

## NOTES OF INFORMAL MEETING HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2007

**Present:** S Lye, D Jackman (Independent Remuneration Panel Members),  
Councillor J M Whitehouse (Leader of Liberal Democrats Group), I Willett,  
G Lunnun

---

1. Councillor Whitehouse circulated a list of bullet points for discussion.
2. In relation to Basic Allowance he did not consider it an attraction to becoming a Councillor but did not regard it as a barrier. Most candidates did not regard the allowance as income for a form of employment. There was no particular agitation to change the level - a level should be agreed and then up rated yearly with inflation.
3. The public service element should be recognised. Time was more of a barrier than the amount of the allowance. Some authorities were paying too much - a substantial increase would be unlikely to result in a noticeable improvement in the Council. Contributions made were more important than attendance but linking part of the allowance to attendance at meetings/training was worth exploring.
4. The Leader's role was demanding but was difficult to reconcile with a full time job.
5. SLA's recognised need for some daytime meetings/engagements - the roles could be justified as full time in county/unitary authorities but not districts. The allowances justified a greater differential with the basic allowance.
6. The Deputy Leader role was mainly one of status and did not justify a separate allowance.
7. It was logical to assume there were differentials in value in the Portfolio Holder roles but we should caution about getting too involved in evaluations. The Portfolios involved in waste management had been onerous in the build up to a new contract but were now less onerous. The Planning and Economic Development Portfolio would be very onerous when the East of England Plan came into being but less so at other times. Allowances for Portfolio Holders could not be adjusted year by year but there was a case for two or three tiers of payment taking account of budget/manpower responsibilities. There was a need to take account of what was planned for next May in relation to Portfolios. Possibly one tier for the Leader and two other tiers.
8. The Council was still exploring how Overview and Scrutiny could work best. The importance of Overview and Scrutiny should be recognised through the scheme. The workload on the Scrutiny chairs was less onerous than on Cabinet members. Overview and Scrutiny should not receive the same amounts as Portfolio Holders.
9. The allowance to the Chairman of the JCC should be abolished.
10. No first hand knowledge of Housing Appeals, Complaints, Licensing. Roles can be demanding if done properly. Not clear of role of Chairman above that of other

members of Panels - simply chairing meeting or need to be proactive? Housing Appeals and Licensing should possibly be paid the same as Area Plans Subs.

11. Tend to be against allowances for all members of Panel.
12. Travelling should be paid for informal site visits.
13. No member should receive more than one SRA - should be paid for the primary role only.
14. Group Leaders - should be base payment with further element based on number in Group. Help to secure smooth running of Council, consultation such as this exercise - can be demanding role depending on size of Group.
15. Not to wish to see explosion in SRA's.
16. Agree basic allowance limitations but not a complex system and no more than  $\frac{1}{3}$  to be dependant on attendance etc.
17. Tiering/ranking of Portfolios required more in depth work to be done - may not be right time in view of changes planned for next May.