

**A Review
Of
Members' Allowances
For
Rochdale Borough
Council**

**A Report by the
Independent
Remuneration Panel**

**Declan Hall PhD (Chair)
Jill Nagy
Tony Rollins**

July 2021

Executive Summary – Recommendations

The Table below sets out the Panel's recommendations for the Basic Allowance and SRAs (2021/22), including total number of SRAs and maximum amounts payable. In reality the total paid out in SRAs is likely to be less due to the 1-SRA only rule.

Rochdale July 2021 Review	Recommended Maximum Payable 2021/22			
POSITION	Nos Paid	Basic Allowance	Total P/Mbr (BA+SRA)	Sub Total Per Category
BASIC ALLOWANCE	60	£11,172		£670,320
SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES		SRA annual		
EXECUTIVE				
Leader	1	£33,516	£44,688	£33,516
Deputy Leaders	2	£16,758	£27,930	£33,516
Other Cabinet Members	7	£15,082	£26,254	£105,575
Assistants to Portfolio	9	£3,016	£14,188	£27,148
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY (O&S)				
Chairs O&S Committees	3	£8,379	£19,551	£25,137
REGULATORY				
Chair Audit & Governance Committee	1	£8,379	£19,551	£8,379
Chair Planning & Licensing Committee	1	£11,172	£22,344	£11,172
Chair Employment & Equalities Committee	1	£8,379	£19,551	£8,379
Members Adoption and Fostering Panels	2	£1,676	£12,848	£3,352
TOWNSHIPS				
Chairs Townships	5	£8,379	£19,551	£41,895
OPPOSITION POSTS				
Leader Main Opposition Group	1	£11,731	£22,903	£11,731
Leader Other Opposition Groups <i>(Where Group has reached threshold of 3 Members)</i>	1	£1,676	£12,848	£1,676
Sub Total - Basic Allowance	60			£670,320
Sub Total - SRAs	34			£311,475
Total (BA+SRAs)				£981,795
SRA paid to Members appointed to GMCA TC	0			
Leader's SRA under GMCA Order*	NA	£5,879	£50,567	£987,674
				Total + GMCA SRA

The IRP also recommends:

Other SRAs considered but not recommended

That Committee Vice-Chairs and Shadow Opposition Portfolio Holders are not recommended an SRA is paid.

Maintaining the 1-SRA Only Rule and Exceptions

That the 1-SRA only rule is maintained with the exception of the Leader who is able to receive the additional SRA paid in respect of appointment to the GMCA.

The Co-optees' Allowance

There is no recommendation regarding the Co-optees' Allowance.

The Dependants' Carers' Allowance (DCA)

No change to the terms and conditions and maximum rates for which the DCA may be claimed.

Travel and Subsistence Allowances - Within the Borough

That the Basic Allowance continues to be deemed inclusive of all in-Borough travel and subsistence costs.

Travel and Subsistence Allowances - Outwith the Borough

That the current approved duties and conditions and rates for which the Travel and Subsistence Allowances may be claimed outwith the Borough are maintained, with the addition that the current mileage rates are clarified to include provision that if a Member is claiming out of Borough mileage by driving a hybrid or electric vehicle that the applicable mileage rates continues to be HMRC approved rates.

Issues arising I - linking remuneration to performance

That there no recommendation is made linking remuneration to performance.

Issues arising II – Provision of Mobile Phones and data/call packages

That from the 2022 elections that Members are no longer provided with mobile phones and the £35 per month worth of calls and data. In its stead, Members should be able to claim £20 per month Mobile Phone Allowance to support Members on their own mobile phones for any Council related calls and data usage they may incur.

Indexation

That the following indices are applied to the allowances paid to Members of Rochdale Borough Council:

- A. **Basic Allowance and SRAs (including those paid in accordance with the GMCA Order):**
- Indexed to the annual percentage salary increase for local government staff (at spinal column 49) as agreed each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services and applicable to the same year it applies to Officers but implemented from the start of the municipal rather than financial year.
- B. **Mileage Allowance (Outwith only):**
- Members' mileage allowances rates indexed to HMRC Approved Mileage Allowance Payment rates.
- C. **Subsistence Allowances (Outwith only):**
- Subsistence allowances should continue to be indexed to the same rates that are applicable to Officers.
- D. **The Dependants' Carers' Allowance:**
- Maximum hourly rate claimable indexed to the National Living Wage.

The IRP also recommends that indexation should run for four years (2021-2025), which is the maximum length of time permitted by the 2003 Regulations.

Implementation

That the new scheme of allowances based on the recommendations contained in this report is adopted from the date of the Council's Annual Meeting on 19th May 2021.

The only exception to this recommended implementation date is regarding the recommendation to discontinue the provision of mobile phones plus £35 per month call/data package to be replaced by a Mobile Telephone Allowance of £20 per month. This recommendation should be implemented from the date of the Council's Annual Meeting in May 2022

A Review
Of
Members' Allowances for Rochdale Borough Council
Independent Remuneration Panel
July 2021

Regulatory context

1. This report is a synopsis of the deliberations and recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel (the IRP or Panel) for Rochdale Borough Council to advise the Council on its Members' Allowances scheme.
2. The IRP was convened under The Local Authorities' (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 1021) ("the 2003 Regulations"). These regulations, which arise out of the relevant provisions contained in the Local Government Act 2000, require all local authorities to establish and maintain an advisory Independent [Members] Remuneration Panel to review and provide advice on Members' allowances on a periodic basis.
3. All Councils are required to convene their IRP and seek its advice before they make any changes or amendments to their Members' Allowances Scheme. They must 'pay regard' to their IRPs recommendations before setting a new or amended Members' Allowances Scheme. On this particular occasion, the IRP has been reconvened under the 2003 Regulations [10. (5)], which states:

Where an authority has regard to an index for the purpose of annual adjustment of allowances it must not rely on that index for longer than a period of four years before seeking a further recommendation from the independent remuneration panel established in respect of that authority on the application of an index to its scheme.

4. It is this mechanism, known as the '4 year rule', that ensures IRPs are convened at least every four years if a council wishes to continue indexing

their allowances. It provides an opportunity for IRPs to publicly scrutinise their Councils' allowances schemes and enhance public accountability.

Terms of Reference

5. The terms of reference provided to the IRP for this review were as follows:

In accordance with the 2003 Members' Allowances Regulations the IRP shall make recommendations to be considered at the Council meeting on 19th May 2021 on:-

- i. The amount of basic allowance that should be payable to its elected members and the expenses that it is deemed to include
- ii. The responsibilities or duties which should lead to the payment of a special responsibility allowance (SRA) and as to the amount of such an allowance
- iii. The duties for which a travelling and subsistence allowance can be paid and as to the amount of this allowance
- iv. The co-optees to be paid a co-optees' allowance and the amount
- v. Whether the authority's allowances scheme should include an allowance in respect of the expenses of arranging for the care of children and dependants and if it does make such a recommendation, the amount of this allowance and the means by which it is determined
- vi. The implementation date for the recommendations, including whether any allowance should be backdated to the beginning of a financial year in the event of the scheme being amended
- vii. Whether annual adjustments of allowance levels may be made by reference to an index, and, if so, for how long such a measure should run
- viii. Any matters that are brought to the attention of the IRP in its consultation with Members and briefings from Officers

Furthermore, in accordance with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Order 2011 Schedule 1 - Constitution (Remuneration page 18) the IRP shall consider:

- ix. Whether a SRA should be paid to Rochdale member[s] appointed by the Council to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) in respect of duties and responsibilities undertaken as a member of the GMCA, and if so to specify the amount of any such allowance.
6. In arriving at their recommendations the IRP shall also take into account:
 - A. The views of Members both written and oral
 - B. Factual Briefings from Officers
 - C. Allowances paid in comparable councils, namely the other Greater Manchester Metropolitan Councils
 - D. The Statutory Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances 2006.
 - E. The 2003 Members Allowances Regulations

Membership of the Independent Remuneration Panel

7. Rochdale Borough reappointed the Chair of the IRP who led on the previous (2016) review and two new IRP Members, consisting of the following appointees:
 - Dr Declan Hall (Chair): an independent consultant specialising in members' allowances and support and a former lecturer in local government and politics at the Institute of Local Government, The University of Birmingham.
 - Jill Nagy: The Chief Executive of Rochdale Training and a Rochdale resident. Jill has a degree in English Education and Leadership and Management and is a qualified teacher. She has worked at Rochdale Training for 19 years and been CEO for 11 years. Previously, Jill was a lecturer in Business Management at Hopwood Hall College.
 - Tony Rollins: CEO Atlantic & Pacific Insurance Group & Rollins Group Companies and a Rochdale resident.
8. The IRP was supported by Peter Thompson, Committee & Constitutional Services Officer (Governance and Committee Services), who was the organisational lead in facilitating and supporting the work of the IRP.

The Review Process and Methodology

9. In undertaking the review the IRP adopted a 2-fold process. In the first instance the IRP Chair undertook preliminary research, benchmarking and taking the lead in putting together the written information necessary for the rest of the IRP to consider. The IRP then convened virtually on 24th-25th March 2021 to consider all the written evidence and data and receive factual briefings on the Council and how it operates from relevant Officers. It was during this time that a representative range of Members met with the IRP to discuss their roles and responsibilities and to raise any issues of concern. Any Member not invited but who wanted to meet with the IRP was accommodated.
10. In addition every Member was sent a short questionnaire through which they could make their views known and raise any concerns directly with the IRP, of which 20 were received. The questionnaire also had the methodological advantage of ensuring all Members were being asked a common set of questions during the interviews, the main point being that all Members had at least one opportunity to exercise their voice during the review.
11. During the course of the review, post May 2021 elections, there was a change in leadership at the Council. The new Leader instituted a few governance changes (discussed below) that necessitated the IRP to consider further written information and reconsider its recommendations (via email) in light of these marginal governance changes.
12. In compliance with the terms of reference and for benchmarking purposes the IRP also took into account the range and levels of allowances paid in comparable local authorities, namely the other Greater Manchester Councils.
13. The full range of interviewees and written information received and considered by the IRP is set out in the appendices as follows:
 - Appendix 1: List of information and evidence that was included in the Information Pack for IRP Members
 - Appendix 2: Members who met with the IRP
 - Appendix 3: Officers who briefed IRP
 - Appendix 4: Summary of benchmarking of Rochdale Borough Council Allowances against other GM Councils

Key Messages – Allowances Scheme – still broadly fit for purpose

14. A key theme emerging from the representations (with some not insignificant divergent views – discussed below) that by and large the current allowances scheme was still fit for purpose. The scheme had been brought up to date at the time of the previous review (November 2016) and more or less fulfils the function of Members' Allowances. While the Basic Allowance and SRAs were never intended to reflect the 'market value' of the workload and responsibilities undertaken by Members, they are intended to go a large way to recognising that there is a substantial time commitment and complexity to being an elected Member that is largely recognised in their current remuneration.
15. This purpose is highlighted by the original policy underpinning the work of remuneration panels when considering the principles for establishing a Members Allowances Scheme¹:

The financial support for Councillors must also reinforce the culture of the modern council and address, as far as possible, any disincentives to serving in local politics. People do not enter public service to make their fortune. But neither should they pay a price for serving the public.

16. As such, this time around the main function of the IRP during this review was to address the main anomalies arising rather than seeking to carry out a further fundamental reform.

Recognising the current economic climate: cost neutral recommendations

17. Another key theme emerging from the representation received by the IRP was that it needed to be cognisant of the current economic climate. While there was some substantial support arguing the case to increase the Basic Allowance in particular, it was generally put in the context that now was not the current time to do so. This was particularly the case with the Covid-19 pandemic still raging, and its effects likely to be last for the next couple of years at least. The residents of Rochdale are facing challenging times and as such the recommendations of the IRP should be broadly cost neutral.
18. It is noted that if the Council does accept all the recommendations from the IRP there will be a relatively marginal increase in the cost of Members' Allowances (just under £23,000, maybe less because of the 1-SRA only rule). However, this additional cost has arisen as a function of the post-May 2021 governance changes rather than the IRP recommending substantial increases. Additionally, much of this additional costs will be offset by savings through changes in support

¹ Modern Local Government – In touch with the People: Cm 4014 July 1998, 3.54

to Members, in not only in direct costs but also below the line costs, namely Officer time required to administer the current level of support provided to Members.

The IRPs Recommendations - the Basic Allowance

- Rochdale current Basic Allowance: £11,172
- Recalibrated Basic Allowance: £11,010
- Greater Manchester Councils Mean Basic Allowance: £11,208
- Greater Manchester Councils Median Basic Allowance: £11,108
- Recommended Basic Allowance 2021/22²: £11,172

Recalibrating the Basic Allowance

19. The one area where there was noticeable support for an increase (albeit largely but not exclusively marginal) was in relation to the Basic Allowance. Consequently, as a checking mechanism, the IRP decided to recalibrate the Basic Allowance by replicating the formula utilised in arriving at the recommended Basic Allowance in the November 2016 but with updated variable values where appropriate.

20. In recalibrating the Rochdale Basic Allowance the IRP was mindful of the 2006 Statutory Guidance (paragraph 67) which states:

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.

21. This guidance highlights three considerations when arriving at the recommended Basic Allowance, namely:

- The 'hours' or time required to be an effective ordinary Member
- The amount of this time that should be remunerated, often known as the Public Service Discount (PSD)
- The rate of remuneration

Time required to be a Member

22. As the Basic Allowance is primarily a time-based allowance that must be paid equally to all Members, it should take into account the full range of duties and

² All recommendations relate to 2021/22, subject to any indexation that may be applicable

activities (much of which is now done virtually) that Members are expected to undertake including:

- Attending meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Committees and related bodies
- Ward casework and constituent meetings
- Attendance at meetings of external organisations (Outside Bodies)
- Sitting on Township Committees and Sub Committees and related Forums, Working Groups and other Township-specific bodies that may have been established.
- Emails, reading reports, agendas and research, preparation and relevant training where necessary

23. The most up to date source of what time is required to be an effective Member is from the Local Government Association (LGA) Census of Councillors 2018 which shows that on average an elected Member of a metropolitan council who does not hold any position of significant responsibility puts in on average 24 hours per week on 'Council business'.³ In effect, it is the equivalent of three days per week, although it is recognised that this input is spread over a whole week and often outside the 9-5 context. This is an increase on the 21.8 hours per week utilised in the 2016 Review to arrive at the recommended Basic Allowance.

Recognising the Public Service Principle

24. In arriving at the recalibrated Basic Allowance the IRP has to recognise that not all the time put in by Members should be remunerated as there is an element of public service or *pro bono publico* in being a Member.
25. The standard amount of time that is typically discounted for public service is between 30% and 35% on the basis that, of the average time spent on Council business by all English Councillors, almost 30% is the proportion that is spent "engaging with constituents, surgeries and enquiries."⁴ In the 2016 review the IRP opted for a public service discount of 33% as Members of metropolitan councils have more constituents to represent than most unitary and district councils and more direct contact with constituents than would be the case for County Councillors who are responsible for more strategic services. The IRP did not receive any information to suggest that a 33% public service discount is no longer appropriate for recalibration purposes.

³ This does not include on average an additional 5.7 hours per week on group/party business. Breakdown of means hours by type of council and by positions held supplied to Chair of IRP in email from S. Richards, LGA 21st October 2019

⁴ See Councillors Census 2018, LGA, Chart 3 page 5. This is for all English Councillors regardless of type of council and position held - the only data available.

26. Thus, out of an assessment of an average of 24 hours per week required to be an effective ordinary Member, 33% of that time (8 hours) should not be remunerated, it is deemed as given as public service.

Rate for Remuneration

27. In the past Remuneration Panels were issued with advisory guidance from the Local Government Association (LGA) setting out a 'day session' rate that IRPs could (and did) adopt in setting a Basic Allowance. In 2010 this day session rate was £152.77⁵ or approximately £19 per hour. The LGA discontinued the publication of the day session rate the following year by which time it was over £20 per hour, partly because many IRPs found such a rate hard to defend or justify methodologically (it was weighted to reflect male non-manual average earnings) and partly because there has been a change in how average earnings are published in that they began to be set out on a local authority area basis.
28. IRPs now typically base the rate for remuneration on the average earnings for all full time employees resident in their particular council district. A locally based rate of remuneration relates the Basic Allowance to the average earnings of those whom Members represent and thus has a greater robustness. In 2016 the IRP using data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) as published in its Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE 2016) adopted the mean gross hourly earnings for all full time employees resident in the Borough of Rochdale, which was £13.76.
29. However, for the purposes of recalibration the IRP has adopted the 2020 *median* gross hourly earnings for all full time employees resident in the Borough of Rochdale, which was £13.17 per hour. The IRP has switched from mean to median earnings as the rate of remuneration as the ONS advises that median earnings are a more 'true' reflection of average earnings as it is not distorted by a high handful of high earners and the unusually high cluster of those earning (or just above) the minimum wage.
30. Consequently, in consideration of the three variables utilized to arrive at a recalibrated Basic Allowance the IRP has adopted the values as set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Variables and their sources in arriving at the Basic Allowance

Variable	Amount	Evidence provided
----------	--------	-------------------

⁵ See LGalert 62/10, Members' Allowances, 23 June 2010

Time/Hours	1248 hours per year	Based the LGA Councillor Census 2018 figure of 24 hours per week multiplied by 52 weeks.
Public Service Discount	33% (412 hours)	Based on LGA Councillors Census 2018 Chart 3
Rate for Remuneration	£13.17 per hour	Based on ONS ASHE table 8.5a: mean gross hourly earnings of all full time employees resident in Rochdale Borough 2020

31. By following the approach set out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance the IRP arrived at a recalibrated Basic Allowance based on the following calculation:
- 1248 hours minus 33% = 836 remunerated hours x £13.17 per hour = £11,010
32. The recalibrated Basic Allowance (£11,010) shows that the current Rochdale Basic Allowance (£11,172) has not lost relative value since the previous review.

Benchmarking

33. Benchmarking shows that the current Rochdale Basic Allowance (£11,172) is between the mean Basic Allowance (£11,208) and median (£11,108) Basic Allowances paid across Greater Manchester. Again, this supports the case not to revise the current Basic Allowance.
34. As a further check the IRP benchmarked the recalibrated Basic Allowance against remuneration for non-executive directors (NEDs) of NHS Trusts. Although the roles of a NHS NED and an elected Member are not strictly analogous the IRP felt that it helped put the Rochdale recalibrated and current Basic Allowance in context, especially as NEDs are given an explicit time commitment.

Table 2: Remuneration of NEDs of NHS Trusts⁶

NHS Trust	Stated time commitment	Annual Remuneration
Non Trusts & Foundation Trusts	3 days per month	£13,000

⁶ https://improvement.nhs.uk/documents/6110/Chair_and_NED_Remuneration_Structure_1nov.pdf

35. Although it is recognised that the time expectation for NHS NEDs is often an understatement, the same often applies to Councillors. The IRP is simply contrasting the difference in expected time requirements and relative remuneration. In this context the current Rochdale Basic Allowance represents value for money and even supports the case for an increase.
36. However, the IRP is not recommending any change to the current Basic Allowance on the following grounds:
- The recalibrated Basic Allowance is broadly in line with the current Rochdale Basic Allowance
 - Similarly, GM benchmarking shows no significance difference in relation to the current Rochdale Basic Allowance
 - The representation received strongly argued that now was not the right time to increase the Basic Allowance despite there being a limited case to do so
37. **The IRP recommends that the current Basic Allowance is maintained at £11,172, subject to any indexation going forward over the next four years.**

Special Responsibility Allowances

38. In recommending SRAs and posts that merit an SRA the IRP was mindful of the 2006 Statutory Guidance (paragraph 72) which states that:

If the majority of Members of a Council receive a Special Responsibility Allowance the 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.

39. The IRP considered each of the Special Responsibility Allowances currently paid by the Council and also those roles that currently do not attract a Special Responsibility Allowance regarding their 'significance' in terms of responsibility and real time commitment. Although the IRP recommendations would lead to just over 50 per cent of Members being paid an SRA the IRP is confident that due to the 1-SRA only rule (see below) that in practice the total number of SRAs recommended (32) would not be payable. Regardless, even if the maximum number of SRAs recommended were payable in practice the IRP is convinced that they each carry a significant enough responsibility for the 50 per cent rule to be marginally breached.

The Leader's SRA

- Leader's current SRA: £33,516
- Other GM Councils Leaders' Mean SRA: £35,490
- Other GM Councils Leaders' Median SRA: £32,405
- Recommended Leader's SRA: £33,516

40. The previous (2016) review led to a significant increase in the Leader's SRA (from £23,412 to £31,535) as it had not been substantially revised since 2003/04 while the role had undergone significant change and it became clear that it required a full time commitment, and certainly precludes any meaningful paid employment in the normal sense. In addition, the role of Leader had grown in responsibility with the passage of The Localism Act 2011. This Act enhanced the powers of all Leaders by requiring all Councils operating the executive model of governance to adopt the strong Leader model. Consequently the Leader now has all executive powers vested in the post and is responsible for the discharge of all executive functions.

41. The IRP received representation that the role of Leader continues to develop, particularly in relation to the setting up of the Integrated Commissioning Board⁷ (which involves a number of senior Members) and meets bi-monthly, which broadly has the remit:

- To commission high quality all age health, social care and related services for the people of the Borough of Rochdale in order to meet assessed population, community and individual need, within the financial resources over which the Board has control.
- To agree the Health, Social care and Well-being commissioning strategies and commissioning outcomes for Rochdale Borough Council (RBC) and NHS Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Clinical Commissioning Group (HMRCCG) in accordance with the agreed delegations from RBC and HMRCCG.
- To manage all the pooled budgets established under section 75 of the National Health Service Act 2006.

42. The other aspect of the Leader's role that continues to develop is at the sub-regional level, namely at the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) Although the Leader's responsibilities at the GMCA are addressed below, the reality is that regardless of whether there was a GMCA, the Leader of Rochdale

⁷ <http://democracy.rochdale.gov.uk/documents/s63845/Agenda%20Item%206%20-OCT%202018CBToRnewdraftv3%20SE.KH%203.pdf>

Council would have a sub-regional and regional, and indeed national, dimension to their role. This was evident before the GMCA was set up in 2011 as the Leader became the key post in representing Rochdale at relevant forums regionally and nationally, such as the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) and the Local Government Association (LGA) – roles the Leader continues to carry out.

43. The Leader's current SRA (£33,516) has been set in accordance with a methodology 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.

44. This is known as the factor approach. As such, the Leader's SRA has been set at a multiple of three times the Basic Allowance. A multiple of three times the Basic Allowance is the most common factor used in arriving at a Leader's SRA. Benchmarking shows a mean Leaders' SRA of £35,490 across the GM Councils, which is 3.1 times the mean Basic Allowance (£11,208). Despite methodological convergence between the Rochdale Basic Allowance/Leader's SRA and the GM Councils mean Basic Allowance/mean Leader's SRA benchmarking against the median SRA (£32,405) shows that the current Rochdale Leader's SRA is more comparable in monetary terms.
45. As with the Basic Allowance the IRP extended benchmarking to a non-councillor role, in this case comparing remuneration of the Leader to that of the non-executive Chairs of NHS Trusts. From 1st April 2022, Chairs of (large) NHS Trusts will receive a total remuneration of at least £49,500 per year. Moreover the expressed time commitment for non-executive Chairs of Foundation NHS Trusts is 3 days per week and for a Chair of an ordinary NHS Trust it is 2-3 days per week. This in context the current total remuneration (including GMCA SRA) of the Rochdale Leader represents value for money.
46. There was a good deal of representation to the IRP arguing that there was a case to increase the Leader's SRA, in fact it was the strongest of all representation received. However, the IRP is not recommending any change to the Leader's SRA on the following grounds:
- Replication of the factor approach (3 times the Basic Allowance) does not support any increase
 - It is not fully supported by benchmarking against GM Councils
 - The GMCA aspect of the role is addressed below

- The representation received argued in the main that despite having one of the strongest cases for an increase that now was not the right time to increase the Leader's SRA

47. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Leader of the Council remains at 3 times the recommended Basic Allowance (£11,173), which equates to £33,516 per annum.**

The Deputy Leaders of the Council (x2)

- Deputy Leaders' current SRA (X 2): £16,758
- Other GM Councils Deputy Leaders' Mean SRA: £19,973
- Other GM Councils Deputy Leaders' Median SRA: £18,843
- Recommended Deputy Leaders' SRA (X 2): £16,758

48. In recommending other SRAs the IRP has in the main followed the approach laid 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.

49. This is known as the 'pro rata' approach in that the other remunerated posts are assessed as a ratio or percentage of the Leader's role. By definition the size of the Leader's roles is 100% and other SRAs are set as a proportion of 100%. The IRP has chosen to maintain this approach and adjusted the ratio for SRAs where there is a demonstrable case to do so.

50. The Leader has appointed two Deputy Leaders each with their own portfolio. Currently they each receive an SRA of £16,758; set at 50% of the Leader's SRA. There was queries raised with the IRP questioning the value or necessity of having two Deputy Leaders. However, it is not the role of the IRP to query on how the Council, has determined to organise itself, just to make assessments on the value of the roles in place and whether they merit remuneration or not.

51. The IRP notes that the Deputy Leaders are assigned the larger portfolios so appointing two Deputy Leaders, who are paid slightly more than Other Cabinet Members, is a way of recognising the larger workloads and responsibilities. The Deputy Leaders also undertake the traditional role of attending briefings with the Leader, acting as a sounding board and stepping in for the Leader in the Leader's

absence, which occurs more frequently as the Leader has had to undertake a larger GM wide role. Indeed it means that the Deputy Leaders (as do most other executive members but to a lesser extent) have acquired a larger GM wide role. This includes deputizing for the Leader at the GMCA when required and being appointed to GMCA committees, e.g., the Deputy Leader with the Healthy Lives Portfolio is also on the Association of Greater Manchester Executive Board.

52. Benchmarking shows that even when the fact that the Rochdale Deputy Leaders SRA (£16,758) is the lowest across Greater Manchester, with the mean SRA (£19,973) and median SRA (£18,843) being paid to Deputy Leaders across the GM Councils. However, once the fact that Rochdale has two Deputy Leaders is taken into account then the additional marginal cost (compared to the other Cabinet Members) of having two Deputy Leaders in Rochdale is in line with the level of Deputy Leader's remuneration across the rest of Greater Manchester.
53. As such, the current ratio (50% of the Leader's SRA) is still appropriate in setting the recommended SRA for the Deputy Leaders which equates to £16,758.
54. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the two Deputy Leaders remains at £16,758, which is 50% of the Leader's SRA.**

Other Cabinet Members (x7)

• Other Cabinet Members' SRA current SRA:	£15,082
• Other GM Councils Other Cabinet Members' Mean SRA:	£15,146
• Other GM Councils Other Cabinet Members' Median SRA:	£15,364
• Recommended Other Cabinet Members' SRA:	£15,082

55. There was an argument presented to the IRP to vary the SRAs for other Cabinet members depending on the size and scope of their respective portfolios. This has been addressed somewhat by having two Deputy Leaders being assigned the larger portfolios. Moreover, as a general rule IRPs do not make a distinction between different sized portfolios and in the main Cabinet Portfolio Holders are paid an equal SRA. The reasons are two-fold. Firstly, there is the problem of meaningful metrics - how to measure distinctions in responsibility between portfolios? A portfolio may have a large budgetary responsibility to deliver services but much of the spend could be routine, while another portfolio may have a smaller budgetary responsibility but that spend may be more by driven local priorities rather than national directives which gives the 'smaller' Portfolio Holder greater discretion within their remit.

56. Secondly, where distinctions between the workload and responsibilities of different Cabinet Members' portfolios become glaring and therefore unsustainable there is now a mechanism to even out these distinctions between portfolios. The remit of a particular portfolio is now the responsibility of the Leader who can rebalance a portfolio if it was felt necessary. In fact, the new Leader recognised this situation by in effect splitting the old Quality of Place Portfolio into two separate portfolios (Environment and Facilities and Highways and Housing) adding one more other Cabinet Member. Consequently the IRP is not making a recommendation to pay differential SRAs to the other Cabinet Members (Portfolio Holders).
57. Legislation puts a cap on the number of Cabinet Members; it cannot contain more than ten (10) members including the Leader and Deputy Leader[s]. Currently there are now seven other Cabinet Members. The IRP has taken the view that in light of the legislative cap on the number of executive Members then the SRA for other Cabinet Members should not varied because of an additional other Cabinet Member, the rate for the job is the rate for the job.
58. The current SRA for other Cabinet Members is £15,082; set at 45% of the Leader's SRA. This is marginally below the mean SRA (£15,146) and median SRA (£15,364) paid to other Executive Members across the GM Councils, although the difference is of no meaningful significance. be
59. The IRP received no evidence to revise the SRAs paid to the seven other Cabinet Members and have kept the current ratio, i.e., 45% of the Leader's recommended SRA, in setting their SRA.
60. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the seven other Members of the Cabinet is maintained at £15,082, which has been set at 45% of the Leader's recommended SRA.**

The Assistants to Portfolio Holders (x9)

• Assistants to Portfolios' current SRA:	£3,016
• GM Councils Assistants to Portfolios' Mean SRA:	£6,333
• GM Councils Assistants to Portfolios' Median SRA:	£6,872
• Recommended Assistants to Portfolios' SRA:	£3,016

61. The Leader also appoints what is now nine Assistants to Portfolio Holders, each Assistant being assigned to a Cabinet Member. As with other Cabinet Members there is an additional Assistant to Portfolio Holders appointed post-May 2021. They are not formal deputies to Cabinet Members and are not executive members under the Local Government Act 2000. Thus they cannot operate as

formal substitutes for the Portfolio Holders, exercise any executive powers nor have assigned to them any delegated decision making. In law, they cannot vote at Cabinet meetings or make decisions on behalf of their respective Cabinet Member; the current protocol also indicates they may not present reports or answer questions on behalf of their Cabinet Member at Council. All of which led the IRP to query whether this SRA was merited, a query which received a significant echo in the representation received.

62. Nonetheless, the Assistants to Portfolio Holders do have a role profile which specifies that they may carry out such duties as their Cabinet Member determines, including deputizing in the latter's absence except in respect of decision making and any limitations or conditions that their Cabinet Member may specify. They are able to attend meetings and speak on behalf of their Cabinet Member. While in reality there is some degree of variation in the scope and level of their workloads dependent on both the personal relationship between the Portfolio Holder and their Assistant and the complexity of the portfolio it is expected that each of the Assistants to the Portfolio Holders are assigned a discrete remit or topic in which they will take the lead on the Portfolio Holders behalf. For example, the Assistant to the Cabinet Member with the portfolio for regeneration is assigned the remit for Town Centre development. In effect they are in place as the full executive "Members cannot do it all."
63. Currently each Assistant to Portfolios receives an SRA of £3,016, set at 20% of the other Cabinet Members' SRA. Despite the non-statutory basis of the post, i.e., they are not required in law, they are in place in seven of the other nine GM Councils, with a mean/median SRA of £6,333 and £6,872 respectively. The SRAs paid to the Assistants to the Executive have the greatest variation of all posts, with the lowest being £1,433 (Bury) and the highest being £10,589 (Salford), a difference of over 800%. The reason for this variation arises out of the fact that these posts are at the discretion of the Leader in determining their workloads, remits and indeed numbers, all of which varies from council to council. Thus it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons for benchmarking purposes as the number and remits varies.
64. Nonetheless, the Assistants to the Portfolios do have meaningful roles to undertake and merit a SRA, although not at the level suggested by benchmarking. The IRP understands that there is an element of succession planning involved with the appointment of Assistants to the Portfolio Holders, which mitigates against paying a higher SRA. It is also typical practice elsewhere to remunerate equivalent posts.
65. In setting their SRA the Panel has not been guided by the benchmarking due to the variation in numbers and roles across GM and the succession planning

aspect to their role. Moreover, the Panel understands that the workloads of the Assistants to the Portfolios can be variable depending on relationships and how their respective Portfolio Lead interprets the role. As such the Panel has decided that their current SRA is still appropriate. As with the additional other Cabinet Member the additional Assistant to Portfolio Holders does not affect their workloads/responsibilities, there is a natural limit to their numbers and a going rate for the job within that limit.

66. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the nine Assistants to the Portfolio Holders is maintained at £3,016, set at 20% of the SRA for the Portfolio Holders.**

Chair of Planning and Licensing Committee (x1)

- Planning & Licensing Chair current SRA: £11,172
- GM Councils Planning Chairs (only) SRA mean: £9,538
- GM Councils Planning Chairs (only) SRA median: £9,662
- Recommended Planning & Licensing Chair SRA: £11,172

67. Among the GM Councils only Oldham has adopted the Rochdale model in that it has a single committee for Planning and Licensing. The other GM Councils have separate Planning and Licensing Committees, with the latter function (in five instances) further supported by SRAs paid to the Licensing Committee Vice Chair, and to a lesser extent Chairs, Vice Chairs and Members of Licensing Panels where these post holders often get involved in taxi licensing issues - in Rochdale many of such types of licensing issues are delegated to Officers.
68. There was not insignificant representation to the IRP questioning why the Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee received the highest Committee Chair's SRA. In fact one model presented to the IRP on more than one occasion was to remunerate all Committee Chairs equally. However, the IRP while bringing about greater equalisation in SRAs for Committee Chairs (in that the recommendations will put most remunerated Chairs on a standard Chair's SRA of £8,379) has not done so in the case of the Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee. In this case, it is relatively simple to differentiate between the respective powers of this and the other committees, with different meetings schedules and scope of remit.
69. Both Planning and Licensing are statutory functions and where those functions are not delegated to Officers they must be discharged by a committee. Decisions of the Planning and Licensing Committee are quasi-judicial in that they have the force of law. The rationale for having a single committee for two statutory

functions was that many planning applications where determined by elected members were undertaken by the Planning Sub-Committees of the Townships Committees and the prescriptive nature of the Licensing Act 2003 meant there was limited specific business for a Licensing Committee convened under that Act to undertake.

70. The Planning and Licensing Committee dealt with planning matters that, in accordance with a delegation scheme agreed by the Council, could not be determined at a Township level. However, the Council (19 October 2016) agreed the transfer of all planning related delegated functions from the Township Planning Sub-Committees to the Planning and Licensing Committee. Although, there is greater delegation to Officers under the revised arrangements it has required the Planning and Licensing Committee to consider more applications than in the past, particularly contentious applications, and the committee has increased in size from 11 to 15 Members to afford equal representation to all the Townships. In the revised planning arrangements the Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee is more high profile and often subject to local lobbying.
71. As the Council's statutory Licensing Committee (established in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003), the Planning and Licensing Committee is responsible for liquor and gambling licensing. However, the largest part of this work relates to liquor and gambling applications that are the subject of objections and requests made for the review of licenses. In turn these are considered by ad hoc Licensing Panels, consisting of 3 Members. The Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee while not required to sit on and chair approximately the three or so meetings per year of Licensing Panels is always given the opportunity to do so in the first instance and normally does so except where there may be conflict of interest. This is in addition to chairing the monthly meetings of the full committee. The Planning and Licensing Committee also has responsibility for electoral matters. As such the Planning and Licensing Committee is meeting more frequently, normally 12 times per year, than the other committees, which typically have six scheduled meetings per year. .
72. The current SRA (£11,172) for the Chair of Planning and Licensing Committee has been set at 1/3 of the Leader's SRA. Due to the dual statutory remit of this committee, the return of responsibility for determining local planning applications, the frequency of meetings and the lead role the Chair is expected to undertake in chairing the Licensing Panels, the IRP still concludes that the Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee has a larger workload and responsibility than other committee chairs and their SRA should reflect this position.
73. Because of the unusual arrangements in Rochdale, benchmarking is of limited guidance. The mean SRA paid to the Chairs of Planning Committees across the

GM Councils is £9,538 and £3,380 for Vice Chairs (paid in 5 out of the 10 GM Councils). The mean SRA for the Chairs and Vice Chairs (also paid in 5 out of 10 GM Councils) of Licensing Committees is £8,850 and £3,245 respectively. In this context the SRA for the Rochdale Chair of a single Planning and Licensing Committee represents very good value for money and the IRP is content that the current SRA (and the fact that it is the highest SRA paid to a Chair) is still appropriate.

74. **The IRP recommends SRA for the Chair of Planning and Licensing Committee remains at £11,172, which 1/3 of the Leader's SRA.**

Chairs of the Township Committees (x5)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| • Township Chairs' current SRA: | £8,379 |
| • GM Councils Area Chairs mean SRA: | £7,806 |
| • GM Councils Area Chairs median SRA: | £8,379 |
| • Recommended Township Chairs' SRA: | £8,379 |

75. There are now five Township Committees, an increase of one since the 2016 review, with the splitting of the large Rochdale Township Committee into Rochdale North and South. They were established in 1992, and they are now an integral part of the Council's decision making process. They have some responsibility for local delivery of devolved services including:

- Environmental Management, excluding Refuse Collection, Recycling and Bereavement Services)
- Highways
- Community Centres
- Township Funds
- Leisure Projects - commissioning
- Development Control (on consultative basis for major applications and call in for by ward Members when relevant)
- Other regulatory matters which impact locally such as Traffic Regulation Orders

76. Each Township Committee has devolved capital and revenue resources, including a revenue Township Fund (calculated at £2 per township resident). Examples of how these funds and budgets can be used include local grants schemes; funding community and environmental projects; funding priorities identified in the Township Plan, etc. The Township Committees have established their own Sub-Committee arrangements and terms of reference for dealing with devolved services and the expenditure of devolved funds.

77. They are the arena to monitor and review all services and activities provided by the Council in the Township. They are also the prime vehicle by which the Council engages with the public, with their meetings starting with an Open Forum session giving local residents the opportunity to raise issues of local concern. All Members sit on a Township Committee. The full committees meet four times per year and the Chair and Vice Chair are elected by the Committee Members. The Township Chair will also chair their relevant Township Sub-Committee which also meets four times per year.
78. Currently the Township Chairs receive an SRA of £8,379, set at 25 per cent of the Leader's SRA. Only three other GM Councils have devolved arrangements where they remunerate their respective Chairs so meaningful benchmarking is difficult in this regard. However, limited benchmarking shows that the SRA for Township Chairs does not require revision, the Rochdale Township Chairs are paid an SRA equivalent to the median SRA (£8,379) for chairs of equivalent posts across Greater Manchester; nor did the IRP receive any other evidence that the current SRA (£8,379) was in need of revision.
79. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Chairs of the Township Committees (x5) remains at £8,379, which is 25% of the Leader's SRA.**

Chairs of Overview and Scrutiny Committees (x3)

- | | |
|--|--------|
| • Scrutiny Chairs' current SRA: | £8,379 |
| • GM Councils Scrutiny Chairs' Mean SRA: | £8,274 |
| • GM Councils Scrutiny Chairs' Median SRA: | £8,379 |
| • Recommended Scrutiny Chairs' SRA: | £8,379 |
80. Overview and Scrutiny is a statutory function which has to be discharged by at least one Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Overview and Scrutiny is the process whereby executive decision-makers are held to account. Overview and Scrutiny Committees also have an important role to play in the Council's policy and budget development process. Since May 2015 Rochdale Borough Council has three Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as follows:
- Communities, Regeneration and Environment
 - Health, Schools and Care
 - Corporate
81. More specifically, their work falls into several areas as defined in law or statutory guidance. Firstly, the Overview and Scrutiny Committees are consulted by the

Cabinet as part of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework before making a final recommendation to Council for adoption. They can be consulted on other matters where it is deemed important to get the views of Members on a particular topic.

82. Secondly, they consider the Plans and related targets produced for each Council Directorate as they apply to their particular terms of reference. These Plans inform Members of work programmes of the Directorates and set out the indicators to be reported to the Committee as part of the performance management framework. The Committees are then able to call for more detailed reports on areas of identified concern.
83. Thirdly, as well as generally scrutinising the work of the Cabinet, the Overview and Scrutiny Committees also exercise the statutory function of 'call-in'. This is a process by which that, in the event that two or more Councillors feel that an executive decision made by the Cabinet, a Cabinet member, the Health and Wellbeing Board or Integrated Commissioning Board, or a Township Committee/Sub-Committee should receive a further consideration, they can, within a set timescale, "call-in" the decision for scrutiny by submitting a formal notice with reasons and a supporting statement to the Chief Executive. The Committee considers the decision made and the report which led to that decision, the reasons why the decision has been called in, and the response of the decision maker and the relevant Officer. On the basis of the evidence provided, the Committee has three options, namely:
 - I. to accept the decision, in which case the decision takes immediate effect;
 - II. to refer the decision back to the decision maker for re-consideration, providing reasons as to why they feel it should be re-considered;
 - III. If it is considered the decision may be contrary to the Council's budget or an agreed policy, the matter may be referred to full Council for determination as to whether the original decision should be upheld or whether it should be referred back for reconsideration.
84. A called-in decision can only be referred back to the decision maker once but the decision maker should take into account the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and/or full Council in re-considering the decision, but is within its rights to re-affirm the original decision.
85. Fourthly, the Overview and Scrutiny Committees may identify topics for study and review to be undertaken by a Working Group of Councillors. These studies or reviews can consider activities and policies of the Council, or activities and policies which cut across other public service providers. The Committee will determine the Terms of Reference, together with the timetable and study

methodology, for such exercises and approve recommendations for submission to the Cabinet (and/or other bodies as appropriate).

86. The Overview and Scrutiny Committees are scheduled to meet 5-6 times per year although they typically add 1-2 meetings per year as required. In addition, while a call-in of an executive decision typically only occurs 1-2 times per year, the Chair of the relevant committee is required to lead in the process. Moreover, the Council is statutorily bound to consult with the relevant Chair to determine if an executive decision/report is to be exempted (or not depending on circumstances) from the call-in process. In certain circumstances (usually on the grounds of urgency) they are also consulted on late additions to the Notice of Key Decisions List - especially if that decision is to be considered in private. Key Decisions have to be published to the Council's web-site at least 28 days prior to the meeting that is to determine the Key decision.
87. Currently the Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees each receive an SRA of £8,379, set at 25 per cent of the Leader's SRA, which is on a par with that paid to the Chairs of the Township Committees. No evidence was received to suggest the current SRA needed substantial revision and benchmarking shows that the current SRA is broadly on a par with peers
88. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees (x3) remains at £8,379, set at 25% of the Leader's SRA.**

Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee (x1)

• Audit & Governance Chair current SRA:	£6,703
• Other GM Councils Audit Chair Mean SRA:	£7,368
• Other GM Councils Audit Chair Median SRA:	£7,365
• Recommended Audit & Governance Chair SRA:	£8,379

89. The Audit and Governance Committee was established in May 2015 arising out of a merger of the former Audit and Risk Management and Standards Committees with the addition of some constitutional functions. It was established on efficiency grounds following the implementation of the revised elected Member Standards regime introduced under the Localism Act 2011 resulting in less business being submitted to the former Standards Committee. It also gave greater force to a fully integrated governance body for the Council directly overseen by Members.
90. The Audit and Standards functions remain statutory functions of the Council. There is no requirement to have a committee to deal with either Audit or

Standards - although it is recommended as good practice by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) to have a committee to discharge the Audit function. In effect the merger was a reflection of the lighter workloads and responsibilities of the Audit and Risk Management and the Standards Committees.

91. The Audit and Governance Chair is paid an SRA of £6,703, set at 20 per cent of the Leader's SRA. The mean SRA paid to Chairs of equivalent committees in the GM Councils (8 out of 10) is £7,368, with a median SRA of £7,365. However, once again, benchmarking provides limited guidance in this case. The Audit and Governance Committee is typically scheduled to meet four times per year with a fifth meeting to determine/sign off the Council's annual accounts. This is a statutory function the Council has delegated to this Committee to determine. Also the Audit and Governance Committee receives regular reports from the Council's external auditors (Mazars) regarding aspects of the Council's work. The Chair of the Committee will, together with the Council's Chief Finance Officer and Head of Internal Audit, meet with seconded staff from Mazars from time to time, outside of the formal Committee structure, to discuss issues of concern and the progress of audit activity.
92. On the other hand, the Standards remit has decreased substantially since 2013, with only one Standards Hearings being required since the previous review. In part this is a reflection that where there are complaints against Members they are expected to be dealt with by the Monitoring Officer and the new statutory post of Independent Person (external to the Council). There are also fewer complaints being made as the sanctions that can be imposed by the Audit and Governance Committee if and when it upholds a complaint have been restricted under the Localism Act.
93. Nonetheless, the Audit and Governance Committee does have a wide remit, which includes dealing with a number of statutory functions, with such functions being specialised and complex in nature. As the such, and partly in response to representation received the IRP has decided to place the SRA for the Chair of Audit and Governance Committee at the standard SRA for committee chairs and reset it at 25 per cent of the Leader's SRA, which equates to £8,379..
94. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee is reset at 25% of the Leader's SRA, which equates to £8,379.**

Chair of the Employment and Equalities Committee

95. The Council previously had an Employment and Equalities Committee that was disbanded at the end of 2016/17 municipal year following a governance review. The Chair was in receipt of an SRA, paid on a par with the SRA paid to the Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee. Since the Annual Meeting on 19th May 2021 the Council has re-established the Employment and Equalities Committee so as to give elected Members an overall oversight and greater control over the implementation of Council staffing policies and structures.
96. The initial proposal is for the Employment and Equalities Committee to meet four times per year. It is expected that there will be a need for additional meetings when required, such as to deal with savings proposals (which could incur redundancies/job losses or significant restructuring of services).
97. The IRP decided that the Chair of the Employment and Equalities Committee merited an SRA. Benchmarking was of limited value as a guide as none of the other Greater Manchester Councils appear to remunerate an equivalent post. Nonetheless, the IRP in keeping with representation received and subsequent principle adopted, namely to bring greater consistency to the SRAs for Committee Chairs, has opted for the standard Chairs SRA of £8,379 (set at 25 per cent of the Leader's recommended SRA).
98. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Chair of the Employment and Equalities Committee is set at 25% of the Leader's SRA, which equates to £8,379.**

Committee Vice-Chairs

99. The IRP received some representation that Committee Vice-Chairs merited an SRA. In fact, most Committee Vice-Chairs did receive an SRA (set at 25 per cent of their respective Chair's SRA) until they were discontinued following the November 2016 review.
100. The IRP did not receive sufficient evidence to reverse this recommendation. This is not to say there is not a job of work to do, as there is. Vice-Chairs need to stand in when required, keep informed on their committees' remit and attend agenda briefings with their Chair, but that alone does not entail a significant responsibility that merits an SRA.
101. There might have been a greater case to maintain these SRAs when there was a low Basic Allowance but the Rochdale model of remuneration is now changed, and the current level of Basic Allowance recognises that:

Whilst such responsibilities may be unique to a particular member it may be that all or most members have some such responsibility to varying degrees. Such duties may not lead to a significant extra workload for any one particular member above another. These sorts of responsibilities should be recognised as a time commitment to council work which is acknowledged within the basic allowance and not responsibilities for which a special responsibility allowance should be recommended.⁸

102. It is for this reason that the majority of councils do not remunerate Vice-Chairs of Committees as a matter of course. This is backed up by the benchmarking that shows only in the main the other GM Councils do not remunerate their Committee Vice-Chairs. In fact, the only Committee Vice-Chairs that do tend to receive an SRA elsewhere are the Planning and Licensing Committee Vice-Chairs and the IRP received next to no representation to remunerate the Rochdale Planning and Licensing Vice-Chair.

103. Thus the IRP is not recommending that Committee Vice-Chairs are paid an SRA for the following reasons:

- Budgetary pressures
- Lack of clearly defined responsibility across the board
- To do otherwise would lead to a significant breach of the Statutory Guidance regarding no more than 50 per cent of Members should be paid an SRA
- The comparative picture

104. **The IRP does not recommend that the Committee Vice-Chairs are paid an SRA.**

Opposition SRAs – Leader of Main Opposition Group

• Main Opposition Group Leader current SRA:	£11,731
• GM Councils Main Opposition Group Leader Mean SRA:	£11,304
• GM Councils Main Opposition Group Leader Median SRA:	£11,143
• Recommended Main Opposition Group Leader SRA:	£11,731

105. The 2003 Regulations require that where the Council is controlled by one or more political groups (defined as having a minimum of two Members) then at least one SRA must be paid to an Opposition Member. The current Rochdale Borough Council allowances scheme fulfils this requirement by making specific provision

⁸ Statutory Guidance 2006, paragraph 73

for Leader of the Main Opposition Group with an SRA of £11,417, set at 35 per cent of the Leader's SRA.⁹

106. The IRP received no evidence that this SRA required revision. It is broadly in line with the SRA paid to similar posts in the comparator Councils. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group is maintained at £11,731, set at 35% of the Leader's SRA.**

Opposition SRAs – Opposition Shadow Portfolio Holders

107. There was some representation received arguing that the Opposition Shadow Portfolio Holders should receive an SRA. These posts (as were Other Opposition Group Spokespersons) were remunerated up until the November 2016 Review at which stage the IRP recommended (and the Council accepted) that they were discontinued.
108. The extensive provision for Opposition SRAs related to when there was a different political composition of the Council, in particular where there was no overall control and Opposition Groups had an enhanced role in the governance arrangements of the Council. In the current political context, extending the scope of the Opposition SRAs payable to Opposition Shadow Portfolio Holders would be disproportionate; all Members of the Main Opposition Group would receive an SRA. The enhanced recommended Basic Allowance recognises that all the Opposition Members have a spokesperson role particularly in regards to the remits of those committees that they sit on.
109. Moreover, the IRP is not recommending that Opposition Shadow Portfolio Holders are paid an SRA for the same reasons it did not recommend that Committee Vice-Chairs are paid an SRA. **The IRP does not recommend that the Opposition Shadow Portfolio Holders are paid an SRA.**

Opposition SRAs – Leader[s] of Other (Qualifying) Opposition Groups

110. Currently, the allowances scheme contains provision for an SRA for Leaders of Other Opposition Groups on the condition that the Group should reach a qualifying threshold of having 10 per cent of the Council membership, i.e., at least six Members. The SRA is £3,351, set at 10 per cent of the Leader's SRA. Currently no Other Opposition Group meets the qualifying criteria for this SRA to be paid.

⁹ In fact Rochdale goes beyond the statutory requirement to pay at least one Opposition Member an SRA by having an Opposition Member chair and Overview and Scrutiny Committee as well as having provision for other Opposition Group Leaders to receive an SRA who meet the qualifying criteria

111. This qualifying criteria is historical and the IRP maintained it at the time of the November 2016 review. Setting a qualifying criterion for an SRA to be paid to Leaders of Other Opposition Groups is common elsewhere. Although it only takes two Members to form a group, IRPs typically impose a higher threshold for Other Opposition Leaders SRA to be paid. One reason this is done is that two Members is such a low threshold it could encourage group splintering and break away factions simply to get an Other Opposition Group Leader's SRA
112. The IRP received representation that the current qualifying criteria to pay an SRA to a Leader of an Other Opposition Group was too high and in effect discriminated against a long standing, albeit historically small, Opposition Group. The IRP had some sympathy with this view and decided to reduce the qualifying criteria by half from 10 per cent to five per cent of the Council membership, i.e., a minimum of three Members.
113. In return, as part of a *quid pro quo* the IRP has reduced this SRA by half from 10 per cent of the Leader's SRA to five per cent of the Leader's SRA, which equates to £1,631. This would mean that under the current political configuration of the Council that it would be paid to one Leader of an Other Opposition Group.
114. **The IRP recommends that the qualifying criteria for paying an SRA to a Leader of Other Opposition Group[s] is reduced to three Group Members and the SRA is reset at £1,676, which is five per cent of the Leader's SRA.**

Other SRAs – Members appointed to Adoption and Fostering Panel (x2)

115. The IRP received representation that the two Members who are appointed to the Adoption and Fostering Panel had a responsibility that was significant enough to merit paying an SRA. It is noted that across the GM Councils only Manchester remunerates such roles.
116. Nonetheless, the IRP had some sympathy with this argument. It is a requirement to appoint two Members to the Adoption and Fostering Panel. The Panel undertake a statutory function of the Council and make life changing decisions. The Adoption and Fostering Panel meets as and when required but together it normally meets at least six times per year and it deals with complex issues, with meetings often lasting the better part of the day.

117. As such the IRP is making a recommendation to remunerate the Members appointed to Adoption and Fostering Panel. In determining the appropriate level the IRP has set it at five per cent of the Leaders' SRA, which equates to £1,676¹⁰.
118. **The IRP recommends that the Members appointed to the Council's Adoption and Fostering Panel are paid an SRA of £1,676, which is five per cent of the Leader's SRA.**

Recommended SRAs in accordance with the GMCA Order 2011

119. The IRP has been asked to consider whether a SRA should be paid to Rochdale Member[s] appointed by the Council to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) in respect of duties and responsibilities undertaken as a member of the GMCA and any of its committees, and if so to specify the amount of any such allowance. The GMCA is prohibited from paying allowances to any of its Members or appointees to its committees. This point was made specifically in the 2015 amendment to the GMCA Order, and any remuneration in this regard has to be paid through the schemes of the constituent councils.

Rochdale Members appointed to the GMCA Transport Committee

120. Currently, the Rochdale allowances scheme contains provision to pay two Members it appoints to the Transport for Greater Manchester Committee (TfGMC) as SRA of £4,182. The TfGMC was a joint GM committee to make decisions on transport issues delegated to it by the GMC Combined Authority. It no longer exists as the elected Mayor of the GMCA now holds all transport powers for GM.
121. As a consequence, the TfGMC has been replaced by the GMCA Transport Committee (GMTC). The GMTC is primarily an advisory committee with very limited powers. However, the residual SRA paid to Members appointed to the TfGMC that is still listed in the Rochdale Members' Allowances scheme has been transposed and paid to the Rochdale Members appointed to the GMTC. The IRP notes that this may also be the case in a handful of other GM Councils as they continue list the SRA for appointees to the TfGMC in their allowances schemes.
122. Nonetheless, the IRP notes that this is primarily a legacy issue. It is not a merited SRA – Rochdale also appoints Members to the GMCA Scrutiny and Audit

¹⁰ It is recognised that in practice only one SRA will be paid in this respect due to the 1-SRA only as one of the Members appointed to the Adoption and Fostering Panels is typically a Cabinet Member with the relevant portfolio remit

Committees but no additional remuneration is paid. Moreover, the much reduced remit of the GMTC means that it exercises limited responsibility.

123. As such, **the IRP recommends that the current SRA (£4,182) paid to the Rochdale Members appointed to the GMTC is discontinued.**

Rochdale Leader appointed to the GMCA

124. The rolling implementation of devolution since the previous review has created a different set of challenges for all GM Council Leaders/elected Mayor and the Rochdale Leader in particular. Each Leader on the GMCA has a particular policy lead; the Leader of Rochdale is the GMCA and AGMA portfolio lead for Communities, Co-ops and Inclusion, which also involves appointments to other relevant bodies, such as being appointed to the Transport for the North Board. Also the Leader, as with all Leaders/District elected Mayor on the GMCA, sits on the GM Health and Social Care Strategic Partnership and the GM Police and Crime Panel.

125. The GM region is the only region thus far to take control of its combined health and social care budgets, which is more than £6 billion. More recently, through the GMCA Devolution Agreement with the Government, there has been a further significant devolution of powers and responsibilities to GMCA designed to drive economic growth and reform of public services. There was general agreement that the GMCA-related work of the Leader had increased significantly since the November 2016 review.

126. In the November 2016 review the IRP recognised this aspect of the Leader's role and recommended an additional SRA to be paid to the Leader in accordance with the GMCA Order 2011. It was originally set at £5,500 (now £5,879 with indexation). It was set at this level on the basis that it should be no less than the lowest SRA paid to the three other GM Councils that specifically pay an additional GMCA SRA to their Leader under the 2011 Order.

127. Although the benchmarking is limited (as only four out of the 10 GM Councils pay their Leader a GMCA SRA under the 2011 Order) it does show the following:

- Rochdale Leader's GMCA SRA: £5,879
- GM Leaders GMCA SRA mean: £8,053
- GM Leaders GMCA SRA median: £7,982
- Recommended Rochdale Leader's GMCA SRA: £5,879

128. The IRP notes that the current GMCA SRA paid to the Rochdale Leader is the lowest out of the four GM Councils that pay such an SRA and broadly on a par with that paid to the Leader of Oldham (£5,985).
129. Despite the low SRA in the benchmarking context and the increased demands on made on the Leader at the GMCA the IRP has not recommended that the Leaders' GMCA SRA should be increased. The main reason is that the IRP has been cognisant of one of the key messages received in the representations received, namely regardless of the merits of the case now is not the time to recommend significant increases in Members' Allowances.
130. **The IRP recommends that there is no change to the Leader's SRA of £5,879 paid as a Member/Portfolio Holder on the GMCA under the 2001 Order.**

Maintaining the 1-SRA Only Rule and Exceptions

131. In common with most Councils¹¹ Rochdale Borough Council has adopted what is known as the 1-SRA only rule; in that regardless of the number of remunerated posts held by an elected Member they can be paid 'one SRA only', excluding those SRAs paid for GM posts. No evidence was received to change this practice.
132. **The Panel recommends that the 1-SRA only rule is maintained with the exception of Leader's additional SRA paid (under the 2011 Order) as a Member/Portfolio Holder of the GMCA.**

The Co-optees' Allowance

133. Currently there is no provision to pay a Co-optees' Allowance. This is an annual allowance, typically less than £1,000 where it is paid, that may be paid to Members who have been co-opted onto a council committee or sub-committee under the 2000 Local Government Act. When Standards Committees were statutory committees with substantial powers of sanction and with statutory co-optees, the Co-optees' Allowance was more commonly paid, but since the implementation of relevant sections of the Localism Act 2011 in July 2013 the Co-optees' Allowance is less common.
134. No evidence was received to indicate that the Council needs to make available a Co-optees' Allowance. The only Co-optees the Council appoints are the

¹¹ Out of the 10 GM Councils only Trafford permits the payment of more than 1 SRA. Where a Member in Trafford holds 2 remunerated posts they are paid 1.5 SRAs.

statutory appointments in relation to scrutiny and they are not full voting Members of such committees. **Thus, the IRP is not making a recommendation regarding the Co-optees' Allowance.**

The Dependants' Carers' Allowance (DCA)

135. While no issues were raised with the IRP by Members regarding the DCA. It is noted that it has not been claimed for a few years despite a number of Members being eligible to claim it. Regardless there was widespread support in the representation received to maintain this allowance on the principle that it helped reduce a barrier to public service from traditionally underrepresented sections of the population. Moreover, all the GM Councils now make the DCA available.
136. The IRP understands that there may be reluctance on the part of eligible Members to claim the DCA as it appears as a published expense against a Members' name in the annual statutory publication of remuneration and reimbursements received by each Member.
137. The IRP takes this opportunity to point out that this allowance was given recognition in statute and is specifically designed to reduce a potential barrier to being an elected Member for those with caring responsibilities. The IRP suggests that if it is known that a Member has caring responsibilities then the DCA is specifically brought to their attention. It should be also pointed out that the approved duties for which this allowance may be claimed is governed by statute.
138. Currently the maximum rate claimable for DCA is based on the National Living Wage (currently £8.91 per hour) and the allowances scheme notes that the DCA is a contribution to the cost of caring for dependants while on approved duties rather than designed to cover all actual costs. Furthermore, since the November 2016 Review the cap of being able to claim no more than for 7.5 hours per week of care for any dependants was raised to 15 hours per week. **The IRP is not making any recommendations to change the terms and conditions and maximum rates for which the DCA may be claimed.**

Travel and Subsistence Allowances - Within the Borough

139. Currently the Basic Allowance is deemed to include all travel and subsistence expenses incurred by Members while carrying out council related duties within the Borough. The additional travel and subsistence expenses incurred by Members for undertaking in-Borough approved duties are so marginal that there is no justification to pay it, particularly considering the cost in Officer time that

would be incurred in administering claims-based in-Borough travel and subsistence allowances.

140. There was some (albeit minor) representation that argued all travel and subsistence related expenses incurred while carrying out council related duties should be reimbursed whether they are within or outwith the Borough. However, it is pointed out that most of the duties which were quoted for which in-Borough travel and subsistence allowances should be paid, such as undertaking ward duties or informal meetings, would not meet the standard definition of approved duties. Moreover, it is common practice across the other GM Councils to include all within authority travel and subsistence expenses in the Basic Allowance. The current Covid-19 pandemic also means that Members are not travelling to and from meetings to the same extent as they were so the logic of an in-Borough travel and subsistence allowance is further weakened.
141. **The IRP recommends that the Basic Allowance continues to be deemed inclusive of all in-Borough travel and subsistence costs.**

Travel and Subsistence Allowances - Outwith the Borough

142. It is a different context when a Member has to travel outwith the Borough to represent the Council at regional and national meetings or attend conferences. In these cases Members are incurring expenses that are beyond 'incidental' and are not typically incurred through a Member's routine work.
143. Currently Members can claim out of Borough Subsistence Allowances that are based on the same rates that are applicable to Officers. The travel allowance is either reimbursement of public transport costs (under same conditions that apply to Officers) or where a Member uses their own vehicle to attend an out of Borough approved duties then HMRC approved mileage rates are applicable.
144. **The IRP received no evidence to change the current approved duties and conditions for which the Travel and Subsistence Allowances may be claimed outwith the Borough and recommends that they continue with one minor amendment, namely the regarding mileage rates.**
145. Although a Member claiming mileage for out of Borough approved duties while driving a hybrid or electric vehicle was not raised with the IRP the IRP decided to address the issue, if nothing else to future proof the scheme.
146. The Office of Low Emission Vehicles advises that where mileage claims are being made for the driving of hybrid and electric vehicles then the normal HMRC

approve mileage rate is applicable, currently 45p per mile for first 10,000 miles 25p per mile after 10,000 miles.

147. **The IRP recommends that the current mileage rates are clarified to include provision that if a Member is claiming out of Borough mileage by driving a hybrid or electric vehicle that the applicable mileage rates continues to be HMRC approved rates.**

Issues arising I - linking remuneration to performance

148. The IRP received representation expressing some disquiet that the flat rate Basic Allowance is paid to all Members regardless of their workloads. While by no means pervasive, there was a sense of inequity arising from a perception that while the vast majority of Members work hard for their Basic Allowance, some Members demonstrated few signs of carrying out the duties for which they are paid. In particular, it was felt inequitable that where a Member took an extended leave of absence from the country they still received the same Basic Allowance.
149. The simple fact is that the IRP is unable to vary the Basic Allowance to differentiate between the work loads of Members. Under the 2003 Regulations a Member by virtue of being elected is entitled to the full Basic Allowance. Apart from resigning the only way not to pay the Basic Allowance is for a Member to be in breach of the 'six month' rule. If a Member does not attend an approved duty at least once every six months then they cease to be a Councillor and therefore no longer paid as such. This light touch had more logic 40 years ago when Members' work was more meetings centred, in a context where they had fewer meetings to attend, particularly community and stakeholder meetings. Moreover, as the principal remuneration was through an attendance allowance it meant if a Member did not attend their scheduled meetings they did not get paid. The 2003 Regulations specifically prohibit the payment of an attendance allowance.
150. Even if the IRP could find flexibility within the legislation the practical issues remain problematic. The most obvious metric by which to gauge workload is attendance at meetings which in theory can be recognised through an SRA. While attending meetings is not the sole focus of a Members' work it is an important one that can be measured. If a Member is not attending the majority of their scheduled meetings and training events they are not representing the interests of their constituents and the Council in general to the best of their ability.
151. Yet some Members might not attend all their scheduled meetings, or have fewer scheduled meetings than most Members, as they feel their efforts are best

focused in their ward or representing their constituents to the Council. Furthermore, a variation of remuneration that is linked to the percentage of meetings attended does not take into account the number of committees a particular Member is scheduled to attend each year. A handful of Members only have a dozen or so scheduled meetings per year to attend while others may have over 3 dozen; it is easier for former to have a 100% attendance record than the latter even though the latter may actually attend many more meetings.

152. Moreover, while in the past there were a couple of Members who were conspicuous by their absence from the Council Chambers there is little evidence suggesting it will be a long term issue and may well be resolved through the final arbiter regarding Member performance, namely the ballot box.
153. **The IRP is not making any recommendations regarding linking Member remuneration to performance.**

Issues arising II – Provision of Mobile Phones and data/call packages

154. The IRP was made aware that currently the Council provides mobile phones to all Members, replaced every four years. On top of this each Member through the corporate contract provider receives data/call support that costs £35 per month, which may be topped up if exceeded (subject to reasonable use).
155. The direct provision of mobile phones and the accompanying level of call/data may have had a greater validity in the past when mobile phone ownership was less widespread. This is no longer the case; mobile phone ownership is now more or less universal. It is an expensive way to provide support to Members for an item which they have in any case. There is the issue of having a separate mobile phone to take council-related calls but with dual SIM mobile phones increasingly available this is less of an issue these days. Moreover, mobile phone or SIM only monthly plans that provide next to unlimited calls and high levels of data can be obtained now for £20 per month.
156. **The IRP recommends that from the 2022 elections that Members are no longer provided with mobile phones and the £35 per month worth of calls and data. In its stead, Members should be able to claim £20 per month Mobile Phone Allowance to support Members on their own mobile phones for any Council related calls and data usage they may incur.**

Indexation

157. There was overwhelming support in the representation received that the allowances continue to be indexed. Typically uplifting the allowances by an

annual cost of living index means that they do not lose relative value so fast which in turn requires substantial periodic uplifts just to maintain their relative value. Moreover, the indexation of allowances is in place in almost all of the other GM Councils.

158. The IRP recommends that the following indices are applied to the allowances paid to Members of Rochdale Borough Council:

- **Basic Allowance and SRAs (including those paid in accordance with the GMCA 2011 Order):**
 - Indexed to the annual percentage salary increase for local government staff (at spinal column 49) as agreed each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services and applicable to the same year it applies to Officers but with an implementation date from the start of the municipal rather than financial year.
- **Mileage Allowance (Outwith only):**
 - Members' mileage allowances rates indexed to HMRC Approved Mileage Allowance Payment rates.
- **Subsistence Allowances (Outwith only):**
 - Subsistence allowances should continue to be indexed to the same rates that are applicable to Officers.
- **The Dependants' Carers' Allowance:**
 - Maximum hourly rate claimable indexed to the National Living Wage.

159. The IRP also recommends that indexation should run for four years (2021-2025), which is the maximum length of time permitted by the 2003 Regulations. For authority for indexation to be extended beyond the fourth anniversary of the establishment of the new scheme of allowances the Council is required to first seek advice from the IRP.

Implementation

160. The IRP recommends that the new scheme of allowances based on the recommendations contained in this report is adopted from the date of the Council's Annual Meeting on 19th May 2021.

161. **The only exception to this recommended implementation date is regarding the recommendation to discontinue the provision of mobile phones plus £35 per month call/data package to be replaced by a Mobile Telephone Allowance of £20 per month. This recommendation should be implemented from the date of the Council's Annual Meeting in May 2022.**

APPENDIX ONE - Information reviewed by the IRP

1. IRP Terms of Reference
2. Rochdale Council Members' Allowances Scheme 2020/21 including full schedule of SRAs payable and methodologies for determining allowances
3. A Review of Members' Allowances for Rochdale Borough Council, A Report by the Independent Remuneration Panel, November 2016
4. Council minutes that considered and made decision on November 2016 IRP Report, 14th December 2016
5. Rochdale Borough Council, A Guide to the Council's Decision-Making Structure, including a flow diagram of council committees, etc.
6. Terms of Reference for Committees
7. Calendar of Council Meetings 2020/21, including membership of Cabinet and Committees including Chairs and Vice-Chairs
8. Paper on recent governance changes, Changes to Portfolio Holders and Assistants to Portfolio Holders, 16th December 2020
9. Copy of aide memoir sent to all Councillors, including replies
10. New Council Constitutions: (Statutory) Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances, May 2006
11. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, SI 2003/1021
12. Local Government Association, summary of hours worked (mean per week/by type of Council/by positions held) by Councillors (Census of Councillors 2018)
13. NJC for Local Government Services, Pay increase 2020/21, 24th August 202
14. Benchmarking - summary of allowances paid across the GM Councils 2020/21 or the latest data available
15. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority Order 2011, Schedule 1, SI2011/908
16. Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), Table 8.5a., average hourly earnings (gross) for all full time employees resident in the Borough of Rochdale, provisional results, November 2020
17. Office for Low Emission Vehicles, Ultra Low Emission Vehicles Tax Benefits 2018

18. NHS Improvement, Structure to align remuneration for chairs and non-executive directors of NHS Trusts and NHS foundation trusts, Implementation document, November 2019
19. Peter Thompson, Report to Council, Cabinet Portfolios and Responsibilities, 19th May 2021
20. Monitoring Officer, Report to Council, New post Special Responsibility Allowances, 19th May 2021
21. Rochdale Borough Council, Employment and Equalities Committee, Terms of Reference

APPENDIX TWO - Member Interviewees**Members who met the IRP (24th - 25th March 2021)**

1. Cllr S. Ahmed: Chair Planning & Licensing Committee (Labour)
2. Cllr D. Ali: Deputy Leader (Labour) & Portfolio Holder for Healthy Lives
3. Cllr A. Brett: Former Leader of Council, Chair of the Cabinet & Labour Group Leader
4. Cllr P. Dale: Assistant to Portfolio Holder for Healthy Lives (Labour)
5. Cllr A. Dearnley: Leader Main (Conservative) Opposition Group
6. Cllr R. Dutton: Chair Health, Schools and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Labour)
7. Cllr K. Heakin: Former Portfolio Holder for Getting a Good Start (Labour)
8. Cllr M. Holly: Chair of Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee & Shadow Portfolio Holder for Corporate Delivery (Conservative)
9. Cllr A. Kelly: Leader Minority (Liberal Democrats) Opposition Group
10. Cllr P. Malcolm: Chair Audit & Governance Committee (Labour)
11. Cllr S. O'Neil: Chair Rochdale North Township Committee & Vice Chair Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Labour)
12. Cllr P. Rush: Chair Heywood Township Committee (Labour)
13. Cllr P. Sullivan: Vice-Chair Health, Schools and Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Shadow Portfolio Holder for Getting a Good Start (Conservative)

APPENDIX THREE - Officer Briefings

Michael Garraway:	Committee Manager
Asif Ibrahim:	Assistant Director (Legal, Governance & Workforce/Monitoring Officer)
Steve Rumbelow:	Chief Executive
Peter Thompson:	Committee & Constitutional Services Officer

APPENDIX FOUR – Benchmarking Allowances Paid on the GM Councils

BM1 Rochdale BM Group - Other GM Mets: BA + Exec + Scrutiny SRAs (20/21 unless indicated)										
Comparator Council	Basic Allowance	Leader or Elected Mayor	Leader Total	Deputy Leader	Executive Members	Assistant or Deputy Execs	Chair Main O&S	Chairs/Lead Scrutiny	V/Chairs Scrutiny	Chairs Scrutiny Panels/WGs
Bolton (19/20)	£11,644	£31,294	£42,938	£18,775	£7,140			£5,100		
Bury	£8,708	£27,303	£36,011	£16,387	£10,923	£1,433	£6,829			
Manchester	£16,635	£41,543	£58,178	£17,472	£17,472	£6,990		£10,494		
Oldham	£9,976	£29,929	£39,905	£20,951	£17,958	£7,482		£8,978		
Salford (19/20)	£11,043	£54,654	£65,697	£22,253	£14,253	£10,689		£8,910		
Stockport (19/20)	£10,430	£31,290	£41,720	£17,210	£15,645			£6,258		£1,252
Tameside (19/20)	£12,567	£38,907	£51,474	£25,368	£21,701	£9,018		£10,345	£3,449	
Trafford(19/20)	£6,754	£27,017	£33,771	£18,910	£13,508	£6,753	£8,104	£8,104	£4,052	
Wigan	£13,150	£39,450	£52,600	£25,644	£17,776	£5,280		£7,901		
Rochdale	£11,172	£33,516	£44,688	£16,758	£15,082	£3,016	£8,379	£8,379		
Mean	£11,208	£35,490	£46,698	£19,973	£15,146	£6,333	£7,771	£8,274		
Median	£11,108	£32,405	£43,813	£18,843	£15,364	£6,872	£8,104	£8,379		
Highest	£16,635	£54,654	£65,697	£25,644	£21,701	£10,689	£8,379	£10,494		
Lowest	£6,754	£27,017	£33,771	£16,387	£7,140	£1,433	£6,829	£5,100		
Mean Ratios	Leader = 3.17 X BA	100%		56%	43%	42%	22%	23%		

BM2 Rochdale BM Group - Other GM Mets: Regulatory SRAs (20/21 unless indicated)									
Comparator Council	Chair of Planning	V/Chair of Planning	Chair of Licensing	V/Chair Licensing	Chairs Liquor Licensing Panels/Subs	Chair of Audit &/or Governance	V/Chair Audit	Chair Standards	V/Chair Standards
Bolton (19/20)	£8,177	£2,813	£7,740	£2,521					
Bury	£6,829		£6,829			£6,829			
Manchester	£10,494	£3,500	£10,494	£3,500					
Oldham	£8,978		Inc in Planning			£6,396			
Salford (19/20)	£8,910		£8,910			£8,910			
Stockport (19/20)	£7,823		£4,694		£3,755	£3,755			
Tameside (19/20)	£10,345	£3,449	£6,692	£2,492	£6,692	£10,345	£3,449	£6,692	£2,492
Trafford (19/20)	£10,807	£4,052	£10,807	£4,052	£3,377	£8,104	£4,052	£2,387	
Wigan	£11,849	£3,084	£14,633	£3,658		£7,901			
Rochdale	£11,172		<i>Inc in Planning</i>			£6,703			
Mean	£9,538	£3,380	£8,850	£3,245	£4,608	£7,368			
Median	£9,662	£3,449	£8,325	£3,500	£3,755	£7,365			
Highest	£11,849	£4,052	£14,633	£4,052	£6,692	£10,345			
Lowest	£6,829	£2,813	£4,694	£2,492	£3,377	£3,755			
Mean Ratios	27%		25%		13%	21%			

BM3 Rochdale BM Group - Other GM Mets: Opposition & Other & GMCA SRAs (20/21 unless indicated)								
Comparator Council	Main Opposition Leader	Main Opposition Deputy Leader	Opposition Lead or Shadow Exec	Other Opposition Group Leaders	Area Chairs	GMCA Leader's SRA	GMCA SRA - Other	Other SRAs/Comments
Bolton (19/20)	£10,555	£6,333	£2,940					Chair Bolton Cares Steering Committee £8,085, Chair Bolton at Home £5,500
Bury	£9,013	£3,602		£4,508				Dep Leader Minority Opposition Group £1,622, Mbrs Licensing Hearing Panels £25 p/day/£12.50 2-4 hours/£6 up to 2 hours
Manchester	£17,472	£6,990						Opposition Lead Mbr Finance £1,750, Mbr Adoption Panel £5,630, Mbr Fostering Panel + City Centre Spokesperson £6,990, Airport Group Brd Mbr £10,494, Mbrs Licensing Appeals £526
Oldham	£14,965	£5,986	£2,993		£7,182 - £5,387	£5,985		Chairs Health & Wellbeing + Miocare + Unity Partnership £8,978,
Salford (19/20)	£8,910			£8,910				
Stockport (19/20)	£9,387			£1,051 + £315 p/Mbr	£4,694			
Tameside (19/20)	£12,168			£2,492	£10,345			Chair Council Business £12,701, Dep Chairs Liquor Licensing Panels £2,492, Dep Area Chairs £3,449, Cllr Member of Standards £1,636
Trafford (19/20)	£13,508	£2,700	£2,700	£2,700		£9,979		Opposition Spokespersons (Planning + Licensing) £2,387, Shadow Deputy Executives £1,349
Wigan	£5,328					£10,367	Chair GMTC £5.139	
Rochdale	£11,731				£8,379	£5,879	£4,182 GMTC Mbrs	
Mean	£11,304	£5,122	£2,878	£4,653	£7,806	£8,053		
Median	£11,143	£5,986	£2,940	£3,604	£8,379	£7,982		
Highest	£17,472	£6,990	£2,993	£8,910	£10,345	£10,367		
Lowest	£5,328	£2,700	£2,700	£2,492	£4,694	£5,879		
Mean Ratios	31.9%		8.1%	13.1%	22.0%			