

Extract from the draft minutes of the Cabinet meeting on 23 November 2020

522. Officer Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22

The Assistant Director, Corporate and Improvement Services submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, stressed the importance of the Officer Pay Policy Statement in terms of transparency. He drew particular attention to the pay multiplier, which demonstrated that pay to senior staff was either in line or slightly below that of peer organisations. In view of the size of the borough and the scale of the challenges faced this demonstrated good value for money. The gender pay gap was in favour of women. The Council's commitment to the Living Wage for its employers and contractors made a real difference to living standards.

Concern was expressed about the impact of the £95,000 cap on public sector exit payments which would effectively penalise long serving staff on mid-range salaries.

Councillor Cory, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Councillor Higgins, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services and Councillor Fox, Portfolio Holder for Housing, supported the Officer Pay Policy Statement and noted in particular the gender pay gap, and reiterated the concerns around the exit gap.

Cabinet expressed its thanks to all officers for their hard work throughout the year dealing with the challenges of the Covid 19 pandemic.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL that the Officer Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 be approved and adopted.

REASONS

The Localism Act requires “authorities to prepare, approve and publish pay policy statements articulating their policies towards a range of issues relating to the pay of its workforce, which must be approved by full Council annually. An authority's pay policy statement must be approved by a resolution of that authority before it comes into force”.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The only alternative would be to not recommend the approval of the Pay Policy Statement, but that would be contrary to the requirements of the Localism Act.