 100 per cent and other post holders are pro-rated as a proportion of that accordingly.
42. The Deputy Leader's current SRA (£14,156) has been set at 70 per cent of the Leader's SRA. Benchmarking shows that the SRA for the Slough Deputy Leader is broadly in line with peers, with a weighting slightly below SEE Allowances Survey and CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours:
- Other Berkshire Unitary Councils (mean SRA) £13,561
 - SEE Allowances Survey 2019 (mean SRA) £14,864
 - CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours (mean SRA) £14,953

43. By maintaining the current ratio of 70 per cent of the recommended Leader's SRA (£21,939) to arrive at a recommended SRA for the Deputy Leader it produces at tentative SRA of £15,357. This is somewhat above the mean figures in the benchmarking groups. However, the IRP has always used a slightly higher ratio for arriving at the Deputy Leader's SRA than in most authorities as the model of Deputy Leader in Slough has always been an active one. As such the IRP is content that the current ratio of 70 per cent of the Leader's recommended SRA is still appropriate in arriving at the recommended SRA for the Deputy Leader.
44. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Deputy Leader is set at £15,357.**

The other Lead (Cabinet) Members (6)

45. The current SRA (£11,123) for Slough Lead (Cabinet) Members has been set at 55 per of the Leader's SRA. Benchmarking shows that it slightly below that paid to other Cabinet Members in the peer authorities:
- Other Berkshire Unitary (mean SRA) £11,777
 - SEE Allowances Survey 2019 (mean SRA) £11,443
 - CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours (mean SRA) £12,234
46. By maintaining the current ratio of 55 per cent of the recommended Leader's SRA (£21,939) to arrive at a recommended SRA for the other Lead (Cabinet) Members it produces at tentative SRA of £12,066 This is somewhat above the mean figures in the Other Berkshire Unitary Councils and SEE Allowances Survey benchmarking groups. However, bearing in mind the commercialisation strategy adopted by the Council and the shared risk across the Cabinet the IRP is content that the current ratio of 55 per cent of the Leader's recommended SRA is still appropriate in arriving at the recommended SRA for the other Cabinet Members.
47. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the other Lead (Cabinet) Members is set at £12,066.**

Vice Chair of the Scrutiny Panels (3)

48. Currently, the Vice Chairs of the three Scrutiny Panels are not remunerated. The only Vice Chairs that receive an SRA are those of the three main standing committees – Planning, Licensing and the Overview and Scrutiny Committees. Nonetheless, the IRP has been asked to consider the appropriateness of recommending an SRA for the Vice Chairs of the three Scrutiny Panels.
49. Benchmarking shows that the equivalent posts are rarely remunerated. In the Other Berkshire Unitary Councils only Reading pays an SRA (£1,074) to its Chairs of Scrutiny Panels. In the CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours benchmarking

group only three out of the ten pay their Deputy Chairs of Scrutiny Panels an SRA. The SEE Allowances Survey (2019) also shows that only three out of the 12 respondents pay Scrutiny Vice Chairs an SRA – however the SEE Survey does not distinguish between main Overview and Scrutiny Committees and Scrutiny Panels. For instance, the SRA paid to the Slough Vice Chair of Overview and Scrutiny is included within that figure of three payees.

50. Moreover, the IRP has always been cognisant of the 2006 Statutory Guidance (paragraph 72) which states

If the majority of members of a council receive a special responsibility allowance the local electorate may rightly question whether this was justified. Local authorities will wish to consider very carefully the additional roles of members and the significance of these roles, both in terms of responsibility and real time commitment before deciding which will warrant the payment of a special responsibility allowance.

51. The Slough Members' Allowances Scheme already currently pays 21 SRAs for 42 elected Councillors. Indeed, the scheme could pay an additional 3-4 SRAs depending on size of the executive and number of qualifying Minority Opposition Group Leaders. To recommend further SRAs would go against the grain of the statutory guidance in a context where the IRP has already recommended a scheme that potentially could pay more 50 per cent of the elected Members an SRA. To add further SRAs would be unjustified bearing in mind the statutory guidance.

52. As a final check the IRP considered the LGA Peer Review – Interim Report to the Audit and Governance Committee (5th March 2020) to ascertain what it said about Scrutiny in Slough and in particular if it recommended a set of discrete tasks or responsibilities for the Vice Chairs of the Scrutiny Panels. While the LGA Peer Review did make some recommendations regarding Scrutiny in Slough, particularly more senior Officer Scrutiny Champions, it did not mention Scrutiny Vice Chairs. Although the Interim Report did cite the use of Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups as “good examples” the IRP was informed that there is no requirement nor is it the practice that the Vice Chairs of Scrutiny Panels are expected to chair these Task and Finish Groups. The IRP has concluded that the role is not significant enough to merit an SRA.

53. As, such, **the IRP is not recommending that the Vice Chairs of the three Scrutiny Panels are paid an SRA.**

54. One approach raised with the IRP was to pay the Scrutiny Panel Vice-Chairs an SRA for when they have to stand in to Chair a Scrutiny Panel in the absence of the Chair. The IRP has rejected this approach for the following reasons:

- It would remunerate twice over for a single role
- It would be administratively cumbersome

- Such an approach is not undertaken in any of the benchmarked authorities
- It is a reasonable expectation that most Councillors would stand in when required to chair a Scrutiny Panel or task and finish working group, for which the Basic Allowance is paid

55. Consequently, **the IRP is not recommending that the Vice Chairs of the three Scrutiny Panels are paid an SRA when chairing a Scrutiny Panel in the absence of the Chair.**

Issues arising I – Members sitting on the Licensing Sub-Committees

56. In its previous review in February 2019, the IRP was asked to consider whether the Members who sit on the Licensing Sub-Committee that hears licensing appeals merit an SRA. The Licensing Sub-Committee meets when required and consists of three elected Members drawn from the full Licensing Committee. There are three designated Chairs of the Licensing Sub-Committee (including the Chair of the full Licensing Committee) with other members (in theory) appointed on a rotating basis. Its function are to:

- Consider and determine licences for private hire vehicles and hackney carriage drivers where special circumstances apply such as convictions for traffic or other offences.
- Exercise the functions of the Licensing Act 2003.
- Exercise the functions of the Gambling Act 2005.
- Determine street trading, public entertainment and a number of other licences

57. The IRP said it would return to the issue at the time of the next review and indeed the issue was once again raised with the IRP. Benchmarking shows that this role is not remunerated in any of the peer authorities. Normally, this role is deemed to be covered by the Basic Allowance, it is part of the regulatory role that all Members can reasonably expect to undertake.

58. One argument presented to the IRP was that the Licensing Sub-Committee meetings were frequent, lengthy and held during the day. The IRP received information going back to 2018 that shows on average there are four Licensing Sub-Committee meetings per year, ranging in length from 20 minutes (14th November 2019) to four hours and four minutes (10th December 2018) with a weighting towards approximately one and half hours in length. As such sitting on a Licensing Sub-Committee is no more onerous than being on the Planning Committee.

59. **The IRP is not recommending that Members sitting on the Licensing Sub-Committee are paid an SRA.**

Issues arising II – Co-optees’ Allowance

60. The Co-optees’ Allowance was also an item the IRP said it would return to at the time of the next review as at the time there was a view that it was on the low side. Currently, the Co-optees’ Allowance is £548 and is paid to the co-opted Members of the Audit and Governance Committee. It is a difficult allowance to benchmarking due to varying use of Co-optees in other Councils and the fact that this allowance is not always published in every allowances scheme. However, a review of allowances schemes of the other Berkshire Councils did not suggest that the current Co-optees’ Allowance was unduly low. For instance, the Co-optees’ Allowance is £297 in Bracknell Forest, none are paid in Windsor and Maidenhead and this allowance is not mentioned in the Reading, West Berkshire and Wokingham allowances’ schemes. Reading Council pays its Co-optees a daily rate but it is unspecified. Moreover, there was no representation in this review regarding the Co-optees’ Allowance. Nor was there any reported issue regarding recruiting Co-optees due to a low Co-optees’ Allowance.
61. **The IRP recommends no change to the Co-optees’ Allowance, currently, £548.**

Issues arising III – The Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance

62. The Dependants’ Carers’ Allowance (DCA) is an allowance that is expressly permitted by the 2003 Allowances Regulations that permits elected Members to claim against cost of caring for any dependants while undertaking approved duties. It is capped at £520 per year and cannot be paid “in respect of carers who are members of the immediate family or household.” (Slough Members’ Allowances Scheme, Dependant Carers’ Allowance paragraph 9. (4)).
63. The IRP received representation that the DCA was not flexible enough, it was argued that for the child care element it is restricted to registered child minders and the annual cap was a somewhat on the low side, in effect representing an average of £10 per week.
64. The IRP agrees that the current annual cap of £520 per year is low. Although the DCA is designed to be a contribution to care costs rather than a full recompense, it is clear that an average of £10 per week is too low a contribution. As such, the IRP has simply decided to double the current annual cap and **recommends that the annual cap on the DCA is raised to £1,040 per year.**
65. The IRP’s reading of the scheme does not necessarily bear out that claims for child care must be through a registered child minder – in fact the scheme is silent on the issue. However, **the IRP recommends that for clarification purposes it would assist potential claimants if at the end of paragraph 9. (4) (Dependants Carers’ Allowance) of the allowances scheme that the**

following qualifier was inserted – “The DCA can be claimed for care provided by informal carers as long as it is receipted.”

Appendix One – Information and Evidence reviewed by the IRP

1. IRP Terms of Reference
2. IRP Membership details
3. Process and Methodology document
4. Slough Borough Council, Members' Allowances Scheme 2020/21
5. Previous IRP Reports namely
 - IRP Report July 2010
 - IRP Report February 2015
 - IRP Supplementary Report June 2017
 - IRP Report February 2019
6. Short briefing paper by Panel Chair to cover
 - Review of how we arrived at current allowances under review
 - Recalibration of the Basic Allowance
 - Benchmarking
7. LGA 2018 Census of Councillors, showing mean hours worked by Members of Unitary Councillors by positions held and division of time spent on Council duties (all Councillors/all Councils)
8. Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2019, Slough, Annual Gross Pay for all employee jobs, Table 8.7a
9. Benchmarking 1: Other Berkshire Unitary Councils
10. Benchmarking 2: South East Employers (SEE) Members' Allowances Survey 2019 (revised)
11. Benchmarking 3: Slough's 10 Nearest Neighbours (CIPFA 2014 model)
12. Report to Cabinet, Proposed Commercial Committee, 17th June 2019
13. Report to Cabinet, Commercial Sub-Committee Terms of Reference, 16th September 2019
14. Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report – including Terms of Reference of Scrutiny Panels, including meetings schedule

15. 2006 Statutory Guidance Paragraphs 1-90
16. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 SI No. 1021
17. Copies of written submissions
18. Slough Borough Councils, number of meetings by the Licensing Sub-Committees 2018 to the present
19. Report to Slough Wellbeing Board, 8 May 2019, setting out terms of reference, membership and relationship to other partnership groups, etc.
20. Slough Wellbeing Annual Report, 2018-19
21. Report to Audit & Corporate Governance Committee, LGA Peer Review – Interim Report, 5th March 2020
22. The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 SI No. 392

Appendix Two – Councillors who met with the Panel including written submissions

Councillors who met with the IRP

Cllr Akram	Deputy Leader of Council, Cabinet Lead for Governance & Customer Services and Member of Commercial Sub-Committee
Cllr Dhaliwal	Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Cllr Sandu	Chair of Health Scrutiny Panel
Cllr Smith	Vice Chair of Health Scrutiny Panel
Cllr Strutton	Leader of Opposition (Conservative) Group
Cllr Swindlehurst	Leader of Council, Cabinet Lead for Regeneration and Strategy and Member of Commercial Sub-Committee

Councillors who made written submissions to the IRP

Cllr Anderson	Cabinet Lead Member for Sustainable Transport & Environmental Services
Cllr Bains	Cabinet Lead for Inclusive Growth & Skills
Cllr Carter	Cabinet Lead Member for Children & Schools
Cllr Hulme	Labour Member
Cllr Nazir	Cabinet Lead Member for Housing & Community Safety
Cllr Pantelic	Cabinet Lead for Health & Wellbeing
Cllr Parmer	Labour Member
Cllr Sabah	Chair of Audit & Governance Committee
Cllr Strutton	Leader of Opposition (Conservative) Group
Cllr Swindlehurst	Leader of Council, Cabinet Lead for Regeneration and Strategy and Member of Commercial Sub-Committee

Appendix Three: Officers who briefed the IRP

Stephen Gibson	Interim Director of Regeneration
Janine Jenkinson	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Catherine Meek	Head of Democratic Services
Thomas Overend	Policy Insight Manager (including managing the Scrutiny function)
Sushil Thobhani	Service Lead Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer
Dean Tyler	Service Lead Strategy and Performance/Statutory Scrutiny Officer
Josie Wragg	Chief Executive

BM2: Slough BC Review- BA & Relevant SRAs - SEE Allowances Survey 2019 (Adapted to remove zero values)							
	Basic Allowance	Leader SRA	Leader Total (BA+SRA)	Dep Leader SRA	Cabinet SRA	Chair O&S SRA	Dep Chair O&S SRA
Bracknell Forest Council	£8,687	£28,954	£37,641	£17,372	£15,926	£5,791	
Brighton & Hove City Council	£13,002	£32,505	£45,507	£19,503			
Isle of Wight Council	£8,011	£16,022	£24,033	£10,014	£8,011	£8,011	£1,602
Medway Council	£10,421	£31,263	£41,684	£20,842	£15,632	£10,421	£3,647
Milton Keynes Council	£10,710	£31,212	£41,922	£15,606	£11,444	£4,682	
Portsmouth City Council	£11,175	£20,115	£31,290		£7,823	£2,794	
Reading Borough Council	£8,220	£18,500	£26,720	£11,300	Committee System		
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead	£8,143	£24,482	£32,625	£13,434	£12,215	£6,107	
Slough Borough Council	£7,779	£20,224	£28,003	£14,156	£11,123	£7,080	£1,415
Southampton City Council	£12,636	£25,272	£37,908		£12,636	£6,318	
West Berkshire Council	£7,697	£19,242	£26,939	£11,545	£9,622	£4,810	
Wokingham Borough Council	£7,784	£20,000	£27,784		£10,000	£5,000	
MEAN	£9,522	£23,983	£33,505	£14,864	£11,443	£6,101	£2,221
MEDIAN	£8,454	£22,353	£31,958	£14,156	£11,284	£5,949	£1,602
Highest	£13,002	£32,505	£45,507	£20,842	£15,926	£10,421	£3,647
Lowest	£7,697	£16,022	£24,033	£10,014	£7,823	£2,794	£1,415
Mean Ratio		2.5 X Mean BA					

BM3: Slough BC Review - BA & Relevant SRAs CIPFA 10 Nearest Neighbours (2014 model) 2019/20										
CIPFA Near Neighbour (listed in order)	Basic Allowance	Leaders' SRA	Leaders Total	Deputy Leader	Cabinet Members	Chair of O&S	Dep Chair of O&S	Chair[s] Scrutiny	Dep Chair[s] Scrutiny	Other
Reading	£8,220	£18,500	£26,720	£11,300	Committee system			£3,039	£1,074	
Luton	£7,500	£15,000	£22,500	£5,625	£5,625	£2,500		£1,250		
Milton Keynes	£10,710	£31,212	£41,922	£15,606	£11,444	£7,803		£4,682		Chairs T&F WG £4,682
Peterboro'	£10,508	£31,524	£42,032	£21,017	£15,762			£7,881		Cabinet Advisors £7,881
Thurrock (18/19)	£9,202	£32,207	£41,409	£16,563	£11,502			£5,901	£1,380	
Leicester	£10,767	Mayoral System			£14,430	£10,202	£2,550	£8,502	£2,126	
Swindon	£8,552	£25,656	£34,208	£14,966	£12,828	£6,414		£6,414		Chair Health & Wellbeing £6,414
Bracknell Forest	£8,687	£28,954	£37,641	£17,372	£15,926	£7,239		£5,791		Mbrs Champions £2,201
Southampton	£12,636	£25,272	£37,908		£12,636	£6,318		£3,159		
Coventry	£13,825	£24,885	£38,710	£17,969	£11,062	£11,062	£2,768	£6,916		Deputy Cabinet Mbrs £3,760
Slough	£7,779	£20,224	£28,003	£14,156	£11,123	£7,080	£1,415	£3,033		
Mean	£9,853	£25,343	£35,105	£14,953	£12,234	£7,327	£2,244	£5,143	£1,527	
Median	£9,202	£25,464	£37,775	£15,606	£12,069	£7,160	£2,550	£5,791	£1,380	
Highest	£13,825	£32,207	£42,032	£21,017	£15,926	£11,062	£2,768	£8,502	£2,126	
Lowest	£7,500	£15,000	£22,500	£5,625	£5,625	£2,500	£1,415	£1,250	£1,074	
Mean ratio		2.6 X								
		Mean BA								

