

# Public Document Pack



Contact Officer:  
Maureen Potter on 01352 702322  
maureen.potter@flintshire.gov.uk

To: All Members of the Council

13 November 2019

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend a meeting of Flintshire County Council which will be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 19th November, 2019 in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Mold CH7 6NA to consider the following items.

This agenda is subject to restrictions on content due to the Election Period which runs from 7th November to 13th December.

## **A G E N D A**

### **1 PRESENTATION**

**Purpose:** APSE Apprentice of the Year Awards Recognition.

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**Purpose:** To receive any apologies.

### **3 MINUTES (Pages 5 - 14)**

**Purpose:** To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2019.

### **4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**Purpose:** To receive any Declarations and advise Members accordingly.

### **5 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

**Purpose:** To receive the communications as circulated.

### **6 PETITIONS**

**Purpose:** This is an opportunity for Members of Council to submit petitions on behalf of people in their ward. Once received, petitions are passed to the appropriate Chief Officer for action and response.

**7 TRIBUTES TO THE LATE COUNCILLOR NIGEL STEELE-MORTIMER**

**Purpose:** To enable Members to pay tribute to the late Councillor Nigel Steele-Mortimer.

**8 WELCOME TO COUNCILLOR KEVIN RUSH**

**Purpose:** Welcome to Councillor Kevin Rush, elected as Member for Bagillt West on 24 October 2019.

**PRINCIPAL ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

**9 FLINTSHIRE ELECTORAL REVIEW (Pages 15 - 40)**

Report of Chief Executive, Chief Officer (Governance)

**Purpose:** To respond to the draft proposals from the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales.

**10 UPDATED PAY POLICY STATEMENT FOR 2019/20 (Pages 41 - 82)**

Report of Chief Executive, Senior Manager Human Resources & Organisational Development

**Purpose:** All local authorities are required to publish their Pay Policy Statement by April annually. The Pay Policy Statement presented within this report is the seventh annual Statement published by Flintshire County Council.

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

**11 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**Purpose:** This item is to receive any Public Questions: none were received by the deadline.

**12 QUESTIONS**

**Purpose:** To note the answers to any questions submitted in accordance with County Council Standing Order No. 9.4(A): none were received by the deadline.

13 **NOTICE OF MOTION**

**Purpose:** This item is to receive any Notice of Motion: none which were eligible and able to be considered during the pre-election period were received.

Yours sincerely



Robert Robins  
Democratic Services Manager

**WEBCASTING NOTICE**

This meeting will be filmed for live broadcast on the Council's website. The whole of the meeting will be filmed, except where there are confidential or exempt items.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, by entering the Chamber you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and / or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact a member of the Democratic Services Team on 01352 702345.

This page is intentionally left blank

**FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**22 OCTOBER 2019**

Minutes of the meeting of Flintshire County Council held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Mold on Tuesday, 22 October 2019

**PRESENT: Councillor Marion Bateman (Chair)**

Councillors: Bernie Attridge, Mike Allport, Janet Axworthy, Glyn Banks, Haydn Bateman, Sean Bibby, Chris Bithell, Helen Brown, Derek Butler, Clive Carver, Geoff Collett, David Cox, Paul Cunningham, Jean Davies, Rob Davies, Ron Davies, Adele Davies-Cooke, Chris Dolphin, Rosetta Dolphin, Ian Dunbar, Andy Dunbobbin, Carol Ellis, Veronica Gay, George Hardcastle, Patrick Heesom, Dave Hughes, Kevin Hughes, Ray Hughes, Dennis Hutchinson, Joe Johnson, Paul Johnson, Rita Johnson, Christine Jones, Richard Jones, Tudor Jones, Colin Legg, Brian Lloyd, Richard Lloyd, Dave Mackie, Billy Mullin, Hilary McGuill, Ted Palmer, Mike Peers, Michelle Perfect, Vicky Perfect, Neville Phillips, Ian Roberts, Aaron Shotton, Paul Shotton, Ralph Small, Ian Smith, Carolyn Thomas, Owen Thomas, Martin White, Andy Williams, David Wisinger and Arnold Woolley

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillors: Sian Braun, Bob Connah, Mared Eastwood, David Evans, David Healey, Gladys Healey, Cindy Hinds, Andrew Holgate, Mike Lowe, Tony Sharps, Ralph Small and David Williams

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Chief Executive; Chief Officer (Governance); Chief Officer (Planning, Environment and Economy); Chief Officer (Streetscene & Transportation); Chief Officer (Housing & Assets); Chief Officer (Social Services); Chief Officer (Education & Youth); Corporate Finance Manager; Internal Audit Manager; Corporate Business & Communications Executive Officer; Principal Accountant (People & Resources); Democratic Services Manager; Democratic Services Team Leader; and Democratic Services Officer

**46. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting on 11 September 2019 were received.

As requested by Councillor Peers, two amendments were agreed on Minute number 39: Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales Local Review. On the third paragraph, the Chief Executive's comments that the 'Commission had limited flexibility' should reflect that this was to adhere to the laws and Terms of Reference. The penultimate paragraph to clarify that the county average ratio of 1,836 electors per member applied to 2018 and that the average ratio for 2023 was recorded as 1,915 in the latest draft document.

The minutes would also record that Councillors Richard Lloyd and Joe Johnson were present at the meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

That subject to the amendments, the minutes be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**48. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

In presenting her Communications, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, the Chair highlighted a number of school visits, recognition of entrepreneurs at the Flintshire in Business Awards and a visit to Coleg Cambria. She thanked the Vice-Chair for his support and various Members who had arranged events, including Councillor Tony Sharps who was not present. Tribute was also paid to the contributions of Councillor Andrew Holgate who was due to resign at the end of the month.

Councillor Ian Roberts expressed his gratitude to all those involved in assisting residents at Bolingbroke Heights in Flint following the recent flooding incident. He paid particular tribute to the Fire Service for their prompt response, and officers from across the Council who had maintained a presence on site to ensure that all residents were safe and supported. He also thanked the Chief Officers for Housing & Assets and Social Services and local Members for their assistance at the scene.

The Chair expressed her own appreciation for the remarkable efforts of the Fire Service and Council officers, as did Councillor Jean Davies.

Councillor Richard Jones' suggestion that the Council formally write to thank the Fire Service was supported by the Chair. The Chief Executive responded to a query on the financial implications and conveyed his own thanks to those who had assisted. To give reassurances on the response and findings from the incident, he suggested that a report be scheduled for a future Overview & Scrutiny meeting.

**49. PETITIONS**

None were received.

**50. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2018/19**

The Chief Executive introduced the report to endorse the 2018/19 Annual Performance Report to achieve publication by the deadline. This was a statutory report providing a retrospective overview of performance against priorities in the 2018/19 Council Plan and assessment of the Council's objectives in accordance with the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015.

The Corporate Business & Communications Executive Officer gave a presentation covering the following:

- Format and content
- Performance Overview 2018/19
- Progress Overview
- Highlights
- Areas for Improvement
- Well-being of Future Generations
- Performance Overview
- Summary Overview
- Next Steps

Amongst the range of achievements under each theme were the Council house building programme, national recognition of the Progress for Providers project, high waste recycling rates and achievement of planned efficiencies. Areas identified for improvement were being incorporated into the Council Plan for 2019/20 including reducing the number of days to complete Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) on which progress was already being made.

The Chief Executive said that the slight dip in performance against national rankings would continue to be monitored and that strong endorsement by the three statutory regulatory bodies since the timing of the report should provide assurance. He spoke about future legislative changes which provided for more flexibility in performance reporting and reminded Members that recurring issues of specific interest in the Council Plan should be submitted on to Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes.

On achievements in Holywell, Councillor Palmer spoke about positive joint working with businesses on the re-opening of the High Street and the success of Holywell Leisure Centre on which he thanked Councillor Tudor Jones.

The Chief Officer (Planning, Environment and Economy) agreed to provide a separate response to Councillor Carver's question on the number of landlords/letting agents not complying with Rent Smart Wales regulations. He agreed to speak with him outside the meeting regarding concerns about a House of Multiple Occupation and said that the main priority of the Environmental Health team was enforcing housing and planning conditions legislation to ensure adequate living conditions.

In response to a question from Councillor Ellis, it was explained that the areas for improvement related to performance and that high-risk areas would continue to be monitored. Some risk may remain on residential care provision after completion of work on Marleyfield House, depending on demand levels. Delayed transfer of care was a continued risk and was unlikely to improve to Green.

Councillor Richard Jones asked whether the risk status on debt levels due to Universal Credit should be lowered in view of the commentary. The Chief Officer (Housing & Assets) advised that this should remain a Red risk to allow time for mitigation measures to take effect and that it be kept under review. On infrastructure investment, the Chief Officer (Streetscene & Transportation) explained that the initial scope of the Deeside Plan had been widened to become the Flintshire Integrated

Transport Strategy linking all modes of transport across the County. A report would be submitted to the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee in December.

In praising the report, Councillor Tudor Jones paid tribute to the Council's approach in tackling homelessness and asked about involvement by local Members. The Chief Officer (Housing & Assets) spoke about the work of the dedicated Outreach Worker who was engaging with homeless people across Flintshire. He said it should be acknowledged that it was the choice of individuals whether to accept that support and that efforts to engage would continue. Members were encouraged to download the 'Streetlink' app to their mobile phones to help identify individuals who were sleeping rough and assist in targeting resources accordingly. The Chair asked that details of the app be shared with Town and Community Councils.

Councillor Paul Johnson said that areas for improvement were inevitable and he paid tribute to the quality of the workforce for their contributions on performance.

In welcoming the report, Councillor Peers said that the risk on affordable housing supply should incorporate private sector provision through the planning process. He asked that the charts showing performance against Public Accountability Measures be accompanied by the data (shown later in the report). The Chief Executive said that a hyperlink would be inserted in the published document. In response to further questions, the risk to Council Tax collection rates would remain a pressure particularly due to changes to legal powers. On the replacement street lighting programme, the Chief Officer (Streetscene & Transportation) advised that currently the vast majority had been replaced with LED lights, achieving significant savings on energy costs and repairs. A report on the new policy would be shared with the Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Carolyn Thomas commended the Council and officers for the achievements despite ongoing funding cuts and efficiencies, and she highlighted the improvements carried out on highways with funding from Welsh Government.

In moving the recommendation in the report, Councillor Ian Roberts said that some of the areas identified for improvement were challenging due to external factors. He commended the aim to further improve recycling rates on which Flintshire was already a high performer and took the opportunity to thank members of the public who had participated in the recent survey. He said that in acknowledging the need to improve performance on DFGs, the revised policy had been agreed by Cabinet earlier in the day. He thanked the officer and her team for the report and endorsed the comments made on the contributions of employees.

Councillor Mullin seconded the proposal. On being put to the vote, this was carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the 2018/19 Annual Performance Report be approved, as recommended by Cabinet, with the inclusion of a hyperlink on the performance data summary.



## **51. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2018/19**

The Corporate Finance Manager presented the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2018/19 which, following consideration by the Audit Committee and Cabinet, had raised no specific issues. He drew attention to the key points of the report which confirmed that the Treasury Management function had operated within the limits detailed in the Strategy for the period. The Mid-Year Report for 2018/19 was also presented, having been recommended by Cabinet for approval.

Councillor Richard Jones asked whether the amount of income derived from investments could be considered as a third reason for investment (set out in section 2.02) which could make a difference during times of austerity.

In response, the Chief Executive said that the wording could clarify that the aim was to generate income from surplus funds provided that the two main principles were met.

The Corporate Finance Manager and Chief Officer (Governance) referred to the Welsh Government investment guidance which gave priority to security and liquidity, followed by yield.

Following comments by Councillor Peers, the Corporate Finance Manager said that the Treasury Management Strategy detailed the range of considerations behind investments, noting that pension fund investments were separate to those of the Council. In local government, the approach to borrowing meant that outstanding debt was necessary to pay for investments and assets over time. The repayment of debt over the longer term was funded through the Minimum Revenue Provision which included the Council Fund and Housing Revenue Account. As a point of accuracy, it was clarified that the two loans detailed in section 3.03 of the Annual Report were taken out on 6 December 2018.

In response to other questions, the Principal Accountant explained that the loan for NEW Homes, the Council's wholly owned subsidiary, was taken out over a 45 year period with a small margin added to the repayment rate over and above the amount borrowed.

Councillor Mackie queried the difference between figures on borrowing activity and was advised that the table in the annual report included other items such as the short-term debt portfolio.

In moving the recommendations, Councillor Banks said that the report demonstrated the challenging period and market conditions. He thanked the Corporate Finance Manager and his team and paid tribute to the contributions of the Treasury Management advisors and the Audit Committee during the process.

As Chair of the Audit Committee, Councillor Chris Dolphin seconded the proposal. On being put to the vote, it was carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Annual Treasury Management Report 2018/19 and Treasury Management Mid-Year Report 2018/19 be approved.

**52. AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT**

The Internal Audit Manager presented the Audit Committee Annual Report 2018/19 which, in accordance with best practice, demonstrated to the Council its accountability and effectiveness on its Terms of Reference. The report had been endorsed by the Audit Committee in September.

Councillor Peers asked that the section on attendance more clearly reflect that he had attended as a substitute and was not required to be present at the other meetings. He also suggested that section 5.4 note the practice for the Audit Committee to vote to allow substitutions at meetings. The Internal Audit Manager agreed to make the changes.

As Chairman of the Audit Committee, Councillor Chris Dolphin moved the recommendation and thanked the Internal Audit Manager and her team.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Audit Committee Annual Report 2018/19 be approved.

**53. REVIEW OF THE FLINTSHIRE STANDARD**

The Chief Officer (Governance) presented a report on the outcome of a review of the Flintshire Standard within the Local Resolution Protocol which set out expected standards of behaviour from Members in dealing with each other and officers. Following consultation, the changes proposed by Group Leaders and officers had been supported by the Standards Committee together with a further amendment on the timing of the complaints process.

In October 2019, the Constitution and Democratic Services Committee had endorsed all the revisions and recommended that the standards of behaviour also apply to Member when using social media in their official capacity and that the Local Resolution Procedure make provision for non-aligned (ungrouped) Members.

Councillor Richard Jones said that the standards of behaviour appeared to be over-prescriptive as mutual respect should be part of general behaviour.

During discussion, Councillors Roberts and Bithell both spoke in support of the Flintshire Standard. The Chief Officer provided explanation on the rationale behind some of the wording in the Standard which, whilst not restricting political expression, would ensure that officers were specifically excluded from the scope of political comments.

The Chief Executive thanked Group Leaders for their work on the Standard during the consultation.

The Chief Officer noted Councillor Dunbobbin's suggestion that Town and Community Councils should be encouraged to adopt the Flintshire Standard.

As Chairman of the Constitution & Democratic Services Committee, Councillor Palmer moved the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Roberts. On being put to the vote, it was supported.

**RESOLVED:**

That the amended Flintshire Standard be adopted.

**54. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR COUNCILLORS**

The Chief Officer (Governance) presented a report to seek agreement to a change in the Code of Conduct for Councillors in respect of gifts and hospitality. The matter had arisen from a number of best practice recommendations published by the Committee on Standards in Public Life in considering the impact of changes made to the ethical regime in England. Whilst these were not mandatory in Wales, the Standards Committee had proposed that the Council voluntarily adopt the recommendation to require that Members declare not only gifts/hospitality above a certain individual value but also those above an aggregate value. For Flintshire, it was recommended that the current practice of registering gifts worth over £10 be extended to include gifts of £100 or more received from the same donor over a 12 month period. This change had been endorsed by the Constitution & Democratic Services Committee.

Councillor Bithell said that standards expected of local government should also apply elsewhere. The Chief Officer said that the report demonstrated the Council's approach in noting examples of good practice outside Wales.

Councillor Rosetta Dolphin questioned whether it was time for an increase in the Council's current threshold for registering individual gifts valued at £10 and over. The Chief Officer agreed to make enquiries on the limit imposed by other councils.

Councillor Palmer moved the recommendation in the report which was seconded by Councillor Peers. On being put to the vote, this was carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the suggested amendment requiring gifts with a total value of £100 or more in any 12 month period to be declared is added to the Code of Conduct for Councillors.

**55. NOTICE OF MOTION**

Two Notices of Motion were received:

(i) Raising Awareness of Violence against Women and Domestic Abuse - Councillor Andy Dunbobbin

'Members may recall that the Welsh Government has developed an e-learning package, to raise awareness of violence against women and domestic abuse. All staff are undertaking this e-learning, which we applaud.

The package had been adapted to be available to Members. It would show our support for this worthy initiative if all Members were to do this training, which only takes about 40 minutes.

Can we all commit to giving 40 minutes to acquiring learning which may help all of us to deal more effectively with such issues which we may encounter in our wards?'

The Chair suggested that a video on domestic abuse, previously shown at an Overview & Scrutiny Committee, be shared with all Members.

The Motion was seconded by Councillor White who, as an ambassador for the White Ribbon campaign, spoke in support of highlighting this important issue. He shared a colleague's suggestion that Members could undertake the training at the same time whilst accommodating the Chair's suggestion.

As Vice-Chair of the Domestic Abuse Safety Unit for Deeside, Councillor Bithell commended the Council's work in supporting the White Ribbon campaign. He said that Members would be given instructions on accessing the e-learning package and he spoke in favour of the suggestion made by Councillor White.

In welcoming this, Councillor Brown suggested that the training session link to the Domestic Abuse Safety Unit (DACU) Freedom Programme.

The Chief Executive said that all the suggestions would be incorporated to provide Member training sessions.

Following a comment by Councillor Butler, it was noted that the training would be relevant to male as well as female victims of violence and domestic abuse.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried.

(ii) First Aid Training in Schools - Councillor Kevin Hughes

'This Council calls upon Welsh Government (WG) to make First Aid, including CPR and defibrillator training, compulsory as part of the new curriculum. Further, schools are provided with the required funding to ensure the training can be delivered.'

In providing background information, Councillor Hughes explained that First Aid training was to become compulsory in all schools in England from September 2020 following Lord Kerslake's inquiry into the Manchester Arena bombing. Whilst primary schools in England would provide basic training, secondary learners would

receive life-saving skills including the use of a defibrillator. In Scotland, a similar commitment had been made to teach life-saving skills in schools. This aligned to the aim of the Red Cross and other charities which had been campaigning for First Aid training to be included in the curriculum across all schools.

Speaking in support of his Motion, Councillor Hughes paid tribute to the performance of Education Services in Flintshire despite the significant pressures. Whilst First Aid training was already provided in some schools, it was not compulsory in all schools and would only require a half or full day each year. Providing pupils with these important skills would not only benefit those individuals but also increase the number of people able to use the defibrillators installed across the County.

Councillor Peers supported the intention of the Motion but said it was important to allow pupils the choice of whether they wished to participate in the training. This view was shared by Councillor Ellis.

Councillor Richard Jones proposed an amendment that the Motion refer to promoting life skills such as coping with stress and financial issues, in alignment with the aim of the Welsh Youth Parliament.

Councillor Brown spoke about the work of the Oliver King Foundation on defibrillator installation and training in schools across Merseyside and in Penarlag.

As Leader and Cabinet Member for Education & Youth, Councillor Roberts thanked Councillor Hughes for his Notice of Motion and said that curriculum design for the 'Health and Well-being area of learning and experience' in the Curriculum for Wales 2022 should be flexible to respond to a diverse range of changing needs by placing the voice of the learner at the centre of planning. He said there was a large range of topics for schools to consider in developing such a curriculum including First Aid and life-saving skills.

Councillor Roberts said that the Council was working to encourage schools to register their defibrillators with the Ambulance Service and to participate in a range of initiatives including the St John's Ambulance online First Aid resources and lesson plans. In acknowledging the positive work being undertaken, he urged Members to support the Motion to agree that WG be requested to make First Aid, including CPR and defibrillator training, compulsory as part of the new curriculum. He spoke about the positive impact on learners themselves and suggested that the Red Cross and St John's Ambulance could be involved. In response to the point raised by Councillor Jones, he said that some schools in Flintshire were already teaching life issues such as financial planning.

A number of Members spoke in support of the Motion including Councillor Cunningham who highlighted the work of St John's Ambulance and Councillor McGuill who seconded the Motion.

In response to the points raised by Councillors Peers and Ellis, Councillor Hughes clarified that the Motion called for the training to be made 'compulsory as part of the new curriculum' rather than compulsory for every pupil. On Councillor

Jones' proposal, he referred to the Leader's comments acknowledging that training on life skills had already been introduced in some schools.

Councillor Tudor Jones commended Councillor Hughes for his Motion which would enable flexibility for those pupils for whom the training may not be appropriate. He made the point that if implementing the changes, WG should properly fund it in recognition of the benefits to the Health Service. He went on to thank volunteers who had undertaken First Responder training.

Following his earlier comments, Councillor Peers thanked Councillor Hughes for the clarification on the wording of his Motion which he supported on that basis.

Having been moved and seconded, the Motion was put to the vote and carried.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) That the Notice of Motion from Councillor Dunbobbin on the e-learning package to raise awareness of domestic abuse be supported, together with the proposal for Member training sessions to incorporate the points raised; and
- (b) That the Notice of Motion from Councillor Hughes on First Aid in schools be supported.

**56. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

None were received.

**57. QUESTIONS**

None were received.

**58. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS ON COMMITTEE MINUTES**

None were received.

**59. MEMBERS OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE**

There was one member of the public in attendance.

(The meeting started at 2pm and ended at 4.25pm)

.....  
**Chair**



## FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	Tuesday, 19 November 2019
<b>Report Subject</b>	Flintshire Electoral Review
<b>Report Author</b>	Chief Executive & Chief Officer (Governance)

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In September, the Local Democracy & Boundary Commission for Wales (LDBC) published its draft proposals for Flintshire. The LDBC proposed changes to the arrangement of local electoral wards to make a step towards achieving electoral parity across the County.

The initial consultation process had taken place between November 2018 and January 2019. The LDBC had indicated at that time that Flintshire should have a Councillor/electorate ratio of 1:1,895: we currently have electorates of between 1,041 and 4,582. During the consultation period, we held extensive discussions with Members, including two workshops, a series of drop-in sessions and both individual and group discussions, before drafting a response.

County Council approved a response at our meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2019. Members had worked together to make proposals to the LDBC for changes which would improve local representation. It was noted that Members representing rural areas had raised concerns that the size and topography of a ward was not taken into account by LDBC in balancing the ratio requirement with the logistics of effective local representation.

As reported to Council in September, the LDBC has now proposed a council of 65 members. This would be a reduction from the current council size of 70 members and would achieve an average ratio of 1,836 electors to each member.

Building on the approach adopted at the first stage, we have had ward workshops, individual discussions, a drop in session and a workshop to ensure that Members' views were heard and could be reflected, wherever possible, in the Council's response to the LDBC.

Appendix 1 of this report outlines the proposals to be submitted to the LDBC based on the extensive consultation undertaken with Members of the Council. This offers a challenge to the LDBC: Flintshire Members have a unique

understanding of the areas which they represent and unparalleled knowledge of local needs and community ties which provide community cohesion and effective representation. Some of the proposals may not meet LDBC electoral parity requirements but they do present viable options which would have local support.

Our approach last time was to allocate proposals a red/amber/green (RAG) status. We have carried that through to the current exercise. **Greens (G)** are supported LDBC proposals or alternative proposals which have consensus amongst our local Members; **Amber (A)** show local proposals which do not have consensus support and **Red (R)** indicates that no agreement has been possible.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1	That the Council agrees to submit the proposals set out in Appendix 1 with or without variation.
---	--

## REPORT DETAILS

<b>1.00</b>	<b>EXPLAINING THE FLINTSHIRE ELECTORAL REVIEW</b>
1.01	The Local Democracy & Boundary Commission for Wales (LDBC) published its <i>Review of the Electoral Arrangements of the County of Flintshire - Draft Proposals Report</i> in September. The consultation period, during which the Council and other interested parties may respond to the proposals ends on 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2019.
1.02	Members will recall that the initial consultation process took place between November 2018 and January 2019. The Commission had indicated at that time that Flintshire should have a Councillor/electorate ratio of 1:1,895. We currently have electorates of between 1,041 and 4,582, with a county average of 1,705. This represents a variance of between -39% and +63%.
1.03	<p>We responded to the task by holding series of drop-in sessions and both individual and group discussions, before drafting a response. The County Council approved a response at our meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January.</p> <p>In our response, each electoral ward has been given a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Green – Proposals where there was agreement and it was within a variance of 25% of the proposed County average.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Amber – Proposals where there was some disagreement but was a ‘favoured’ option and within a variance of 25% of the proposed County average.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Red - Proposals where there was no agreement or the proposal was not compliant as it was not within a variation of 25% of the County average.</li> </ul> <p>Detailed maps and associated electoral information were submitted to the LDBC where any new boundaries were suggested and where any</p>



	<p>consequential changes would also be required to Town / Community wards. All of the information previously collated, which included Members' representations, was also submitted to the LDBC for them to consider in developing their draft proposals.</p>
1.04	<p>In September 2019, the LDBC published its draft proposals for Flintshire. These changes to the arrangement of our electoral wards are to achieve what the LDBC believes will be "a significant improvement" in the level of electoral parity across Flintshire. These will mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a Council of 65 members – a proposed county average ratio of 1,836 electors per member.</li> <li>• a reduction to 39 electoral wards instead of the current 57.</li> </ul>
1.05	<p>The Commission has proposed 17 single member wards, 18 two member wards and 4 three member wards. Originally it proposed that there be no changes to 14 electoral wards. Mold Broncoed was included as an unchanged ward, but it transpired that LDBC had misinterpreted the Council's proposals for Mold. They amended their proposals which produced a solution which the local Members and the Town Council were able to support.</p> <p>The 'unchanged' wards are identified below:</p> <p>Broughton North East  Broughton South  Caerwys  Cilcain  Connah's Quay Wepre  Ewloe  Flint Coleshill  Greenfield  Mostyn  Penyffordd  Sealand  Shotton West  Whitford</p>
1.06	<p>Whilst the reduction in the number of members is not the primary purpose of the review, the LDBC has proposed a reduction from 70 to 65 Members which is to be achieved by :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The disaggregation of Llanfynydd between the neighbouring Caergwrle, Leeswood and Treuddyn wards.</li> <li>• The amalgamation of the current Aston and Hawarden wards (three Members) - into a new two member ward called 'Aston and Hawarden'.</li> <li>• The reorganisation of the four Buckley wards - which are currently represented by seven Members - into two new wards 'Buckley Bistre' and 'Buckley Mountain and Pentrobin', both of which would have three Members.</li> <li>• The amalgamation of the current Ffynongroyw, Gronant and</li> </ul>

	<p>Trelawnyd &amp; Gwaenysgor wards - which between them have three Members - into a new ward called 'Llanasa &amp; Trelawnyd' which would have two Members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amalgamation of the Mancot and Queensferry wards - which currently have two and one representatives respectively - into one 'Mancot &amp; Queensferry' ward with two Members.</li> </ul>
1.07	<p>Representatives of the LDBC provided a briefing to Group Leaders and deputies and statutory officers in September. They stressed that their proposals were not binding, and could be changed if effective representations were made to them. They also explained that in the first round, there was insufficient evidence of community support for the proposals which the County Council had put forward. We have emphasised to Members throughout the ward workshops and individual meetings that any counter proposals put forward during this stage of the consultation must have evidence of community support.</p>
1.08	<p>In the workshops, we reminded the Members present that any proposals must be within the LDBC guidelines, with the emphasis on electoral parity, which LDBC regard as having greater weight than the preservation or creation of single member wards.</p>
1.09	<p>The LDBC have provided a definition of electoral parity, which for 65 members would be a ward with 1,836 electors per councillor. A 25% variance (an upper tolerance) would be between 2,295 electors per councillor and (a lower tolerance) 1,377 electors per councillor. Those are the maximum limits to which the LDBC ordinarily operates. Ideally the ratio of electors to member would be between 2,020 electors per councillor and 1,652 electors per councillor, which is a 10% variance.</p> <p>The variance in the LDBC proposals is -20% to +24%, which represents, in their terms, an improvement on the current position.</p> <p>These numbers will change if the Council or LDBC final proposals varies the total number of members from 65.</p>
1.10	<p>Building on the approach adopted at the first stage, in October we held ward workshops, individual discussions, a drop in session and a workshop to ensure that Members' views were heard and could be reflected, wherever possible, in the Council's response to the LDBC. We have again used a RAG status to offer a consistent approach. During discussions, we identified the key considerations and reiterated that strong evidence is required to address any aspects of the proposals which we seek to oppose. We also explained that issues such as rurality, topography (unless strong evidence is provided), transient populations, local issues/workloads and political implications would not be acceptable.</p> <p>We emphasised that compelling representations needed to take into account statutory requirements and commission policies, suggesting an alternative proposal or objection to the draft proposals needs strong evidence and consider the consequences of the alternative across the widest possible area.</p> <p>Throughout this exercise, we have borne in mind the following two points:</p>

	<p>‘The Commission has placed emphasis on achieving improvements in electoral parity whilst maintaining community ties wherever possible’ (Chapter 3, paragraph 10, <i>Review of the Electoral Arrangements of the County of Flintshire Draft Proposals Report</i>)</p> <p>and that ‘The Commission recognises that there may be different combinations of communities and community wards that better reflect community ties and it would welcome any alternative suggestions that comply with the legislation’ ( Chapter 13 paragraph 12 <i>Review of the Electoral Arrangements of the County of Flintshire Draft Proposals Report</i>)</p>
1.11	<p>For the majority of unchanged wards and a number of others, we received no comments and therefore these are shown as being supported in the appendix. We have produced an analysis of the LDBC proposals, showing where our current wards were being incorporated into the proposals and providing comments where appropriate. Where the LDBC had misinterpreted some of our earlier evidence, we have rectified this. For consistency, we have carried the RAG approach through to the current consultation stage. Greens are either supported LDBC proposals or alternative proposals which have consensus amongst our local Members; Amber is for local proposals which do not have consensus support and Red indicates that no agreement has been possible.</p>
1.12	<p>The Commission have proposed that three wards (in Buckley, Flint and Holywell) should have three members. The Commission have previously indicated in their presentation to Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018 that ‘in the first instance it is desirable if a single member represents each electoral ward’ .</p> <p>The LDBC indicated in the <i>Draft Proposals Report</i> page 6, paragraph 11 that :</p> <p>‘The Commission acknowledges the established practice of multi-member wards within the County of Flintshire and this is reflected in the Commission’s proposals.’</p> <p>Clearly this statement is at odds with the LDBC’s initial presentation. The Council believes that the Commission should only propose multi member wards where this is the only way to achieve electoral parity. Whilst the LDBC appears to have proposed 3 member wards as a means of achieving greater electoral parity, the Council has put forward alternative proposals that we believe could achieve similar levels of parity in some areas.</p> <p>In Flintshire, we currently have 13 x two member wards. Some have argued that this established practice is not a ‘multi-member’ approach - as that implies three or more. We are aware that 3, 4 or even 5 member wards are used in other councils, and would not seek to decry that. If a local practice has worked well it should be allowed to continue. This review, however, should not be used as an opportunity to impose an undesirable and alien approach to community representation where it has not previously existed, as in Flintshire.</p> <p>As a Council, we oppose the creation of three member wards within Flintshire because of the following, which we believe to be compelling arguments arising from our consultation with Members:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three Member wards do not feature in our representational history and ways of working: the Flintshire pattern since 1995 has been predominantly for single Member wards with some use of two member wards within our more populous urban areas. This is understood by the electorate and the current proposals would be a divergence from established local practice and what may be regarded as the ‘Flintshire average’ .</li> <li>• Members have expressed concern that three member wards could be divisive, as electors may approach all three simultaneously with the same issues, thus increasing member workload and officer workload in responding to them. Whilst that may be so, the important consideration is how the electorate perceives the change to representation. The LDBC have placed their primary emphasis on having 1 member representing 1,836 people. That can only be achieved with certainty in a single Member ward. Taking the proposals for combining the current three Holywell wards into a three member ward will mean that each individual Member is faced with the prospect of representing not the LDBC figure of 1,836 electors but 4,634, thus increasing the realistic ratio and thus work load on each councillor by almost two thirds. The same would happen, to a lesser degree in the Buckley Bistre wards, but would also apply in the proposed Buckley Pentrobin and Mountain ward, or in Flint Oakenholt and Trelawny.</li> <li>• Three member wards could discourage diversity as the prospect of canvassing a ward of over 4,000 would be rather more daunting for an individual than a ward with an electorate of under 2,000 people. We in Flintshire are keen supporters of the Welsh Government’s proposals for increasing diversity in candidates at elections. It could be argued that the current proposals for three member wards militate against fostering diversity.</li> <li>• It could also be argued that the creation of three member wards would benefit established political parties at the expense of individual or Independent candidates who may lack the support or resource to be able to canvass a much larger ward. This is unlikely to be the LDBC’s intention, but could be a collateral effect of the three member proposals.</li> <li>• It has been noted that three member wards often feature more commonly in urban councils, but also those council where elections are annually by thirds. This means that in three successive years, there is an election for one of the three ward representatives. Whilst the election process goes on, there is still continuity of knowledge and experience being offered to the electorate by the members who are not up for election in that particular year. Our elections are of the whole council and so we would not have that inherent stability of representation.</li> </ul>
1.13	The Council’s response to the consultation is at Appendix 1. In the first column, we have identified our current wards, the number of Members for that ward and the ratio of Members to electors expressed, for example

	using Argoed, as 1:2179. In the second column, we have the proposed ward, the proposed number of Members and then both the ratio and the percentage variance from the county average. Where the proposed figure is higher than the average, there is a +, plus sign in front of the figure, where lower, there is a -, minus sign. Column three is for notes, such as 'unchanged ward', or rectifying an error. The fourth column is for comments and is colour coded. <b>Green</b> is for supported LDBC proposals or alternative proposals which have consensus amongst our local Members; <b>Amber</b> is for local proposals which do not have consensus support and <b>Red</b> indicates that no agreement has been possible.
1.14	This is the conclusion of Stage Two of the review process. At Stage Three, the Commission will prepare a Final Proposals Report which will be submitted to Welsh Government (in 2020 along with those for all other councils in Wales). Following that, the Welsh Government will consider the proposals at Stage Four of the process. After six weeks, Welsh Government may make an Order and there will then be an opportunity to write to Welsh Government with comments. The final Stage will be the electoral arrangements coming into force for the 2022 local government elections.

<b>2.00</b>	<b>RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</b>
2.01	A reduction in the number of members will result in a reduction in the budget required for Members' salaries.

<b>3.00</b>	<b>CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED / CARRIED OUT</b>
3.01	Members have been consulted through ward workshops, drop in sessions and an all member workshop.

<b>4.00</b>	<b>RISK MANAGEMENT</b>
4.01	None specifically from this consultation.

<b>5.00</b>	<b>APPENDICES</b>
5.01	Appendix 1: Flintshire County Council Draft Response to the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales draft proposals for Flintshire.

<b>6.00</b>	<b>LIST OF ACCESSIBLE BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS</b>
6.01	Electoral Reviews: Policy and Practice document 2016 <a href="http://ldbc.gov.wales/reviews/electoralreviews/58417614/?lang=en">http://ldbc.gov.wales/reviews/electoralreviews/58417614/?lang=en</a> Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales Presentation to

	<p>Draft Proposals Report- Local Democracy &amp; Boundary Commission for Wales Review of the Electoral Arrangements for Flintshire. <a href="https://ldbc.gov.wales/reviews/08-19/flintshire-draft-proposals">https://ldbc.gov.wales/reviews/08-19/flintshire-draft-proposals</a></p> <p>Report of the Chief Executive and Chief Officer (Governance) <i>Local Democracy &amp; Boundary Commission for Wales Local Review</i>, County Council 11<sup>th</sup> September</p> <p>Minute number 39 of County Council, <i>Local Democracy &amp; Boundary Commission for Wales Local Review</i>, 11<sup>th</sup> September 2019</p> <p>Presentation slides for Electoral ward Workshop 28<sup>th</sup> October 2019.</p> <p>E mail from Cllr D Healey to Head of Democratic Services 7<sup>th</sup> October 2019</p> <p>E mail from Cllr H Brown to Head of Democratic Services 30<sup>th</sup> October 2019</p> <p>E mail from Cllr D Hughes Healey to Head of Democratic Services 31<sup>st</sup> October 2019</p> <p>E mail from Cllr M Bateman to Head of Democratic Services 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019</p> <p>E mail from Cllr R Dolphin to Head of Democratic Services 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019</p> <p>E mail from Cllr C Dolphin to Head of Democratic Services 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019</p> <p>Map of Saltney showing the line of Balderton Brook as a potential ward boundary.</p> <p>Email to Cllr G Banks, <i>Settlement Size Clarification</i> 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019</p> <p><b>Contact Officers:</b> Robert Robins, Democratic Services Manager and Lynn Phillips, Electoral Services Manager</p> <p><b>Telephone:</b> (01352) 702320/01352 702329</p> <p><b>E-mail:</b> <a href="mailto:robert.robins@flintshire.gov.uk">robert.robins@flintshire.gov.uk</a> and <a href="mailto:lyn.phillips@flintshire.gov.uk">lyn.phillips@flintshire.gov.uk</a></p>
--	---

7.00	<b>GLOSSARY OF TERMS</b>
7.01	<p><b>Electoral Parity:</b> ensuring that across a council, all members represent, as near as possible, the same number of electors. In Flintshire’s case, 65 members would produce wards with 1,836 electors per councillor. A 25% variance (an upper tolerance) would be between 2,295 electors per councillor and (a lower tolerance) 1,377 electors per councillor.</p> <p><b>Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales (LDBC) :</b> The role of the Commission is to keep under review all local government areas in Wales, and the electoral arrangements for the principal areas, and to make such proposals to the Welsh Government as seem desirable in the interests of effective and convenient local government.</p> <p><b>Local Government (Democracy) Wales Act 2013:</b> An Act of the National Assembly for Wales to make provision about the constitution and functions of the Local Democracy and Boundary Commission for Wales; to make various provisions relating to local government; and for connected purposes.</p> <p><b>Electoral Review:</b> A review of electoral arrangements for a local authority area.</p> <p><b>Council Size Methodology:</b> A model the Commission has adopted for determining the size of Councils.</p>

<p><b>Assessment:</b> The programme is based upon the base data in the assessment table but moving principal councils up or down the order to take into consideration the former Cabinet Secretary's desire for review of certain councils to be undertaken first.</p>
--

This page is intentionally left blank



## Flintshire Ward review – Analysis of LDBC Proposals

**Green:** Supported LDBC proposals or alternative proposals which have consensus amongst local Members, **Amber :** local proposals, **Red:** indicates where agreement has not been possible.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Argoed (1) 1:2,179			
New Brighton (1) 1:2,385	<b>Argoed &amp; New Brighton (2)</b> 1:2,282, +24%		<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Aston (2) 1:1,287			
Hawarden (1) 1:1,578	<b>Aston &amp; Hawarden (2)</b> 1:2,076 +13%		<b>(G) Local Members continue to support their previous proposal for splitting the existing Hawarden ward between the current Aston and Mancot wards, which was part of the County Council submission in January 2019. They have provided evidence of proposed development on the former 'Poor Clare' monastery site. Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by the local Members.</b>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Bagillt East (1) 1: 1,495			
Bagillt West (1) 1:1,706	<b>Bagillt (2)</b> <b>1:1,601,</b> <b>-13%</b>		<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Broughton North East (1) 1:1,693	<b>Broughton North East (1)</b> <b>1:1,693</b> <b>-8%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Broughton South (2) 1:1675	<b>Broughton South (2)</b> <b>1:1,675</b> <b>-9%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Brynford (1)  1:1,777			
Halkyn (1) 1:1,396	<b>Brynford &amp; Halkyn (2)</b> <b>1;1,587</b> <b>-14%</b>		<b>(G) Concern that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as the current. ones. The Local members support status quo Flintshire recognises and supports this due to nature of these upland communities.</b>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Buckley Bistre East (2) 1:1,311			
Buckley Bistre West (2) 1:1,615	<b>Buckley Bistre (3)</b> <b>1:1,950</b> <b>+6%</b>	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see paragraph 1.12 of the covering report)	<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the proposal which has been put forward by all seven Buckley Members and the Town Council, to adjust the current arrangements</b> , so that: 641 electors are transferred from the Buckley Pentrobin Ward to the Bistre East Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly.  515 electors are transferred from the Buckley Mountain Ward to the Buckley Pentrobin Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly. No changes are proposed for Bistre West ward.
Buckley Mountain (1) 1:2,564			
Buckley Pentrobin (2) 1:2,095	<b>Buckley Mountain &amp; Pentrobin (3)</b> <b>1:2,251</b> <b>+23%</b>	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see	<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the proposal which has been put forward by all seven Buckley Members and the Town Council, to adjust the current arrangements</b> , so that: 641 electors are transferred from the Buckley Pentrobin Ward to the Bistre East Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly. 515 electors are transferred from the Buckley Mountain Ward to the Buckley Pentrobin Ward with the boundary between these two wards amended accordingly.

		paragraph 1.12 of the covering report )	No changes are proposed for Bistre West ward.
<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Caergwrle (1) 1:1,198	<b>Caergwrle (1)</b> <b>1:2,027</b> <b>+10%</b>	'New' Caergwrle ward to include the Cefn y Bedd and Cymau wards of Llanfynydd CC.	<b>(G)</b> Concern that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as current. Alternative proposals have been developed by local Members. <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by the local members for Caergwrle and Hope to be amalgamated</b> as a two Member ward on the basis of locally well-known community ties between the two which has existed for hundreds of years. There is a local saying 'to live in Hope and die in Caergwrle' which illustrates the long standing inter-dependence between the two. The case has already been sent to LDBC.  The local member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain. <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case for retention of Llanfynydd as a ward on the basis of the existing community ties and shared activities as illustrated in the case already sent to LDBC by the local Member.</b>

<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Caerwys (1) 1:2,018	<b>Caerwys (1)</b> <b>1:2,018</b> <b>+10%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Cilcain (1) 1:1,526	<b>Cilcain (1)</b> <b>1:1,526</b> <b>-17%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Connah's Quay Central (2) 1:1,202	<b>Connah's Quay Central (2)</b> <b>1:1,755</b> <b>-4%</b>	Changed ward boundaries to provide 'balance' across the CQ county wards.	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Connah's Quay Golftyn (2) 1:1,977	<b>Connah's Quay Golftyn (2)</b> <b>1;1,858</b> <b>+1%</b>	Changed ward boundaries to provide 'balance' across the CQ county wards	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Connah's Quay South (2)	<b>Connah's Quay South (2)</b>	Changed ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>

1:2,291	<b>1:1,857 +1%</b>	boundaries to provide 'balance' across the CQ county wards	
<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Connah's Quay Wepre (1) 1:1,738	<b>Connah's Quay Wepre (1) 1;1,738 -5%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Ewloe (2) 1:2,155	<b>Ewloe (2) 1:2,155 +17%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Flint Castle (1) 1:1,464	<b>Flint Castle (1) 1:1,772 -4%</b>	Welsh version should be 'Castell Y Fflint' not 'Y Fflint Castell'	<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by local members for changes to the Flint Castle ward as submitted to the LDBC</b>
Flint Coleshill (2) 1:1,529	<b>Flint Coleshill (2) 1:1,529 -10.3%</b>	Unchanged ward. Welsh should be Cynswllt y Fflint.	<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by local members for the retention of the current Coleshill ward with a minor change to the A548 boundary.</b>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Flint Oakenholt (1) 1:2,390			
Flint Trelawny (2) 1:1,362	<b>Flint Oakenholt and Trelawny (3)</b> <b>1:1,602</b> <b>-13%</b>	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see paragraph 1.12 of the covering report).	<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by local Members for the retention of the current Oakenholt and Trelawny wards and number of representatives with adjustments to ward boundaries as submitted to the LDBC</b>
Ffynnongroyw (1) 1:1,490			
Gronant (1) 1:1,248			
Trelawnyd & Gwaenysgor (1) 1:1,464	<b>Llanasa &amp; Trelawnyd (2)</b> <b>1:2,101</b> <b>+14%</b>		<b>(G) Local members are concerned that the proposals for a two Member ward are unlikely to adequately represent the interests of local people. They have cited topography, that the A roads tend to run east – west meaning that north –south journeys are on B and c roads which take longer; and that the communities are distinct, and self-contained , resulting in their being 9 community centres, that there are no community ties between</b>

			<p>villages and that local transport connections do not encourage inter-communication. These are communities which have historically looked west towards Prestatyn and Rhyl for services and leisure, rather than to each other or to Holywell, or other Flintshire towns.</p> <p><b>Flintshire recognises and supports this due to nature of these dispersed, self-contained rural communities and the lack of community ties across the proposed ward.</b></p>
<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Greenfield (1) 1:2,014	<b>Greenfield (1)</b> <b>1:2,014</b> <b>+10%</b>	Unchanged ward	<p><b>(G) Some comments received and detailed below. However, Flintshire supports the LDBC proposal.</b></p> <p><b>(A) The Members for Holywell Central, East and West have put forward an alternative proposal for properties and electors to be transferred from Greenfield to Holywell East. They have also suggested that the ward be renamed Holywell Greenfield, citing consistency with other town wards across Flintshire.</b></p> <p>The Members for Greenfield and Whitford have said that their comments on the Greenfield Ward remain the same, and that they have responded to the Boundary Commission, on that basis.</p> <p>They have also suggested that Holywell West should remain the same as it fits the criteria, but renamed Holywell South, The remaining two wards be amalgamated, but as a two Councillor member Ward, named Holywell.</p>



Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Gwernaffield (1) 1:1,641			
Gwernymynydd (1) 1:1,389	<b>Gwernaffield &amp; Gwernymynydd (2)</b> 1:1,515 -17%		<b>(G)</b> No adverse comments received. Therefore, <b>Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Higher Kinnerton (1) 1:1,308			
Hope (1) 1: 2,055	<b>Higher Kinnerton &amp; Hope (2)</b> 1:1,682 -8%		<p><b>(G)</b> Concern that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as current. Alternative proposals have been developed by local Members. <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case made by the local members for Caergwrle and Hope to be amalgamated</b> as a two Member ward on the basis of locally well-known community ties between the two which has existed for hundreds of years. There is a local saying 'to live in Hope and die in Caergwrle' which illustrates the long standing inter - dependence between the two. The case has already been sent to LDBC</p> <p><b>(G)</b> Flintshire recognises and supports the case being made by the local Member for Higher Kinnerton that there are no ready community ties or links between Hope and Higher</p>

			<b>Kinnerton.</b> Higher Kinnerton has an unique character, with tits community ties looking eastwards to its twin village of Lower Kinnerton on the English side of the border, with which it shares a cricket club. The ‘English nature’ of the village is confirmed by the decision to stay as part of the Church of England, and the Chester diocese in 1920 following disestablishment and the creation of the Church in Wales.
<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Holywell Central (1) 1:1,443			
Holywell East (1) 1:1,430			
Holywell West (1) 1: 1,761	<b>Holywell (3)</b> <b>1: 1,545</b> <b>-16%</b>	Flintshire has not had three Member wards previously and opposes them (see paragraph 1.12 of the covering report )	<b>(G)</b> The proposed ward ratio, is a -16% variance, which is very similar to- the existing variances across the current three Holywell wards;-15.4%, -16.1% and +3 effective representation. The three Member proposal is not considered to be in the best interests of the electors, who hitherto have been used to having one vote – one member. Three member wards are suited to larger urban areas, not to small rural towns. Three member wards tend to be in authorities where elections are by thirds, so that there is an element of continuity which will be lost with the LDBC proposal. <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case for status quo as the LDBC proposal doesn’t appear to be better for local residents.</b>  <b>(A)</b> The Members for Holywell Central, East and West have put forward an alternative proposal for properties and electors to be

			<p>transferred from Greenfield to Holywell East. They have also suggested that the ward be renamed Holywell Greenfield, citing consistency with other town wards across Flintshire.</p> <p><b>(A)</b> The members for Greenfield and Whitford have said that their comments on the Greenfield Ward remain the same, and that they responded to the Boundary Commission, on that basis. They have also suggested that Holywell West should remain the same as it fits the criteria, but renamed Holywell South, The remaining two wards be amalgamated, but as a two Councillor member Ward, named Holywell.</p>
<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Leeswood (1) 1:1,620	<b>Leeswood (1)</b> <b>1:1,822</b> <b>-1%</b>	New ward to incorporate the Llanfynydd CC Pontybodkin ward	<p><b>(G)</b> The Local member would prefer status quo, but recognises that if changes have to be made, incorporating Pontybodkin into the Leeswood ward is a 'least worse' compromise as there is evidence of community ties . <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case for status quo as the LDBC proposal doesn't appear to be better for local residents.</b></p> <p>The local member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community ties, cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain. <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case for retention of Llanfynydd as a ward on the basis of the existing community ties and shared activities as illustrated in the case already sent to LDBC by the local member.</b></p>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Llanfynydd (1) 1:1,505	The, proposal is for this ward to be disaggregated between the new Caergwrle, Leeswood and Treuddyn wards		<b>(G)</b> The local member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain. <b>Flintshire recognises and supports the case</b> for retention of Llanfynydd as a ward on the basis of the existing community ties and shared activities as illustrated in the case already sent to LDBC by the local member.
Mancot (2) 1:1,343			
Queensferry (1) 1;1,467	<b>Mancot &amp; Queensferry (2)</b> <b>1;2,076</b> <b>+13%</b>		<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports</b> the case put forward by the local members for Sealand and Queensferry for Sealand to become a two member ward, either on its own or by amalgamation with Queensferry. Whilst there is currently a +17% variance in Sealand, with proposed new development to 2023, this will increase to 51% A submission detailing the community ties and shared activities has already been sent by the local Members to the Boundary Commission  <b>(G) Flintshire supports</b> the case for the current Mancot ward to be amalgamated with part of the existing Hawarden ward, with which there are close community ties. Parts of what is often thought of as Hawarden, are already within the Mancot Ward . Conversely, there is an absence of community ties with Queensferry, which tends to look towards Sealand.

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Mold Broncoed (1) 1:2,096	<b>Mold Broncoed (1)</b> <b>1:2,096</b> <b>+14%</b>	Proposal to transfer electors from Broncoed to South	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Mold East (1) 1:1,547	<b>Mold East (1)</b> <b>1:2,018</b> <b>+10%</b>	Proposal to transfer electors from West to East.	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Mold South (1) 1;2,212	<b>Mold South (1)</b> <b>1:1,923</b> <b>+5%</b>	Proposal to transfer electors from South to West	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Mold West (1) 1:1,984	<b>Mold West (1)</b> <b>1:1,802</b> <b>-2%</b>	Proposal to transfer electors from West to east and from South to West	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Mostyn (1) 1;1,464	<b>Mostyn (1)</b> 1:1.464 -20%	Unchanged ward	<b>(G)</b> No adverse comments received. Therefore, <b>Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Northop (1) 1:2,509			
Northop Hall (1) 1: 1,370	<b>Northop &amp; Northop Hall (2)</b> 1:1,940 +6%		<b>(G)</b> No adverse comments received. Therefore, <b>Flintshire supports the proposal.</b> The Local member for Northop has put forward a proposal that as the largest settlement in the ward – Sychdyn is not mentioned in the proposed ward name, it should revert to the previous name for the two wards when combined between 1995 and 1999: 'Northop' .
Penyffordd (2) 1:1,760	<b>Penyffordd (2)</b> 1:1,760 -4%	Unchanged ward	<b>(G)</b> No adverse comments received. Therefore, <b>Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Saltney Mold Junction (1) 1:1,041			
Saltney Stonebridge (1) 1;2,785	<b>Saltney (2)</b> 1:1,913 +4%		<b>(R)</b> No agreement reached, other than on need for 'Saltney Ferry' to be part of a new ward name. One local Member keen to pursue two single member wards. The other supports the LDBC proposal for amalgamation of the two wards.  The need for the local members to encourage local people and organisations to make individual submissions to LDBC in support of preferences was emphasised.

			Corrections: The LDBC to be advised that FCC had not previously made a formal recommendation, contrary to page 63 and that the name of the brook is Balderton, rather than Boundary as mentioned in Appendix 5, page 20.
<b>Current Ward, number of Members and ratio</b>	<b>Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Sealand (1) 1:2,149	<b>Sealand (1)</b> <b>1:2,149</b> <b>+17%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) Flintshire recognises and supports</b> the case put forward by the local Members for Sealand and Queensferry for Sealand to become a two member ward, either on its own or by amalgamation with Queensferry. Whilst there is currently a +17% variance in Sealand, with proposed new development to 2023, this will increase to 51% A submission detailing the community ties and shared activities has already been sent by the local Members to the Boundary Commission.
Shotton East (1) 1:1,390			
Shotton Higher (1) 1: 1,803	<b>Shotton East &amp; Higher (2)</b> <b>1: 1,597</b> <b>-13%</b>		<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>
Shotton West (1) 1:1,600	<b>Shotton West (1)</b> <b>1:1,600</b> <b>-13%</b>	Unchanged ward	<b>(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>

Current Ward, number of Members and ratio	Proposed ward, number of Members, ratio and % variance from County Average	Notes	Comments
Treuddyn (1) 1:1,352	<b>Treuddyn (1)</b> <b>1:1,826</b>	Incorporates Ffrith ward of Llanfynydd CC	<p>(A) There are concerns that the proposed ward may not work as effectively as current arrangements. An alternative proposal has been developed by the local Member, concentrating on known community ties.</p> <p>The local Member has indicated that if it should be necessary for Treuddyn to be amalgamated with any other community, thus should be with Nercwys because of existing church and school linkages. However, this would have an impact upon the proposals for Gwernymynydd and Gwernaffield.</p> <p>The local Member for Llanfynydd has indicated his opposition to this proposal on the basis that it would divide the 'current Llanfynydd communities' amongst the adjoining wards which would have an adverse effect on established communication, community ties, cohesion and social links on the side of Hope Mountain.</p>
Whitford (1) 1:1,919	Whitford (1) 1:1,919 +5%	Unchanged ward	(G) No adverse comments received. Therefore, <b>Flintshire supports the proposal.</b>





## COUNTY COUNCIL

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	Tuesday, 19 <sup>th</sup> November 2019
<b>Report Subject</b>	Amended Pay Policy Statement for 2019/20
<b>Report Author</b>	Chief Executive and Senior Manager, Human Resources and Organisational Development

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

All local authorities are required to publish an annual Pay Policy Statement.

The Pay Policy presented within this report is an amended version of the seventh annual statement approved by Council in January 2019.

It has been necessary to update the pay policy to reflect the changes to pay for a large proportion of the workforce as a result of a pay modelling exercise undertaken to accommodate Year Two (2019) of the NJC pay agreement.

We are reporting the updated Annual Pay Policy earlier than usual as we expect no further changes.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1	That County Council approves the appended Updated Pay Policy Statement for 2019/20.
---	---

### REPORT DETAILS

<b>1.00</b>	<b>PAY POLICY STATEMENTS</b>
1.01	Under the Localism Act 2011 local authorities are required to publish an annual Pay Policy Statement. A Pay Policy Statement should include:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the local authority’s policy on the level and elements of remuneration for each chief officer;</li> <li>• the policy on the remuneration of its lowest-paid employees - together with its definition of lowest-paid employees and the reasons for adopting that definition;</li> <li>• the policy on the relationship between the remuneration of its chief officers and other officers; and</li> <li>• the policy on other specific aspects of chief officers’ remuneration such as recruitment, pay increases, the use of performance related pay and bonuses, termination payments, and pay transparency.</li> </ul>
1.02	The Council’s current Pay Policy Statement was approved by Council on 29 January 2019.
1.03	Year Two (2019) of the NJC pay agreement provided for the introduction of a ‘new’ pay spine with assimilation to newly created spinal column points. The agreement introduces far greater change than a simple cost of living monetary award. If the Council were to implement the second year of the two year NJC pay agreement as per the national model on a straight like for like ‘read across’ our pay model would be disrupted to such an extent that it would no longer meet our organisational design and pay policy principles, and might also be open to challenge on the grounds of gender inequality. Therefore, our pay model has been fundamentally reviewed to accommodate the national pay agreement.
1.04	<p>In January 2019 Cabinet invited the Chief Executive to conclude negotiations with the Trade Unions and agree and implement a revised pay model using his delegated powers provided that:-</p> <p>(a) the new pay model meets the of being legal and equitable, workable and sustainable, acceptable and affordable;</p> <p>(b) the new pay model passes an independent Equality Impact Assessment; and</p> <p>(c) the recurring base cost does not exceed the provision within the draft 2019/20 budget by a tolerance greater than 5%.</p> <p>Local agreement was reached on the preferred model in March 2019. The overall outcome of the new model, not only results in the implementation the new national pay spine provided for as part of the two year agreement, but achieves a smoothed pay spine, addresses pay parity and addresses the gap between our Greater London Provincial Council (GLPC) core pay and Hay senior pay scales.</p>
1.05	A copy of the agreed pay model is attached at Appendix B.
1.06	<p>The new pay model has passed the tests of being legal and equitable, workable and sustainable, acceptable and affordable.</p> <p>Initial communications to employees were circulated 19 March 2019. It has been agreed (and communicated) that the effective date of the new pay model is 1 April 2019. The target date for implementation date is July 2019, backdated to April 2019. Increments due on 1 April 2019 have since been applied.</p>

1.07	<p>An independent Equality Impact Assessment was commissioned which in summary found the amendments to the pay and grading structure to be a positive development that achieves the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a better relationship between the pay arrangements of those covered by the NJC for local government services and Chief Officers</li> <li>• all grades consist of an equal number of increments</li> <li>• a narrowing of the overall gender pay gap in basic pay</li> <li>• a greater percentage increase in salary for female employees</li> <li>• no bias in terms of gender as a result of the proposed assimilation to grade.</li> </ul>
1.08	<p>The specific sections of the pay policy which have been amended are as follows:</p> <p>Section 6 – Chief Officer salaries  Section 7 – Increase in the remuneration of the lowest pay employees as at 1 April 2019,  Section 8 – Salary sacrifice scheme  Section 9 – Pay relativities within the Authority  Section 11 –National Living Wage (NLW) and the introduction of the new pay model</p>
1.09	<p>Minor editorial changes may be made from time to time in-year. Any changes are not expected to depart from the overarching principles or the approach to remuneration.</p>

<b>2.00</b>	<b>RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</b>
2.01	None as the Pay Policy Statement appended to this report is a description of existing arrangements.

<b>3.00</b>	<b>CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED / CARRIED OUT</b>
3.01	<p>Consultations took place with Chief Officers and their portfolio management teams.</p> <p>Consultations have also taken place and concluded with the recognised Trade Unions.</p>

<b>4.00</b>	<b>RISK MANAGEMENT</b>
4.01	The new pay model, has passed the tests of being legal and equitable, workable and sustainable, acceptable and affordable.

<b>5.00</b>	<b>APPENDICES</b>
5.01	Appendix A – Pay Policy Statement 2019/20 Appendix B – The New Pay Model

<b>6.00</b>	<b>LIST OF ACCESSIBLE BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS</b>
6.01	<b>Contact Officer:</b> Sharon Carney, Senior Manager, Human Resources and Organisational Development <b>Telephone:</b> 01352 702139 <b>E-mail:</b> <a href="mailto:Sharon.carney@flintshire.gov.uk">Sharon.carney@flintshire.gov.uk</a>

<b>7.00</b>	<b>GLOSSARY OF TERMS</b>
7.01	As detailed in the attached Pay Policy Statement for 2019/20.

Pay Policy Statement 2019/20  
(incorporating LGPS Discretionary Pension Statement)

## Contents

1. Introduction and Purpose .....	4
2. Legislative Framework.....	4
3. Scope of the Pay Policy Statement .....	5
4. Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales (IRPW).....	5
5. Broad Principles of our Pay and Reward Strategy.....	6
I) Transparency, accountability and value for money.....	6
II) Development of Pay and Reward Strategy .....	6
III) The Council’s Pay and Grading Structure .....	7
IV) Additional Payments .....	9
V Salary Protection .....	10
6. Chief Officer Remuneration .....	10
i) Definitions of Chief Officer .....	10
ii) Policy on the Remuneration of Chief Officers.....	11
iii) Recruitment of Chief Officers .....	11
iv) Chief Officer Salaries.....	12
v) Additions to Salary of Chief Officers.....	12
vi) Performance Related Pay and Bonuses .....	13
vii) Payments on Termination .....	13
viii) Publication of Chief Officer and Other Senior Post Salaries .....	14
ix) Pay Increases – Chief Officers.....	15
7. Remuneration of the Lowest Paid Employees.....	15
8. Salary Sacrifice Scheme .....	15
9. Pay Relativities within the Authority .....	16
10. National Negotiating Bodies and Pay Awards .....	17
11. National Living Wage (NLW) .....	17
12. Pension benefits .....	19
13. Re-engagement of Chief Officers .....	19
14. Partnership with Trade Unions .....	20
15. Future Legislation.....	20
16. Monitoring, Evaluation and Review .....	20
Appendix 1 .....	21
Salary Scales .....	21

Appendix 2 ..... 27  
Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Discretionary Pension Statement ..... 27

## 1. Introduction and Purpose

This Pay Policy Statement (the statement) sets out the Council's approach to pay policy in accordance with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act). Under section 38 (1) of the Act 2011 English and Welsh local authorities are to produce and publish a pay policy statement for each financial year covering:

- The authority's policies for the remuneration of chief officers;
- The arrangements for the publication of and access to information on the remuneration of chief officers;
- The authority's policies towards the remuneration of its lowest paid employees; and
- The relationship between the remuneration of its chief officers and other employees.

The Council has published information on senior pay for a number of years on its website and in its Statement of Accounts. It has also responded openly and in full to Freedom of Information Act requests for such details.

In relation to other organisations in all sectors across the UK, we are a large, complex organisation providing a very diverse range of services. Many of these services are vital to the wellbeing of individuals and groups of residents in our local community. These can be delivered in very challenging circumstances, which means the Council must take account of the levels of need and ensure the availability of resources to meet them.

We compete with other local employers to recruit and retain managers capable of meeting the challenges of delivering our services to the required standards. This has an important bearing on the levels of remuneration we offer. At the same time, we are obligated to secure the best value for money for our residents and taxpayers in taking decisions on our pay levels. Therefore, the arrangements for the evaluation of posts across the workforce, and pay and terms and consideration of employment, are complex and require careful planning, maintenance and control.

## 2. Legislative Framework

In determining the pay and remuneration of all of its employees, the Council will comply with all relevant employment legislation including the following:

- The Equality Act 2010;
- Part Time Employment (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000;



- The Agency Workers Regulations 2010;
- Where relevant the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Earnings) Regulations.

The Council will ensure that there is no pay discrimination within its pay and grading structures and that all pay differentials in pay can be objectively justified through the use of a Job Evaluation system. The Council's Single Status Agreement is compliant with all relevant legislation and industry practice.

### 3. [Scope of the Pay Policy Statement](#)

The Localism Act 2011 requires authorities to publish their pay policy on all aspects of Chief Officer Remuneration (including on ceasing to hold office) and to explain the relationship between remuneration for Chief Officers and other workforce groups including the 'lowest paid'.

In the interests of transparency the Council has chosen to take a broader approach and produces a policy covering all employee groups with the exception of School Teachers (as the remuneration for this group is set by the Secretary of State at a UK level and therefore is not within local authority control).

Nothing within the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 detract from the Council's autonomy in making decisions on pay that are appropriate to local circumstances and which deliver achieve business objectives and value for money. The Council will follow its own policy in setting remuneration levels for all workforce groups within its scope.

### 4. [Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales \(IRPW\)](#)

Section 143A of the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011, as inserted by Section 63 of the Local Government (Democracy) (Wales) Act 2013 refers to the Independent Remuneration Panel in Wales (the "IRP") and sets out their functions for the remuneration of heads of paid service. All Council's should note that the IRP may make recommendations about any on the salary of the head of paid service and any proposed change to the salary of the position.

The responsibilities of the IRPW are increasing. For example, on recruitment, directions may impose restrictions on proposed recruitment to certain posts, including chief officers. Should the Welsh Ministers decide to issue directions under subsection (1), no chief officer may be recruited without the consent of a person specified in the direction.

Detailed guidance to the Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales on the pay of Heads of Paid Service and Chief Officers under Section 143A of the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2011 and Section 39 of the Local Government (Wales) Act 2015 can be found via the following link <http://gov.wales/topics/localgovernment/publications/guidance-salaries-irp/>.

## 5. Broad Principles of our Pay and Reward Strategy

### I) Transparency, accountability and value for money

The Council is committed to an open and transparent approach to pay policy which will enable anyone to access, understand and assess information on remuneration levels across all groups of Council employees. The following is available on the council's website at [www.flintshire.gov.uk](http://www.flintshire.gov.uk).

#### Remuneration data

- All employee pay scales
- Individual remuneration details for senior employees whose remuneration is over £60,000 per annum, and the number of employees whose remuneration exceeds £60,000 as required under the Accounts and Audit (Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2010.

#### Policy documents

- [Additional Payments](#)
- [Policy Statement on Redundancy and Severance Payments \(including additional pension payments\)](#)

All relevant policies are reviewed periodically to ensure they are current and meet the principles of fairness, equality, accountability and value for money.

### II) Development of Pay and Reward Strategy

The primary aim of a reward strategy is to attract, retain and motivate suitably skilled employees so that the organisation can perform to its best. The biggest challenge for the Council in the current financial climate is to maximise productivity and efficiency within current resources. Pay policy is a matter of striking a balance between setting

remuneration levels at appropriate levels to ensure a sufficient 'supply' of appropriately skilled, experienced and qualified individuals to fill the Council's wide range of posts, and ensuring that the burden of cost does not become greater than can be justified.

It should be recognised that in a competitive recruitment 'market' remuneration levels need to enable the attraction of a suitably wide pool of talent (which will ideally include people from across the public sector and from outside as well as within Wales), and the retention of suitably skilled and qualified individuals once in post. It should be recognised that the Council will often be seeking to recruit in competition with other public and private sector employers.

The Council is a major employer in the area. The availability of good quality employment on reasonable terms and conditions and fair rates of pay has a beneficial impact on the quality of life in the community as well as on the local economy. The Council also has a role in setting a benchmark example on pay and conditions to other employers in the area for the same reasons.

In designing, developing and reviewing the Pay and Reward strategy the Council will seek to balance these factors to achieve performance outcomes for the organisation and the community it serves, whilst managing and controlling total pay costs. This has remained a challenge year on year for the Council against a backdrop of recent pay 'freezes' for local government workers. The 1% NJC national 'cost of living' pay award for 2013/14 made for most employees followed an unprecedented three-year pay freeze.

For senior posts regulated under the Joint Negotiating Council (JNC) the pay 'freeze' had lasted for 6 years to 2015/16 and, for the most senior posts such as Chief Executives, for seven years to 2015/16.

### III) The Council's Pay and Grading Structure

Section 112 of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that a local authority shall appoint such Officers for the proper discharge of its functions on such reasonable terms and conditions, including conditions as to remuneration as the local authority thinks fit.

The remuneration of the large majority of employees of the Council is in accordance with the locally agreed pay scale with spinal column points based on the nationally agreed pay spine (the NJC pay scale).

As part of its ongoing commitment to ensure the integrity of the Single Status Agreement, the Council regularly reviews and analyses a variety of reports to ensure that reward processes are consistently applied in line with the relevant policies and to challenge where appropriate, and to receive Equal Pay Audits and to recommend an action plan as needed.

The Council uses a range of methods to evaluate pay and has multiple pay scales dependent on the terms and conditions of employment.

For roles that are not nationally prescribed and are not Chief Officer posts, the Council uses the Greater London Provincial Committee (GLPC), which is part of the Single Status Collective Agreement, and role profiles for support workers employed by School Governing Bodies.

For employees under JNC Craft Agreement (Red Book) there is a multi-skilling local agreement in place for pay which is based on 3 bands of pay in each trade and is dependent on employees being competent to undertake multi-trade working. The pay scale is based on the National Pay Scales for Craft but is all inclusive of 'tool' and 'dirt money' etc.

In 2016 the Council introduced a collective agreement known as the 'House Agreement' for Theatr Clwyd covering pay and terms and conditions of employment. The agreement introduced a new pay scale and terms and conditions of employment that ensured future payments were equitable, affordable and sustainable whilst facilitating retention and recruitment. Generic profile descriptors are used as a basis for matching each job to the most appropriate grade.

### **Pay Progression**

With the exception of Chief Officers whose pay progression is based on performance, all employees receive annual increments until the maximum spinal point in the grade is reached, subject to six months in that grade (whether attained by appointment, promotion or re-grading).

All employees, including senior employees, will normally be appointed to the minimum point of the pay grade for the job. In certain circumstances it may be appropriate to appoint to a higher point in the pay grade. This may arise when, for example, the

preferred candidate for the job is or has been in receipt of a salary at a higher level than the grade minimum, subject to approval by their respective Chief Officer.

Within Theatr Clwyd incremental progression will be dependent on Theatr Clwyd achieving collective targets which are agreed and reviewed annually by the Board of Trustees.

### **Bonus Payments and Performance Related Pay**

The Council does not apply any bonus payments. The Council operates an appraisal system as part of its performance management strategy and with the exception of Chief Officers (see above) this is not linked to pay.

### **Chief Officer Job Evaluation**

For Chief Officers, the Council uses the nationally recognised Hay Job Evaluation Scheme. The scheme is an analytical one that takes into consideration three key elements of a post:

- Know How – the levels of knowledge, skill and experience (gained through work experience, education and tradition) which are required to perform the job successfully;
- Problem Solving – the complexity of thinking required to perform the job when applying Know How;
- Accountability – the impact the job has on the organisation and the constraints the job holder has on acting independently.

The Council undertook reviews of Chief Officer's roles and associated pay arrangements in 2014. Therefore, current arrangements are modern for the business needs of the Council.

#### **IV) Additional Payments**

There may be occasions when an employee is asked to carry out additional duties to those of their substantive post for a period of time. In such circumstances an additional payment may be made in line with the Council's Additional Payments policy. The policy provides a framework to ensure the continued fairness, equitability and affordability of the pay and grading structure and differentiates between the following scenarios:

## Honorarium

Subject to certain conditions, employees who are temporarily required to undertake some or all of the duties of a higher graded posts are eligible to be paid an honorarium. Details of the scheme can be found in the Council's Additional Payments Policy.

## Market Supplements

From time to time it may be necessary to take account of the external pay levels in the labour market in order to attract and retain employees with particular experience, skills and capacity and apply a time limited, market supplement. Where necessary, the Council will ensure the requirement is objectively justified by reference to a clear and transparent evidence of relevant market comparators, using data sources available from the local government sector and outside, as appropriate.

## V Salary Protection

The Council will take reasonable steps to protect an employee's basic pay where it is reduced as a result of:

- Organisational change
- Redeployment where the individual is at risk of or under notice of redundancy and is redeployed or assimilated into either a lower graded post or a post which attracts a lower total remuneration package than their previous post

The Council protects the remuneration of employees for a maximum of twelve months from the date of the change to basic pay, subject to a maximum of one grade difference or equivalent between the old post and the new post.

## 6. Chief Officer Remuneration

### i) Definitions of Chief Officer

For the purposes of this statement, 'Chief Officers' are as defined within S43 of the Localism Act. The relevant posts within the Council are as follows:

- a) Chief Executive (including Head of Paid Service)
- b) Chief Officer, Governance
- c) Chief Officer, Streetscene and Transportation
- d) Chief Officer, Planning, Environment and Economy
- e) Chief Officer, Social Services
- f) Chief Officer, Education and Youth,

g) Chief Officer, Housing and Assets

These officers are responsible for working alongside and advising elected members over the strategic direction of the Council, carrying out the stated aims of the Council, ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of all services provided by the Council and its partners, and providing overall day to day operational management of services.

A new single grade and pay range for the new Chief Officer group was introduced in June 2014. All roles in the structure are positioned in the same single incremental range, given that all roles are broadly the same size, other than the Chief Executive. Placing the new Chief Officer roles on the same grade also removes any hierarchy at senior management level and reflects the single, collective tier.

All roles have access to the same four increments. The pay range has a clear rationale, building on the options developed with the independent advice from Hay Group and being mindful of both affordability and the relativity to management roles in the grades below. The range overlaps with the increments which existed for the former Heads of Service but falls below the former Director pay. It also represents a consistent policy of paying between the lower quartile and the median. Progression through the range is based on performance. The approach is affordable and fair, and has ensured that the Council can meet its financial targets for the reduction of senior management costs.

ii) [Policy on the Remuneration of Chief Officers](#)

The Terms and Conditions of employment applicable to Chief Officers are as determined by the JNC (Joint Negotiating Council) for Chief Officers of Local Authorities (or JNC for Chief Executives of Local Authorities) as amended/ supplemented or superseded by decisions on conditions of service made by the Council from time to time and contained within the Council's Employment Policies and Procedures.

iii) [Recruitment of Chief Officers](#)

The Council's policy and procedures for the recruitment of Chief Officers is set out within Article 15, 15.01 sub section (b) of the Constitution.

The Council's Management Structure is as approved by Council. The Job Descriptions and Person Specifications for each Chief Officer post are approved prior to advertisement by the Council's appointment panel which comprises seven elected members. The

determination of the remuneration to be offered to any newly appointed Chief Officer will take account of such factors as the requirements of the job, the relative size of the organization, local and national market rates and the relationship with other posts within the grading structure. It is the responsibility of the Chief Executive to make and maintain arrangements for the professional management of the Council which meet both its legal duties and its business needs.

There is a requirement under the Welsh Government Regulations that all vacant posts with a salary of over £100,000 are publicly advertised. The Council has not appointed to any posts in this range since 2007. The only exception to this new rule is where the appointment is for 12 months or less. It is also possible to divide up the duties from one deleted Chief Officer post between other existing post holders.

#### iv) Chief Officer Salaries

Details of the Chief Officers basic salary are set out below (salaries are those applicable at 1 April 2019).

##### Chief Executive

The salary falls within a range of 1 – incremental points between £125,627.00 rising to a maximum of £136,548.00. (This salary range was set by the Council in 2007 with external advice. It was reviewed again in 2014 but a decision was taken not to change at that time.) The 2019 pay award has not been applied at the request of the Chief Executive.

##### Chief Officers

The salary falls within a range of 1 – 4 incremental points between £85,521.00 rising to a maximum of £96,348.00.

#### v) Additions to Salary of Chief Officers

The Council does pay all reasonable travel and subsistence expenses on produced of receipts and in accordance with JNC conditions and other local conditions. Part III changes which formed part of the Single Status Agreement have removed other previous entitlements. A number of senior employees choose not to claim in full expenses to which they are contractually entitled as a 'conscious' voluntary decision given the current financial constraints.



The Returning Officer for the County Council is the Chief Executive. The Returning Officer duties are not part of the Chief Executive's substantive role. Fees for these duties are paid separately and are determined by the full Council for Council elections and by legislation for the Police and Crime Commissioner, the National Assembly for Wales, the Parliamentary Elections, European Elections and national referenda.

#### vi) Performance Related Pay and Bonuses

The Council does not apply any bonuses or performance related pay to its Chief Officers pay. However, the annual increment (if not already at top of scale) is only awarded once the Annual Appraisal has been passed as satisfactory (page 7 refers).

All Chief Officers have annual and mid-year appraisals and the Chief Executive has an annual appraisal facilitated by an external party as per national guidance and the post's contractual rights.

#### vii) Payments on Termination

The Council's policies for redundancy payments and retirement are set out respectively within its Discretionary Compensation Scheme and Early Retirement Policy.

Under the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006, the Council applies its discretion under Regulation 5 in the case of both voluntary and compulsory redundancy to base any payments on an employee's actual week's pay.

Under Regulation 6, the Council makes redundancy payments (compulsory and voluntary) to employees based upon the statutory redundancy payments scale which are calculated by multiplying a number of weeks based on their age and length of service (subject to a maximum of 20 years' service) by their actual weekly rate of pay, as follows:

- 0.5 week's pay for each year of employment in which the employee was aged 21 and below
- 1 week's pay for each year of employment in which the employee was aged 22 to 40 inclusive.
- 1.5 week's pay for each year of employment during which the employee was aged 41 or over.

For employees under the age 55 (or aged 55 and over and are *not* members of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS)) apply a multiplier of 1.5 times the redundancy payment as calculated above.

The Government announced its intention to introduce a cap on Public Sector exit payments in order to restrict these to a maximum of £95,000. This has the potential to reduce both redundancy dismissal and efficiency pension benefits where the Chief Officer is aged 55+ and may have some of their pension benefits reduced where the overall cost of termination exceeds £95,000 including pension strain costs.

The background to the current position is that the Enterprise Act 2016 has been passed and Section 9 provides enabling powers to make regulations for exit payments. The Act also gives powers to Welsh Ministers to 'relax' any regulations made. At the time of writing we continue to wait for draft regulations to be consulted upon which will then give any powers to Welsh Ministers to determine the approach in Wales. Until then, the status quo applies.

Outside of the policies outlined above the Council does not operate any other policy of making any specific or general payment to its Chief Officers or any other employees on their ceasing to hold office or to be employed by the Council but it may, where appropriate, agree to waive contractual notice.

#### viii) [Publication of Chief Officer and Other Senior Post Salaries](#)

Upon approval by the full Council, this statement will be published on the Council's Website. In addition, for posts where the full time equivalent salary is over £60,000 per annum the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts will include a note setting out by posts the total amount of:

- salary, fees or allowances paid to or receivable by the person in the current and previous year;
- any bonuses so paid or receivable by the person in the current and previous year;
- any sums payable by way of expenses allowance that are chargeable to UK income tax;
- any compensation for loss of employment and any other payments connected with termination; and
- any benefits received that do not fall within the above.

## ix) Pay Increases – Chief Officers

The Council employs Chief Officers under JNC terms and conditions which are incorporated into their contracts. The JNC for Chief Officers negotiates on national (UK) annual cost of living pay increases for this group, and any award of the same is determined on this basis. Chief Officers employed on JNC terms and conditions are contractually entitled to any national JNC determined pay rises and this Council will therefore pay these as and when determined in accordance with current contractual arrangements.

Agreement was reached on pay awards applicable from 1 April 2018 and 1 April 2019 on 8 June 2018 for Chief Executives, and 12 July 2018 for Chief Officers. This agreement provided for the individual basic salary of all officers within scope of the JNC for Chief Officers of Local Authorities to be increased by 2.0% with effect from 1 April 2018 and 2.0% with effect from 1 April 2019.

## 7. Remuneration of the Lowest Paid Employees

The lowest paid persons employed under a contract of employment with the Council are defined as those employed on full time 37 hours equivalent salaries in accordance with the minimum spinal column point currently in use within the Council's grading structure post single status. As at 1 April 2019, this is **£17,364** per annum. The Council has adopted this definition as it is recommended in relevant guidance as the most easily understood.

The Council employs apprentices (and other such trainees) who are not included within the definition of 'lowest paid employees' and are paid less than the minimum spinal column point for other employees during their apprenticeship. The purpose of paying a lower salary is to reflect the particular nature and/or duration/frequency of their employment and to maximize the number of apprenticeships offered. There is an exception to this agreement in relation to Graduate Trainees who we have agreed should not earn less than our lowest evaluated rate of pay.

## 8. Salary Sacrifice Scheme

The Council has offered a range of salary sacrifice schemes such as cycle to work for many years but, following a review of our total reward strategy in 2016 we launched a new 'eRewards' scheme. This scheme introduced retail and leisure discounts for employees as well as providing an opportunity to re-launch the cycle to work scheme via new providers all under the National Procurement Service for Wales (NPS) framework.

The aim of the schemes is to stretch net pay for employees following recent years of pay freezes and 1% pay awards against a rise in living costs. The retail and leisure discounts provides many of ways of saving on everyday expenses such as everyday shopping, motoring and insurance.

## 9. Pay Relativities within the Authority

The statutory guidance under the Localism Act recommends the use of pay multiples as a means of measuring the relationship between pay rates across the workforce and that of senior managers, as included within the Hutton 'Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector' (2010).

The Hutton report was asked by Government to explore the case for a fixed limit on dispersion of pay through a requirement that no public sector manager can earn more than 20 times the lowest paid person in the organisation. The report concluded that the relationship to median earnings was a more relevant measure and the Governments Code of Recommended Practice on Data Transparency recommends the publication of the ratio between the highest paid salary and the median average salary of the whole of the Authority's workforce. The median salary for Flintshire County Council based on based on a payroll extract taken on 1 April 2019 is **£19,554.00**

The multiples of pay for Flintshire County Council are as follows:

1. The multiple between the lowest paid (full time equivalent) employee and the Chief Executive is 1:7:86 (*compared to 1:8.78 last year*)
2. The multiple between the lowest paid employee and mean average Chief Officer is 1:4:92 (*previous year 1:5.40*)
3. The multiple between the median (average) full time equivalent employee and the Chief Executive is 1:6:98 (*previous year 1:7.51*)

*(based on a payroll extract taken as at 1 April 2019)*

The interim Hutton Fair Pay Report noted that most 'top to bottom' pay multiples in the public sector are in the region of **1:8.1 to 1:12.1**. The multiples in Flintshire are therefore well within this notional range and are showing a reducing pay range between 'top and bottom' year on year.

## 10. National Negotiating Bodies and Pay Awards

The National Joint Council negotiates the pay, terms and conditions of employees in local authorities. It agrees an annual cost of living uplift to the national pay spine, on which each individual council decides where to place its employees. Each council takes into account a number of factors such as job size and local market conditions when deciding an employee's salary. There are no nationally determined jobs or pay grades in local government, unlike in other parts of the public sector.

As with other Welsh Council's, the Council continues to comply with all national pay bargaining arrangements in respect of the establishment and revision of the national pay spine, for example through any agreed annual pay increases negotiated with join trade unions at a UK level.

## 11. National Living Wage (NLW)

The Government introduced the National Living Wage (NLW) for employees aged 25 and above on 1 April 2016 with the aim of reaching 60% of median UK earnings by 2020. This rate is currently £8.21 per hour and is projected to rise to at least £10.50 by 2024.

For some time it has been recognised at a national level that the pay spine has lost its relevance to modern working arrangements and is unable to absorb the new NLW along with the planned increases. It is also clear that a number of Council's have already taken a decision to pay the Foundation Living Wage (or their own version of this) and this has resulted in a restructure of the national pay spine is required.

Following the conclusion of national negotiations last year, the National Employers having undertaken a longer-term review of the pay spine with Trade Unions, reached agreement on the rates of pay applicable from **1 April 2018** and **1 April 2019**.

The increases effective from 1 April 2018, implemented in June 2018, as a result of the National Agreement, were as follows:

- On SCP 6, £1,380 (equivalent to 9.191%)
- On SCP 7, £1,380 (equivalent to 9.130%)
- On SCP 8, £1,380 (equivalent to 9.052%)
- On SCP 9, £1,380 (equivalent to 8.976%)
- On SCP 10, £1,250 (equivalent to 8.006%)

- On SCP 11, £1,200 (equivalent to 7.592%)
- On SCP 12, £1,050 (equivalent to 6.512%)
- On SCP 13, £900 (equivalent to 5.458%)
- On SCP 14, £900 (equivalent to 5.363%)
- On SCP 15, £900 (equivalent to 5.272%)
- On SCP 16, £900 (equivalent to 5.167%)
- On SCP 17, £900 (equivalent to 5.064%)
- On SCP 18, £800 (equivalent to 4.427%)
- On SCP 19, £700 (equivalent to 3.734%)
- On SCPs 20 and above, 2.0%

Year two (2019) of the NJC pay agreement required a fundamental change to the pay model/spine which we operate and are familiar with. The national agreement is based on the following:

- A lowest pay rate of £9.00 per hour (£17,364) on new Spinal Column Point (SCP)1 (equivalent to old SCPs 6 & 7 );
- The 'pairing off' old SCPs 6-17 incl. to create new SCPs 1-6 inclusive;
- Equal steps of 2.0% between each new SCPs 1 to 22 incl. (equivalent to old SCPs 6-28 inclusive.);
- New SCPs 10, 13, 16, 18 and 21 are created to which no old SCPs will assimilate (by creating equal steps between these pay points); and
- A 2.0% pay increase on new SCPs 23 and above (equivalent to old SCPs 29 and above).

Accordingly, it is has been necessary to undertake detailed pay modelling to develop a new pay model which had to pass the tests of being legal and equitable, workable and sustainable, acceptable and affordable.

The new pay model was implemented in **July 2019**, backdated to **April 2019**.

As an employer we fully support the principle of the National Living Wage. The challenge arises from the lack of any national funding to support its introduction in the public services and within the sectors from which we commission services such as the social care sector. Given our difficult financial position this pay offer, if accepted, will only serve to put further pressure on our diminishing budgets.

## 12. Pension benefits

Where employees have exercised their statutory right to become members of the Local Government Pension Scheme, the Council is required to make a contribution to the scheme representing a percentage of the pensionable remuneration due under the contract of employment of that employee.

The rate of contribution is set by Actuaries advising the Clwyd Pension Fund and reviewed on a triennial basis in order to ensure the scheme is appropriately funded.

There are two sections to the LGPS - MAIN and 50/50. The main section is calculated using 1/49th of an individual's annual pensionable pay (CARE pay). The 50/50 section is a new option (since 01/04/2014). Employees who join this scheme, pay half contributions but build up half the normal pension. This is calculated using 1/98th of annual pensionable pay (CARE pay) instead of the 1/49th in the MAIN scheme.

The contribution rate provided for the LGPS is based on actual pensionable pay, and there are nine different contribution rates ranging from 5.5% to 12.5% in the MAIN scheme and 2.75% to 6.25% in the 50/50 scheme.

The Council has prepared a written statement of policy in relation to its exercise of certain discretionary functions, available under the LGPS regulations. The Council's Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Discretionary Pension Statement is detailed in Appendix 2.

## 13. Re-engagement of Chief Officers

No Chief Officer who was previously made redundant or granted early retirement from the Council will be later re-employed or re-engaged either as an employee (Contract of Service), as a Consultant (Contract for Service) or through an external contractor commission to work in behalf of the Council.

This is aligned to the principles applied within the Voluntary Redundancy Policy which provides that employees who voluntarily leave the Council's employment under the Scheme should not be re-engaged in any capacity within a period of 24 months from the end of their employment, save for exceptional circumstances and only if approved by the Chief Executive as Head of Paid Service.

#### 14. Partnership with Trade Unions

The Council will endeavor to maintain the constructive partnership approach it has developed with the recognised Trade Unions and will continue to work closely with them on pay issues.

#### 15. Future Legislation

The Council will comply with changes to legislation in relation to remuneration and exist payments requirements should legislation change.

#### 16. Monitoring, Evaluation and Review

This policy statement is subject to review on a minimum of an annual basis and the policy for the next financial year will be approved annually by 31st March. Should circumstances require, the policy can be amended during the course of the year subject to the same requirement of approval by full council.



## Appendix 1

### Salary Scales

#### Chief Executives and Chief Officers

<b>Grade</b>	<b>New Salary April 2019</b>	<b>Monthly Salary</b>
<b>CEO Point 01</b>	<b>£125,627.00</b>	£10,365.33
<b>CEO Point 02</b>	<b>£129,266.00</b>	£10,665.58
<b>CEO Point 03</b>	<b>£132,908.00</b>	£10,966.08
<b>CEO Point 04</b>	<b>£136,548.00</b>	£11,266.42
<b>New Chief Officer Point 1</b>	<b>£85,521.00</b>	£7,126.75
<b>New Chief Officer Point 2</b>	<b>£88,769.00</b>	£7,397.42
<b>New Chief Officer Point 3</b>	<b>£92,017.00</b>	£7,668.08
<b>New Chief Officer Point 4</b>	<b>£96,348.00</b>	£8,029.00

## New Flintshire County Council Pay Model (Green Book)

	JE Range	Grade	SCP	Annual Salary	Hourly Rate
<b>Officer Range</b>	<b>&lt;305</b>	<b>Grade 1</b> <i>(old A &amp; B)</i>	1	£17,364	£9.00
			2	£17,711	£9.18
			3	£18,065	£9.36
			4	£18,426	£9.55
	<b>306-369</b>	<b>Grade 2</b> <i>(old C &amp; D)</i>	5	£18,795	£9.74
			6	£19,171	£9.94
			7	£19,554	£10.14
			8	£19,953	£10.34
	<b>370-395</b>	<b>Grade 3</b> <i>(old E)</i>	9	£20,344	£10.54
			10	£20,751	£10.76
			11	£21,166	£10.97
			12	£21,589	£11.19
	<b>395-440</b>	<b>Grade 4</b> <i>(old F)</i>	15	£22,911	£11.88
			17	£23,836	£12.35
			19	£24,799	£12.85
			20	£25,295	£13.11
<b>Senior Officer Range</b>	<b>441-480</b>	<b>Grade 5</b> <i>(old G)</i>	24	£27,905	£14.46
			25	£28,785	£14.92
			26	£29,636	£15.36
			27	£30,507	£15.81
	<b>481-525</b>	<b>Grade 6</b> <i>(old H)</i>	28	£31,371	£16.26
			29	£32,029	£16.60
			30	£32,878	£17.04
			31	£33,799	£17.52
			32	£34,788	£18.03
			33	£35,934	£18.63
<b>Manager Range</b>	<b>526-560</b>	<b>Grade 7</b> <i>(old I)</i>	34	£36,876	£19.11
			35	£37,849	£19.62
			36	£38,813	£20.12
			37	£39,782	£20.62
	<b>561-595</b>	<b>Grade 8</b> <i>(old J)</i>	38	£40,760	£21.13
			39	£41,675	£21.60
			40	£42,683	£22.12
			41	£43,662	£22.63
	<b>596-635</b>	<b>Grade 9</b> <i>(old K)</i>	42	£44,632	£23.13
			43	£45,591	£23.63
			44	£46,532	£24.13
			45	£47,557	£24.75
<b>Senior Manager Range</b>	<b>636-685</b>	<b>Grade 10</b> <i>(old L)</i>	46	£49,025	£25.41
			47	£50,326	£26.08
			48	£51,665	£26.78
			49	£53,042	£27.49
	<b>686-729</b>	<b>Grade 11</b> <i>(old N &amp; M)</i>	50	£54,442	£28.22
			51	£55,887	£28.97
			52	£57,370	£29.73
			53	£58,891	£30.52
	<b>&gt;730</b>	<b>Grade 12</b>	54	£60,449	£31.29
58			£67,119	£34.79	
			59	£68,898	£35.71

		(New Grade)	<b>60</b>	<b>£70,724</b>	<b>£36.66</b>
			<b>61</b>	<b>£72,598</b>	<b>£37.63</b>

### Assistant Educational Psychologists

Spinal Column Point	Previous Salary 1 September 2018	New Salary 1 September 2019	Monthly Salary
<b>01</b>	£28,783.00	<b>£29,359.00</b>	£2,446.58
<b>02</b>	£29,959.00	<b>£30,559.00</b>	£2,546.58
<b>03</b>	£31,134.00	<b>£31,757.00</b>	£2,646.42
<b>04</b>	£32,303.00	<b>£32,950.00</b>	£2,745.83

### Educational Psychologists

Spinal Column Point	Previous Salary 1 September 2018	New Salary 1 September 2019	Monthly Salary
<b>01</b>	£36,446.00	<b>£37,175.00</b>	£3,097.92
<b>02</b>	£38,296.00	<b>£39,062.00</b>	£3,255.17
<b>03</b>	£40,146.00	<b>£40,949.00</b>	£3,412.42
<b>04</b>	£41,994.00	<b>£42,834.00</b>	£3,569.50
<b>05</b>	£43,844.00	<b>£44,721.00</b>	£3,726.75
<b>06</b>	£45,693.00	<b>£46,607.00</b>	£3,883.92
<b>07</b>	£47,434.00	<b>£48,383.00</b>	£4,031.92
<b>08</b>	£49,175.00	<b>£50,159.00</b>	£4,179.92
<b>09</b>	£50,806.00	<b>£51,822.00</b>	£4,318.50
<b>10</b>	£52,439.00	<b>£53,488.00</b>	£4,457.33
<b>11</b>	£53,961.00	<b>£55,040.00</b>	£4,586.67

### Senior and Professional Educational Psychologists

Spinal Column Point	Previous Salary 1 September 2018	New Salary 1 September 2019	Monthly Salary
<b>01</b>	<b>£45,693.00</b>	<b>£46,607</b>	£3,883.91
<b>02</b>	<b>£47,434.00</b>	<b>£48,383</b>	£4031.91
<b>03</b>	<b>£49,175.00</b>	<b>£50,159</b>	£4,179.91
<b>04</b>	<b>£50,806.00</b>	<b>£51,822</b>	£4,318.50
<b>05</b>	<b>£52,439.00</b>	<b>£53,488</b>	£4,457.33
<b>06</b>	<b>£53,961.00</b>	<b>£55,040</b>	£4,586.66
<b>07</b>	<b>£54,586.00</b>	<b>£55,678</b>	£4,639.83

08	£55,754.00	£56,869	£4,739.08
09	£56,911.00	£58,050	£4,837.50
10	£58,089.00	£59,251	£4,937.58
11	£59,243.00	£60,428	£5,035.66
12	£60,420.00	£61,628	£5,135.66
13	£61,617.00	£62,849	£5,237.41
14	£62,774.00	£64,029	£5,335.75
15	£63,986.00	£65,266	£5,438.83

### Educational Improvement Professionals (Soulbury)

Spinal Column Point	Previous Salary 1 September 2018	New Salary 1 September 2019	Monthly Salary
01	£34,749.00	£35,444.00	£2,953.67
02	£35,993.00	£36,713.00	£3,059.42
03	£37,168.00	£37,912.00	£3,159.33
04	£38,359.00	£39,127.00	£3,260.58
05	£39,543.00	£40,334.00	£3,361.17
06	£40,727.00	£41,542.00	£3,461.83
07	£41,971.00	£42,811.00	£3,567.58
08	£43,168.00	£44,032.00	£3,669.33
09	£44,563.00	£45,455.00	£3,787.92
10	£45,807.00	£46,724.00	£3,893.67
11	£47,035.00	£47,976.00	£3,998.00
12	£48,223.00	£49,188.00	£4,099.00
13	£49,569.00	£50,561.00	£4,213.42
14	£50,769.00	£51,785.00	£4,315.42
15	£52,095.00	£53,137.00	£4,428.08
16	£53,293.00	£54,359.00	£4,529.92
17	£54,495.00	£55,585.00	£4,632.08
18	£55,674.00	£56,788.00	£4,732.33
19	£56,891.00	£58,029.00	£4,835.75
20	£57,519.00	£58,670.00	£4,889.17
21	£58,727.00	£59,902.00	£4,991.83
22	£59,780.00	£60,976.00	£5,081.33
23	£60,939.00	£62,158.00	£5,179.83
24	£61,978.00	£63,218.00	£5,268.17
25	£63,089.00	£64,351.00	£5,362.58
26	£64,173.00	£65,457.00	£5,454.75
27	£65,282.00	£66,588.00	£5,549.00
28	£66,405.00	£67,734.00	£5,644.50
29	£67,532.00	£68,883.00	£5,740.25
30	£68,656.00	£70,030.00	£5,835.83

## Young Peoples / Community Service Manager (Y&C Officers)

Spinal Column Point	Previous Salary 1 September 2018	New Salary 1 September 2019	Monthly Salary
01	£36,040.00	<b>£36,761.00</b>	£3,063.42
02	£37,219.00	<b>£37,964.00</b>	£3,163.67
03	£38,398.00	<b>£39,166.00</b>	£3,263.83
04*	£39,601.00	<b>£40,394.00</b>	£3,366.17
05	£40,824.00	<b>£41,641.00</b>	£3,470.08
06	£42,016.00	<b>£42,857.00</b>	£3,571.42
07**	£43,236.00	<b>£44,101.00</b>	£3,675.08
08	£44,622.00	<b>£45,515.00</b>	£3,792.92
09	£45,387.00	<b>£46,295.00</b>	£3,857.92
10	£46,568.00	<b>£47,500.00</b>	£3,958.33
11	£47,742.00	<b>£48,697.00</b>	£4,058.08
12	£48,918.00	<b>£49,897.00</b>	£4,158.08
13	£50,086.00	<b>£51,088.00</b>	£4,257.33
14	£51,265.00	<b>£52,291.00</b>	£4,357.58
15	£52,446.00	<b>£53,495.00</b>	£4,457.92
16	£53,630.00	<b>£54,703.00</b>	£4,558.58
17	£54,820.00	<b>£55,917.00</b>	£4,659.75
18	£56,003.00	<b>£57,124.00</b>	£4,760.33
19	£57,179.00	<b>£58,323.00</b>	£4,860.25
20***	£58,380.00	<b>£59,548.00</b>	£4,962.33
21***	£59,604.00	<b>£60,797.00</b>	£5,066.41
22***	£60,857.00	<b>£62,075.00</b>	£5,172.91
23***	£62,134.00	<b>£63,377.00</b>	£5,281.41
24***	£63,438.00	<b>£64,707.00</b>	£5,392.25

\*normal minimum point for senior youth and community service officers undertaking the full range of duties at this level.

\*\*normal minimum point for principal youth and community service officer undertaking the full range of duties at this level.

\*\*\*extension to range to accommodate discretionary scale points and structured professional assessments.

## Youth Worker Payscale

Spinal Column Point	New Salary 1 September 2019	Monthly Salary
03	£18,117.00	£1,509.75
04	£18,431.00	£1,535.92
05	£18,791.00	£1,565.92
06	£19,106.00	£1,592.17
07	£19,389.00	£1,615.75
08	£20,039.00	£1,669.83
09	£20,865.00	£1,738.75
10	£21,512.00	£1,792.67
11	£22,558.00	£1,879.83
12	£23,580.00	£1,965.00
13	£24,636.00	£2,053.00
14	£25,729.00	£2,144.08
15	£26,474.00	£2,206.17
16	£27,252.00	£2,271.00
17	£28,017.00	£2,334.75
18	£28,787.00	£2,398.92
19	£29,551.00	£2,462.58
20	£30,318.00	£2,526.50
21	£31,179.00	£2,598.25
22	£32,155.00	£2,679.58
23	£33,105.00	£2,758.75
24	£34,060.00	£2,838.33
25	£35,022.00	£2,918.50
26	£35,983.00	£2,998.58
27	£36,945.00	£3,078.75
28	£37,918.00	£3,159.83
29	£38,884.00	£3,240.33
30	£39,851.00	£3,320.92

## Appendix 2

### Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Discretionary Pension Statement

#### **PART A**

The regulations of the LGPS require every employer to

- (i) issue a written policy statement on how it will exercise the various discretions provided by the scheme,
- (ii) keep it under review and
- (iii) revise it as necessary.

This document meets these requirements stating the regulation requirement and the organisation decision on these.

These discretions are subject to change, either in line with any change in regulations or by due consideration by Flintshire County Council. These provisions do not confer any contractual rights.

#### **Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013 and the Local Government Pension Scheme (Transitional Provisions and Savings) Regulations 2014**

1.0 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2014 Regulation 16 (2) (e) & 16 (4) (d) (purchasing additional pensions)

An employer may choose to contribute to a Shared Cost Additional Pension Contribution (APC) scheme in certain circumstances. In the case of an employee paying APCs to buy any or all the 'lost' pension for a period of authorised unpaid leave of absence (including any period of unpaid additional maternity, paternity or adoption leave), the employer shall pay 2/3rds of the cost of the APC (election by the employee to buy back lost membership must be made within 30 days of returning to work). This is known as a Shared Cost Additional Pension Contribution (SCAPC).

Where the absence is in relation to a trade dispute, the employee meets 100% of the cost.

If an employee chooses to make a one off contribution or regular additional contributions in order to buy a set amount of additional pension. It is possible for an employer to contribute towards the cost of purchasing such pension on a voluntary basis. The split between an employee's and employers' additional contributions for an SCAPC can be any ratio as agreed but not 100% cost to the employer.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**Due to potential cost burden Flintshire County Council will not contribute towards the cost of the employee (purchasing additional pension).**

1.1 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2014 Regulation 30 (6) & Transitional Regulation 11 (2) (flexible retirement)

*An employer may allow a member of the pension scheme who has attained the age of 55 to reduce the hours he / she works, or the grade in which he / she is employed and gain access to some or all of their pension benefits.*

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**Flintshire County Council have a policy on Flexible Retirement which requires a minimum reduction of 20% in hours/salary with no backfill arrangements.**

**An employee who is Aged 55 and over may request flexible retirement and each case will be considered on its own merits following full consideration of all financial and service delivery implications via a retirement panel.**

**This does not preclude younger employees, under 55 years of age requesting flexible working but without the payment of their retirement benefits.**

**The Council may review its policy at any time.**

1.2 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2014 Regulation 30 (8) (flexible retirement)

*A member of the pension scheme who has attained the age of 55 and with his / her employer's consent, reduces the hours he / she works, or the grade in which he / she is employed, may make a request in writing to receive all or part of his / her benefits under the Benefits Regulations.*

*If the benefits are reduced in accordance with guidance issued by the Government Actuary, the employer may agree to waive, in whole or in part, any such reduction.*

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is not the policy of Flintshire County Council to waive, in whole or in part any actuarial reduction resulting from Flexible Retirement.**

1.3 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2014 Regulation 30 (8) (early retirement)

An employer may waive, in whole or in part, actuarial reduction on benefits which a member voluntarily withdraws before normal pension age.



Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**Flintshire County Council have a policy on Early Retirement. Any employee from their 55th birthday can voluntarily retire and access their benefits with an actuarial reduction.**

**An employee may request that Flintshire County Council waive in full or in part their reduction on compelling compassionate grounds only. Each case will be considered on its own merits following full consideration of all financial and service delivery implications via a retirement panel.**

**The Council may review its policy at any time**

1.4 LGPS (Transitional Provisions, Savings and Amendment) Regulations 2014, Schedule 2 – (85 Year Rule)

The “85 Year Rule”, where a member’s service and age equal 85, can be activated for individual members, prior to age 60 in the case of Early Retirement, the cost of which can be borne, in full or in part, by the employer.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**Employees can request that the Flintshire County Council to apply the 85 year rule, if they are eligible. To be eligible, the employee's LGPS Service pre 1st April 2014 and their age must equal 85 years or more, and they must have joined the pension scheme before 1st October 2006.**

**Flintshire County Council will approve the ‘switch on’ of the 85 year rule in cases where there is no cost to the employer, allowing the member to take their benefits early with some actuarial reduction.**

**The Council may review its policy at any time.**

1.5 LGPS (Transitional Provisions, Savings and Amendment) Regulations 2014, Schedule 2 – (waiving reductions)

It is an employer’s discretion review applications for waiving the reductions applied to benefits from pre 1 April 2014 membership where an employer has switched on the rule of 85 for a member voluntarily drawing benefits on or after age 55 but before age 60.

**If it is agreed to apply the '85 year rule', Flintshire County Council may waive the actuarial reduction in full or in part following careful consideration of the financial implications and affordability. *Each case will be considered on its own merits following full consideration of all financial and service delivery implications via a retirement panel.***

**The Council may review its policy at any time.**

1.6 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2014 Regulation 31

From 1 April 2014, an employer may grant additional pension up to a maximum of £6,500. The decision to award additional pension can be made only in respect of an employee who is an active member of the LGPS, or within 6 months of leaving employment if the reason for leaving was redundancy or business efficiency.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

***It is not the policy of Flintshire County Council to award additional pension***

**PART B - Discretionary policies relating to earlier Scheme rules**

1.1 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2007  
Regulation 12

An employer may increase (i.e. augment) the total membership of an employee who is currently paying contributions to the Scheme, for example, to enhance a redundancy package for staff with scarce and/or key skills. The member's (of the pension scheme) increase in membership under this regulation (including additional membership in respect of different employments) must not exceed 10 years or go beyond age 75 if retiring after age 65. This discretion is spent entirely after 30/09/14.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is not the policy of Flintshire County Council to augment pension.**

2.2 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2007  
Regulation 30 (2) (deferred pension)

It is an employer's discretion review applications from former employee's for releasing the deferred benefits on or after age 55 but before age 60.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**Flintshire County Council will only consider a request to waive an actuarial reduction, either in full or in part only in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis.**

2.3 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2007  
Regulation 30 (5) (deferred pension)

It is an employer's discretion to review applications for waiving the reductions applied to benefits where an employer has agreed to release the deferred benefits on or after age 55.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**Flintshire County Council will only consider a request to waive an actuarial reduction, either in full or in part only in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis.**

2.4 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2007  
Regulation 30A (3) (deferred pension)

It is an employer's discretion review applications from former employee's for releasing the deferred benefits on or after age 55 but before age 60 following a suspended ill health pension.

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is not the policy of the Flintshire County Council to waive the actuarial reduction on early payment of a deferred pension unless there are compelling, compassionate\* reasons to do so and there is no cost to the Council.**

2.5 LGPS (Benefits, Membership and Contributions) Regulations 2007 Regulation 47

*A scheme member who meets the normal criteria for a refund of pension contributions is not entitled to such a refund if he/she left his/her employment because of:*

- *An offence of fraudulent character – unless the employer directs that a total or partial refund may be made to the member.*
- *Grave misconduct – unless the employer directs that a total or partial refund may be made to the member, his/her spouse, civil partner nominated cohabiting partner or any dependant of his/her.*

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is not the policy of Flintshire County Council to allow a refund in the circumstances above.**

PART C

3.1 Background

There are a further five discretions that are not compulsory to include in the Policy Statement but that are recommended to be included:

### 3.2LGPS (Administration) Regulations 2008 Regulation 22 (2)

*A scheme member may elect to pay optional contributions to cover a period of absence from work providing the option is made within 30 days of return to work or cessation of employment or such longer period as the employer allows.*

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is the policy of Flintshire County Council to consider an extension in cases where the member of staff was not notified of their rights to pay contributions in respect of a period of absence before returning to work, or ceasing to be employed without returning to work. The extension would be for one month from the date that they were notified of their right to pay.**

3.3 LGPS (Administration) Regulations 2008 Regulation 83 (8)

*If a scheme member wishes to transfer pension into the LGPS he/she must opt to do so within 12 months of joining the LGPS or such longer period as the employer may allow.*

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is not the policy of Flintshire County Council to consider extending the time limit for a transfer in of previous pension rights to proceed after twelve months.**

3.4 LGPS (Administration) Regulations 2008 Regulation 25 (3)

*Where the member's employing authority contributes to the scheme, the additional voluntary contributions arrangement is to be known as a shared cost additional voluntary contributions arrangement and contributions to it as "SCAVCs".*

Details of Policy Concerning Resolution

**It is not the policy of Flintshire County Council to contribute towards a shared cost additional voluntary contributions scheme.**

3.5 LGPS (Benefits, Membership & Contribution) Regulations 2007 Regulation 3 (4)

*Where a member is employed in any employment for part only of any financial year, the range (and the contribution rate) applicable to him/her are those that would have applied had he/she been so employed for the whole of that financial year.*

**The tiered contribution rate for each employee will be based on the pensionable pay elements. Basic salary is assessed at the full time equivalent rate, in each post an employee holds at 1 April.**

The contribution rate will be re-assessed annually on implementation/application (regardless of when the award is made) of the annual pay award. Re-assessment will take place at any point in the year in the following circumstances:-

- Promotion
- Demotion
- Incremental progression
- Pay award
- Acting up starts/Acting up ceases
- Contractual Allowance starts/Contractual Allowance ceases

This page is intentionally left blank



## Flintshire County Council Green Book Pay Model 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019

JE Range	Grade	SCP	Annual Salary	Hourly Rate
<305	<b>Grade 1</b> <i>(old A &amp; B)</i>	1	£17,364	£9.00
		2	£17,711	£9.18
		3	£18,065	£9.36
		4	£18,426	£9.55
306-369	<b>Grade 2</b> <i>(old C &amp; D)</i>	5	£18,795	£9.74
		6	£19,171	£9.94
		7	£19,554	£10.14
		8	£19,945	£10.34
370-395	<b>Grade 3</b> <i>(old E)</i>	9	£20,344	£10.54
		10	£20,751	£10.76
		11	£21,166	£10.97
		12	£21,589	£11.19
395-440	<b>Grade 4</b> <i>(old F)</i>	15	£22,911	£11.88
		17	£23,836	£12.35
		19	£24,799	£12.85
		20	£25,295	£13.11
441-480	<b>Grade 5</b> <i>(old G)</i>	24	£27,905	£14.46
		25	£28,785	£14.92
		26	£29,636	£15.36
		27	£30,507	£15.81
481-525	<b>Grade 6</b> <i>(old H)</i>	28	£31,371	£16.26
		29	£32,029	£16.60
		30	£32,878	£17.04
		31	£33,799	£17.52
526-560	<b>Grade 7</b> <i>(old I)</i>	32	£34,788	£18.03
		33	£35,934	£18.63
		34	£36,876	£19.11
		35	£37,849	£19.62
561-595	<b>Grade 8</b> <i>(old J)</i>	36	£38,813	£20.12
		37	£39,782	£20.62
		38	£40,760	£21.13
		39	£41,675	£21.60
596-635	<b>Grade 9</b> <i>(old K)</i>	40	£42,683	£22.12
		41	£43,662	£22.63
		42	£44,632	£23.13
		43	£45,591	£23.63
636-685	<b>Grade 10</b> <i>(old L)</i>	45	£47,757	£24.75
		46	£49,025	£25.41
		47	£50,326	£26.08
		48	£51,665	£26.78
686-729	<b>Grade 11</b> <i>(old N &amp; M)</i>	50	£54,442	£28.22
		51	£55,887	£28.97
		52	£57,370	£29.73
		53	£58,891	£30.52
>730	<b>Grade 12</b> <i>(New Grade)</i>	58	£67,119	£34.79
		59	£68,898	£35.71
		60	£70,724	£36.66
		61	£72,598	£37.63

This page is intentionally left blank