

Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel

Scheme of members' allowances for BCP Council 2020

1. Introduction

This report has been prepared by the Independent Remuneration Panel (the **Panel**) for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council (BCP Council) comprising three individuals drawn from the community who have previously participated in panels across Dorset:-

1.1. Mr John Quinton (Chairman)

Former Head of Democratic Services at Wiltshire Council.

Member of Independent Remuneration Panels for Dorset Council, West and North Dorset District Councils and Weymouth and Portland and Christchurch Borough Councils.

1.2. Mr Keith Broughton

Member of the Independent Remuneration Panel for Dorset Council, West and North Dorset District Councils and Weymouth and Portland Borough Council.

1.3. Mr Martin Varley

Partner at Humphries Kirk LLP (Solicitors) and Chartered Member of the Chartered Institute for Securities & Investment

Member of the Independent Remuneration Panels for Dorset Council, Dorset County Council and Dorset and Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Authority

Previous relevant voluntary work includes Chairman of Wealdon District Council and Eastbourne Borough Council Independent Remuneration Panels and East Sussex Fire & Rescue Authority Independent Remuneration Advisory Group.

2. Legal Basis

2.1. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (the **Regulations**) apply to local authorities including district and county councils.

2.2. The Regulations require a relevant authority to make a scheme providing for the payment of a basic allowance (**BA**) to each member of that authority. The BA must be the same for each member of the authority.

- 2.3. A relevant authority's scheme of allowances may also provide for the payment of special responsibility allowances (**SRAs**) to such members of the authority as have special or additional responsibilities. The specified categories of special or additional responsibilities which may be included in a scheme of allowances include:-
- i) acting as leader or deputy leader of a political group within the authority;
 - ii) acting as a member of an executive where the authority is operating executive arrangements within the meaning of part 2 of the Local Government Act 2000;
 - iii) presiding at meetings of a committee or sub-committee of the authority;
 - iv) representing the authority at meetings of or arranged by any other body;
 - v) acting as a member of a committee or sub-committee of the authority which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods;
 - vi) acting as the spokesman of a political group on a committee or sub-committee of the authority; and
 - vii) carrying out such other activities in relation to the discharge of the authority's functions as require of the member an amount of time and effort equal to or greater than would be required of him or her by any of the above-mentioned activities.
- 2.4. SRAs need not be the same and may reflect the different expectations, time and effort involved in particular roles.
- 2.5. Member allowance schemes may also provide for the payment of a carers' allowance and also for members' travelling and subsistence whilst acting in connection with their duties as a member of the authority.
- 2.6. Before a relevant authority may make or amend a scheme of allowances it must have regard to recommendations made in relation to the scheme by an independent remuneration panel.

3. Context

- 3.1. Following the parliamentary approval of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole (Structural Changes) Order 2018, the new BCP Council came into effect on 1 April 2019. A previous Panel had recommended a scheme for both the Interim period of the new Council (1 April – 6 May 2019) and for the new Council effective from 6 May 2019. As part of that review the Panel had recommended that a further review should be conducted after 12/18 months to consider the emerging governance structure.
- 3.2. Accordingly, a new Panel was appointed by BPC Council at its meeting on 5 November 2019 to conduct this review.

- 3.3. Elections to the new council were held on 2 May 2019. These resulted in no single party having a majority of seats on the new council. A “unity” alliance was formed comprising all of the parties on the Council with the exception of the Conservative group, to run the council.
- 3.4. The Leader of the Council has held an initial meeting with the Panel. At this meeting on 18 December 2019, the Panel was informed by the Leader that the formation of the new Council had led to larger workloads for councillors than expected, and that many committees of the Council were meeting more often and were busier than anticipated.
- 3.5. The Leader outlined the challenges facing the new Council which are significant. The three constituent councils were very different culturally and in the way each one had worked. The Leader also highlighted the different challenges faced by BCP Council and the new Dorset Council and the consequential workloads of councillors. Each constituent council within BCP Council had individual policies in relation to all of the major services that needed to be harmonised for the new Council.
- 3.6. The Leader considered that a distinction should be drawn to the position in Dorset Council, which effectively adopted many of the pre-existing key policies and procedures of the Dorset County Council. The geographical area of the Dorset Council is largely parished whereas within BCP Council it is largely un-parished. This means that much engagement with the residents of the BCP area has to be undertaken by BCP councillors whereas within Dorset some of these issues could be dealt with by parish or town councillors.
- 3.7. On this basis the Leader of the Council has requested the Panel to review the current scheme of allowances.

4. Role of the Panel

- 4.1. A scheme for the payment of a BA must be adopted by the BCP Council. It may also adopt a scheme for the payment of SRAs and other allowances as set out in paragraph 2. Members must have “regard” to the recommendations of an Independent Remuneration Panel in relation to a scheme of allowances before adopting any scheme. Therefore, councillors themselves acting as a relevant authority make the final decision about what allowances are to be available.
- 4.2. Regulation 20(2) requires that an independent remuneration panel shall consist of at least three members none of whom:-
 - (a) is also a member of an authority in respect of which it makes recommendations or is a member of a committee or sub-committee of such an authority; or
 - (b) is disqualified from being or becoming a member of an authority.

- 4.3. The three members of the Panel are individuals, none of whom are disqualified from being or becoming a member of a relevant authority.
- 4.4. The Panel met on 18 December 2019, 24 and 29 January 2020.

5. Evidence

- 5.1. To inform the development of its recommendations, the Panel was provided with the following evidence:-
 - (i) the Regulations;
 - (ii) detailed benchmarking data from South West Councils and from other unitary authorities on the levels of current allowances;
 - (iii) the current members' allowance scheme for Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council;
 - (iv) information relating to the composition of BCP Council;
 - (v) the current governance structure for BCP Council and the various roles of members;
 - (vi) the current work programmes and calendar of meetings of committees.
- 5.2. The Panel also had the opportunity to interview those individuals named at paragraph 6.4 below and to consider the responses to the questionnaire referred to in paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2 below.

6. Methodology for the review

- 6.1. A questionnaire was sent to all BCP Councillors seeking views on the average amount of time spent on council business and whether this represented an increase in previous workloads or, if a new councillor, whether the workload was more or less than anticipated. 22 responses were received and all stated that the workload had increased or it was more than anticipated.
- 6.2. In addition, the questionnaire asked councillors whether the BA and SRAs had been set at the right level. There were various responses to this question and these are dealt with under the relevant sections of this report.
- 6.3. The Panel interviewed the following councillors:
 - (i) Councillor Simon Bull – the Bournemouth Group/Green Party and Chair of Planning
 - (ii) Councillor Colin Bungey - Christchurch Independent Group and Chair of Standards Committee
 - (iii) Councillor Beverley Dunlop – the Conservative Group and member of Audit and Governance and Licensing Committees
 - (iv) Councillor Chris Rigby – the Bournemouth Group/Green Party and member of Overview and Scrutiny Board and Standards Committee

- (v) Councillor L-J Evans – Poole People and Alliance for Local Living Group and Vice Chair of Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee
 - (vi) Councillor Mark Howell - Poole People and Alliance for Local Living Group and Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture
 - (vii) Councillor Felicity Rice - Poole People and Alliance for Local Living Group and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change.
- 6.4. In addition, the Panel interviewed Tanya Coulter – Monitoring Officer, Richard Jones, Head of Democracy, Sarah Culwick, Democratic Services Team Leader and Lindsay Marshall, Scrutiny Specialist.
- 6.5. The Panel wish to record its thanks to those individuals who gave evidence and for all of the support that it received from officers of the Council.

7. Panel Deliberations

- 7.1. The Panel sought to interview councillors of all political groups with particular reference to the issues raised within the responses to the questionnaire. The Panel also interviewed officers with appropriate roles and responsibilities in an effort to gain the best possible interpretation of how the new council was currently operating and functioning.

8. The Basic Allowance (BA)

- 8.1. The Panel carefully considered the responses given by members to the questionnaire referred to in paragraph 6.1 of this report. Most respondents felt the BA was set too low although 4 felt that it was set at the right level. Of the two respondents who actually suggested an increased level, one suggested a range of £13,000 to £15,000 per annum and the other £30,000 per annum.
- 8.2. The Panel was also aware of the views expressed by the Leader as set out in paragraphs 3.4 to 3.6 of this report. These views were echoed by a number of councillors that were interviewed. Indeed, a number of councillors that were interviewed by the Panel had reduced their employed working hours or had revised their employed working arrangements to enable them to fulfil their roles within the Council.
- 8.3. The Panel noted that in response to the question within the questionnaire regarding the average amount of time spent on council duties, this varied significantly from 30 to 40 hours per month to 220 hours a month. This could be explained in part by the wide range of roles performed by those councillors who returned the questionnaire. The reasons cited for this increase in hours in particular were more time spent in meetings or preparing for meetings or travelling to meetings. In addition, the size of the wards and the decrease in the number of councillors was cited.

- 8.4. Interestingly although the range of hours is similar to the responses to the questionnaire in January 2019, the average has increased from 75 hours per month in 2019, to 110 in 2020. Also, the modal average is quite different with nearly half of respondents in 2020 suggesting that they work between 60 to 80 hours a month.
- 8.5. Benchmarking data was provided to the Panel by officers. The data compiled for South West Councils indicated that the current BA payable within BCP Council was fairly placed when compared with a sample of urban unitary councils. However, BCP is a larger council by population than many of these and has many more challenges particularly in the bringing together of three very different councils. When compared to the shire county unitaries in the South West it was slightly on the low side (Dorset £13,000, Cornwall £14,473, Devon £12,859 and Wiltshire £13,463). Data from the south east (Southampton £12,636, Portsmouth £11,175 and Brighton and Hove £13,002) indicated again that the BA is on the low side especially when considering the relative sizes of these councils.
- 8.6. The Panel again received the views of some councillors to the effect that a higher level of BA would attract people from a broader spectrum and demographic to stand for election. Many councillors referred to allowances synonymously as remuneration.
- 8.7. The Panel was persuaded by the evidence received both from the responses to the questionnaires and in interviews, and by the benchmarking data, that the BA required some adjustment. It was sympathetic to the views of councillors who wished the BA to be set at a level that meant that any financial constraints from standing for office, were removed. However, the BA was never intended to be a salary replacement scheme but simply to cover the expenses of performing the role of a councillor. The Panel was of the view that the challenges and the workload of a councillor within BCP Council were far greater than other similar councils in the area and that this justified an increase.
- 8.8. ***The Panel recommends that the basic allowance paid to members be increased to £13,500 per annum.***

9. Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs)

- 9.1. **A. Leader and Cabinet Members.** Of the responses received to the questionnaire seven councillors expressed a view on the Leader and Cabinet SRAs. Four of these respondents thought that the SRAs should be increased, two thought that they were set too high and one thought that they were set at the right level.

- 9.2. The Leader had been very clear at her meeting with the Panel regarding the size of the task facing the Cabinet. Many Cabinet Members were very new to local government and were facing huge workloads. Importantly, at this time there is no individual decision making although the Constitution provided for it. This was a conscious decision by the Leader to ease the new Cabinet Members into their workload but also because the membership of the new Cabinet reflected the political Alliance that was in control of the Council, and it was important for collective decisions to reflect the Alliance rather than individual political groups within the Council. Notwithstanding this the Leader felt that the Leader and Cabinet SRAs were set at about the right level.
- 9.3. There was one suggestion made to the Panel that the SRA paid to the Deputy Leader should be enhanced and paid at a different level to other Cabinet Members. The Panel was not persuaded, noting that the Deputy held a portfolio as did other Cabinet Members and that the Constitution made no distinction from an ordinary Cabinet Member, other than deputising for the Leader. On this basis the Panel is of the view that the SRA payable to the Deputy Leader should continue to be the same as the other Cabinet Members.
- 9.4. Benchmarking evidence presented to the Panel also suggested that the SRAs were not out of kilter with other similar councils and no overwhelming evidence was presented to the Panel to suggest any change was required. Whilst recognising the critical roles performed by the Leader and Cabinet Members the Panel agreed to recommend that the SRAs remain at their current level.
- 9.5. **B. Chairman and Vice Chairman of Council.** The Panel had during its last review received evidence that the civic role of the Chairman of the BCP Council would be significant and would have important links to other partner organisations. In addition to the civic role, the Chairman has an important role in managing and presiding over regular Council meetings to ensure that Councillors who are not in the Cabinet or who do not hold the chair of a main Committee, are able to hold those office holders to account.
- 9.6. Whilst the Panel is not in favour of paying SRAs to vice-chairmen in general, the Panel had agreed in its last review that the Vice-Chairman of the Council is an exception, as, in addition to deputising for the Chairman at meetings of the Council, he/she will also fulfil a civic role. Some respondents to the questionnaire had queried this stance. The Panel received evidence to support the recognition of the Vice-Chairman's civic role. Since May 2019 the Chairman had attended 43 civic events and the Vice-Chairman 24. This in the Panel's view was sufficient to justify the continuation of the award of an SRA to the Vice-Chairman.

- 9.7. However, no evidence had been presented to the Panel to suggest any change in SRA was required and on this basis the Panel agreed to recommend that the SRAs remain at their current level.
- 9.8. **C. Chairmen of Committees.** The Panel received representations concerning the levels at which the current SRAs had been set.
- 9.9. The Panel had at its last review accepted that there would be gradations of responsibility for committees with some meeting more often and being more important to the overall governance of the new BCP Council. The Panel had received evidence that Audit and Governance, Planning and the Overview and Scrutiny Committees along with the Council should be included within the higher-level category, with Planning, in particular, dealing with significant, high-profile and long-lasting issues.
- 9.10. The Panel received evidence from both the responses to the questionnaire and from the interviews undertaken. Views varied but consistently the importance and workload of the Planning Committee was highlighted. There was some question as to whether the Chairman of Audit and Governance Committee should continue to receive an SRA at the same level. Evidence in the form of the Committee's work plan provided by officers suggested to the Panel that it was meeting more times than scheduled and whilst this was not the only factor to measure its workload, the agenda appeared to be full of important items and it had a significant role to play in the corporate management of the Council.
- 9.11. The other issue raised in relation to Chairs of Committees was the relativity of the SRAs paid in relation to the Overview and Scrutiny Board and the two Scrutiny Committees and the fact that they were all paid at the same rate. The Leader has recognised that in attempting to "mirror" the Cabinet agenda and workload, the Board had a larger workload than the two Scrutiny Committees. Evidence presented to the Panel confirmed that the Board was busier and had a wider remit and profile within the Council in holding the Cabinet to account. The work programmes for the Board and the Children's Services and Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committees appeared to confirm that position.
- 9.12. On the basis of the evidence presented, the Panel agreed to recommend that the SRAs payable to all committee chairs should remain at their current level, with the exception of the Chairmen of the Children's Services and Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committees, which should reduce to £7,500.
- 9.13. **D. Vice-Chairmen of Committees.** This appeared to the Panel to be the most controversial issue within the review in the sense that most respondents to the questionnaire raised the issue.

- 9.14. Prior to the inception of the new Council, only Bournemouth Borough Council paid an SRA to vice-chairmen, the other two councils did not. The Panel as part of its last review determined that simply deputising for the Chairman in his/her absence, was not a significant additional responsibility and therefore did not justify the payment of an SRA.
- 9.15. The Panel was informed by some councillors that Vice-Chairmen were undertaking the same level of work as the Chairmen by attending briefings and on numerous occasions deputised by chairing meetings. Councillors also raised the issue of a Vice-Chairman deputising for the Chairman during a period of illness.
- 9.16. The Panel received evidence from officers that there were only four occasions since May 2019 when a Vice-Chairman, in the absence of the Chairman, had chaired a meeting of a committee. This was one Cabinet meeting and 3 Planning Committees.
- 9.17. In terms of whether the workloads of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen were comparable, the Panel again felt that this was unproven. Undoubtedly Vice-Chairmen attended briefings and prepared for the meeting as this was good practice should they have to deputise for the Chairman at the meeting, but as pointed out in the previous paragraph, this happened very infrequently. The Panel is of the view that some of the roles that were currently performed by Vice-Chairmen reflected the way individual councillors wished to operate but this was not a role with defined significant additional responsibility.
- 9.18. The Panel wished to place on record its view of the role of the Chairmen of committees, although accepting that this may vary from committee to committee, according to its function and its profile within the Council. Pre-meeting the Panel would expect the Chairman to help plan and finalise the agenda and the work programme; to attend the briefing, highlighting any areas of concern, agree how any public participation would be managed and how questions would be dealt with, and possibly deal with any press enquiries. At the meeting the Chairman is the focus of attention, managing the debate and the input from various parties; ensuring a fair and open debate; summing up the debate and being clear about the decision before the committee and then managing the vote. After the meeting the Chairman may be consulted on the content of the draft minutes; maybe contacted by the press or interested parties and will want to ensure that the Committee's wishes are actioned.
- 9.19. It was very unlikely that the Vice-Chairman would have anything like this amount of responsibility or accountability and on this basis the Panel agreed there was no substance in the argument for the generic payment of an SRA to all Vice-Chairmen.

- 9.20. On occasions where the Vice-Chairman is required to deputise for the Chairman on a long-term basis, because of ill health or other circumstances, the Panel is sympathetic. This is not something that can easily be provided for within the allowances scheme but is an organisational issue. Where such cases occur, it is open to the committee, or indeed the council, to elect a new chairman for the duration of the absence, in which case the new chair would receive the SRA and not the absent chair.
- 9.21. The Panel has already accepted one exception to the generic rule that SRAs are not payable to Vice-Chairmen, for the Vice-Chairman of Council as explained in paragraph 9.6 above. In addition, the Panel received evidence to suggest that the Vice-Chairman of Licensing should receive an SRA. The Panel understood the Council had agreed that all meetings of the Licensing Sub Committee should be chaired by either the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Committee. The Panel was informed that this requirement would mean that the Vice-Chairman would be expected to chair meetings on a regular basis. These meetings can be quite technical in nature and procedure and involve key partners of the Council and the public. Hence, they are quite demanding to chair. The Panel is of the view that this is over and above the normal deputising role of the Vice-Chairman of a committee and on this basis recommends an SRA of £2,500 for the Vice-Chairman of Licensing.
- 9.22. **E. Group Leaders.** Currently an SRA of £3,000 is payable to all Group Leaders with a membership of no fewer than five. Following the election there are two groups within the Council who have fewer than five members and the Panel has received representations that this qualifying limit should be reduced.
- 9.23. The purpose of the Group Leaders' SRA is to reflect the importance of political groups to the management of the new council. It reflects the need for Group Leaders to communicate with their members on Council business and through this, enables the Council's officers to have a forum of Group Leaders, who can represent their Group's views on issues such as member/officer relations, code of conduct issues, training and development and the management of forthcoming meetings of Council.
- 9.24. The Panel received varied evidence as to how effective the political group process is within the Council. The Panel understood that the Leaders of the political groups that formed the Alliance, meet regularly although this may be for the benefit of the Alliance itself rather than to facilitate the management of the Council. It is also believed that the Leader of the Council may meet separately with the Leader of the Conservative Group although this has not been confirmed.

- 9.25. It is not clear to the Panel whether the Group Leaders' SRA is being used as effectively as it could be. On that basis the Panel recommends that no changes be made to the limit on the size of the Group required to qualify for an SRA, but that the use of this SRA be reconsidered the next time a Review is undertaken.
- 9.26. **F. Number of SRAs Payable.** At the last review most respondees to the questionnaire and interviewees advocated that councillors should only be entitled to claim one SRA regardless of how many SRAs they were entitled to claim. Accordingly, the Panel recommended this limit and it is part of the current scheme.
- 9.27. A number of councillors have now made representations to the Panel that this limit should be reviewed.
- 9.28. The Panel is of the view that taking into account the workloads that councillors have stated that they undertake, the likelihood of one person being able to have the time to fulfil two roles that receive an SRA as well as the normal role of a councillor for which the BA is payable, must be questionable.
- 9.29. On this basis the Panel is of the view that the current limit should continue to apply but that it should not apply to a Group Leader's SRA and that should be permitted to be paid as a second SRA.
- 9.30. ***G. The Panel recommends that the following special responsibility allowances be paid in recognition of the additional workload and levels of responsibility and accountability placed upon members appointed to these roles:***

Leader - £30,000;

Cabinet Members (including Deputy Leader) - £20,000;

Chairman of the Council - £10,000;

Vice-Chairman of the Council - £5,000;

Chairman of Audit and Governance Committee - £10,000;

Chairman of Planning Committee - £10,000;

Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board - £10,000;

Chairman of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committees - £7,500;

Chairman of the Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committees - £7,500;

Chairman of Licensing Committee - £5,000;

Vice-Chairman of Licensing Committee - £2,500;

Chairman of Appeals Committee - £3,000;

Chairman of Standards Committee - £3,000;

Group Leaders - £3,000;

(Note: Groups must have a membership of no fewer than 5 for their Leader to receive an SRA)

9.31. H. The Panel further recommends that:

- (a) no SRAs be paid to vice-chairmen of committees (with the exception of the vice-chairman of Council and the Licensing Committee); and***
- (b) members may not receive more than one SRA (and may elect which SRA to receive) with the exception that a Group Leader's SRA can be payable as a second SRA; and***
- (c) these allowances continue to be paid at these rates until such time as a further review is undertaken.***

10. Travel allowances

10.1. The Panel note that the current allowances scheme provides approved amounts under the HMRC approved Mileage Allowance Payments (MAPs). Anything payable above MAP approved amounts result in a taxable benefit to the claimant. The Panel further note that to introduce taxable benefits into the travel allowances scheme would be a disproportionate bureaucratic burden on the authority.

10.2. The MAP approved amounts are currently:

- (a) car – 45p per mile up to 10,000 and 25p per mile thereafter;***
- (b) passenger payments – up to 5p per mile per passenger (up to a maximum of four) to be claimed only for passengers who would otherwise be eligible for travelling allowance;***
- (c) motorcycle – 24p per mile;***
- (d) bicycle – 20p per mile;***
- (e) in relation to public transport (including rail and bus) – standard fare; and***
- (f) parking fees – actual cost.***

10.3. The Panel received numerous representations concerning the additional travelling that was required to attend meetings of the new BCP Council. The Panel accepts that for some members additional travel time is required and it was hoped that the recommended increase to the BA would compensate for some of the costs of travel time.

10.4. ***The Panel recommends the travel allowances continue to be paid to members:***

- (a) in line with MAP for undertaking official business; and***
- (b) travelling to the BCP Councils offices for meetings and official business as set out in paragraph 12A of the current scheme of allowances.***

11. Subsistence allowances

11.1. Subsistence allowances include the costs of:

- (a) accommodation (if a member needs to stay overnight); and***
- (b) meals and other 'subsistence' while travelling.***

11.2. The Panel has not received any representations concerning the payment of subsistence and therefore intends to recommend that the rates remain at their current level.

11.3. ***The Panel recommends the subsistence allowances be paid to members in the case of an absence not involving an absence overnight from the usual place of residence:-***

<i>Breakfast (more than 4 hours away before 11am)</i>	<i>£7.14</i>
<i>Lunch (more than 4 hours including 12 noon to 2pm)</i>	<i>£10.72</i>
<i>Tea (more than 4 hours including 3pm to 6pm)</i>	<i>£5.35</i>
<i>Evening Meal (more than 4 hours away ending after 7pm)</i>	<i>£14.29</i>

12. Carers' allowance

12.1. The Panel received one representation that the requirement that the allowance is not payable to a member of the claimant's own household was unfair and discriminatory. The Panel agreed that some discretion ought to be built into the scheme to allow for the Monitoring Officer of BCP Council to approve claims on a case by case basis.

12.2. ***The Panel recommends that a carers' allowance be paid to recompense the actual cost expended (and is not payable to a member of the claimant's own household subject to the Monitoring Officer having the discretion to approve claims on a case by case basis):***

- (a) for care of dependants, whether children, elderly people or people with disabilities;***

- (b) *for such time as a member is on BCP Council business where travelling allowances are payable;*
- (c) *at an hourly rate equivalent to 110% of the minimum wage, rounded up to the nearest whole pound, i.e. actual expenditure incurred subject to a maximum of £9* per hour.*

*(*As at April 2019)*

13. Co-opted and Independent Members' allowance

13.1. *The Panel recommends that an allowance £1000 per annum continue to be paid to:*

- (a) *the co-opted members of the scrutiny committee with oversight of education matters;*
- (b) *the independent persons appointed to contribute to the arrangements of promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct; and*
- (c) *the independent persons appointed to serve on School Admission Appeals Panels (in addition to travel and subsistence allowances).*

14. Foregoing and suspension of allowances

14.1. *The Panel recommends that members may, if they wish, forego all or any part of their entitlement to BA or any SRA by giving notice in writing to the Monitoring Office of the BCP Council.*

14.2. *The Panel recommends that where a member is suspended or partially suspended from his/her duties as a councillor in accordance with Part III of the Local Government Act 2000, or regulations made under that Part:*

- (a) *the part of the basic allowance payable to him/her in respect of the period for which he/she is suspended or partially suspended shall be withheld;*
- (b) *the part of the SRA payable to him/her in respect of the period for which he/she is suspended or partially suspended shall be withheld; and*
- (c) *the part of the travelling and subsistence allowance payable to him/her in respect of the period for which he/she is suspended or partially suspended shall be withheld.*

14.3. *The Panel recommends that where payment of any allowance has already been made in respect of any period during which the member concerned is:*

- (a) Suspended or partially suspended from his responsibilities or duties as a councillor in accordance with Part III of the Local Government Act 2000 or regulations made under that Part;**
- (b) ceases to be a member of BCP Council; or**
- (c) in any other way not entitled to receive the allowance in respect of a relevant period,**

the authority may require that such part of the allowance as relates to any such period be repaid to the authority.