

A Review of Members' Allowances

For

Rushmoor Borough Council

**The Eighth Report by the Independent
Remuneration Panel**

**Stuart Elsdon
Dr Declan Hall (Chair)
Alan Thorpe**

January 2026

Executive Summary: Recommendations

Rushmoor BC Review 2026	Basic Allowance and SRAs:			
	Recommended Maximum Payable 2026/27			
POSITION	Nos. Paid	Basic Allowance	Total P/Member (BA+SRA)	Sub Total Per Category
BASIC ALLOWANCE	39	£6,813	£6,813	£265,707
Special Responsibility Allowances	Standing SRAs	SRAs 2026/27		
Leader of Council	1	£18,900	£25,713	£18,900
Deputy Leader of Council	1	£10,878	£17,691	£10,878
Cabinet Members	4	£9,395	£16,208	£37,580
Chair Development Management Committee	1	£6,374	£13,187	£6,374
Chair Audit & Governance Committee*	1	£4,726	£11,539	£4,726
Chair Overview & Scrutiny Committee	1	£4,726	£11,539	£4,726
Chair Policy & Project Advisory Board	1	£4,726	£11,539	£4,726
Chair Licensing & Corporate Business Committee**	1	£2,835	£9,648	£2,835
Cabinet Champions	3	£1,923	£8,736	£5,769
Chair of Council (Mayor)	1	£2,835	£9,648	£2,835
Main Opposition Group Leader	1	£4,726	£11,539	£4,726
Other Opposition Group Leader[s] If have >3 Members	1	£2,835	£9,648	£2,835
Licensing Members serving > 4 Sub-Committees per year	Variable	£549	NA	Variable
Sub Total - Basic Allowance	39			£265,707
Sub Total - Standing SRAs	17			£106,910
Total (BA + SRAs)				£372,617
* SRA to be paid from 26 November 2025				
** SRA to be paid from 21 October 2025				

Other Recommendations: The IRP also recommends that:

Basic Allowance – continuing to include Information Technology & Telecommunications (ITT) costs

The current Basic Allowance continues to cover Members personal Information Technology & Telecommunications costs.

Where there are two or more Main Opposition Groups of equal size

Where there are two Main Opposition Groups of equal size then the SRAs paid to the Leader of Main Opposition Group and Leader of the Minority Opposition Group are aggregated and then divided by two, equating to £3,781 apiece. The same principle should also apply where there are three or more Main Opposition Groups of the same size. In this scenario the qualifying criteria of having a minimum of four Group Members does not apply.

SRAs considered but not recommended

The following roles are not paid an SRA:

- **To the Group Whips.**
- **To the two Vice-Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and two Vice-Chairs of the Policy and Project Advisory Board**

Co-optees' Allowances

The Co-optees' Allowance is maintained at £604, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.

Remuneration for the Independent Person (IP)

The annual remuneration of the Independent Person for Rushmoor Borough Council remains at £604, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.

The Allowances for expenses: Travel and Subsistence Allowances

The conditions and maximum rates under which the Travel and Subsistence Allowances can be claimed are maintained, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.

The Dependants' Carers' Allowance (DCA)

The DCA is maintained at the current rates and terms and conditions subject to any applicable indexation going forward and the following amendments:

- That the DCA should be clarified that where a Member seeks to claim reimbursement for childcare costs that they are able to claim for informal childcare upon the production of a receipt

- That Schedule 2 of the Allowances Scheme is amended to state that it also includes the approved duties for which the DCA is claimed within the Borough

Confirmation of Indexing

The following allowances are indexed for four years (the maximum period permitted under the 2003 Regulations before the Council has to seek further advice from the IRP) from 2025/26 to 2028/29, as follows:

- **Basic Allowance, SRAs and Co-optees' Allowances:**
 - Updated annually in line with the annual percentage pay increase given to Rushmoor Borough Council employees (and rounded to the nearest £) as agreed for each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Staff as agreed at SCP 43.
- **Out of Council Area Mileage Allowance:**
 - Indexed to the Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) Approved Mileage Allowance Payments (AMAP) mileage rates.
- **Out of Council Area Other Travel and Subsistence:**
 - Reimbursement of actual costs taking into account the most cost effective means of transport and/or accommodation available and the convenience of use with the maximum rates indexed to the same periodic percentage increase that may be applied to Officer Subsistence Allowances.
- **Dependants' Carers' Allowance (DCA):**
 - The maximum hourly rates to be indexed to the government's national living wage applicable to the age of the carer (childcare) and Hampshire County Council's hourly rate for a Home Care Assistance (care of other dependants).

Implementation

The new scheme of allowances based on the recommendations contained in this report is adopted from the date of the Annual Meeting on 26th May 2026 with the following exceptions:

- The recommended SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee – to be implemented from the date the Chair took up the post of this Committee on 26 November 2025
- The recommended SRA for the Chair of the Licensing & Corporate Business Committee – to be implemented from the date the Chair took up the post of this Committee on 21 October 2025

**Independent Remuneration Panel:
The Eighth Report of Members' Allowances
For
Rushmoor Borough Council
January 2026**

Introduction: The Regulatory Context

1. This report contains the recommendations arising out of the independent review, December 2025, of Members' Allowances for Rushmoor Borough Council by the Council's statutory Independent Remuneration Panel ('IRP' or 'Panel'). It also lays out the deliberations of the IRP to show elected Members, Officers and the public the rationale for the Panel's recommendations.
2. The Panel was convened under The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 1021) (the 2003 Regulations). These regulations, arising out of the relevant provisions in the Local Government Act 2000, require all local authorities to maintain an independent remuneration panel to review and provide advice on the Council's Members Allowances. This is in the context whereby the Council retains powers to determine the scope and levels of Members' Allowances.
3. All Councils are required to convene their IRP and seek its advice before they make any changes or amendments to their Members' Allowances Scheme. They must 'pay regard' to their IRP's recommendations before setting a new or amended Members' Allowances Scheme. On this particular occasion, the IRP has been reconvened under the 2003 Regulations [10. (5)], which states:

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

4. It is this mechanism, known as the '4 year rule', that ensures IRPs are convened at least every four years if a council wishes to continue indexing their allowances. It also provides an opportunity for IRPs to publicly scrutinise their councils' allowances schemes and enhance public accountability. It is under this requirement that the

Panel has undertaken this review of members' allowances for Rushmoor Borough Council.

Terms of Reference

5. In accordance with the requirements of 2003 Members' Allowances Regulations Rushmoor Borough Council has reconvened its statutory Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to review the Council Members' Allowances Scheme. Specifically the Panel has been asked to make recommendations to the Council on the following:

- a) The amount of the Basic Allowance that should be payable to elected Members;
- b) The responsibilities or duties for which should lead to the payment of a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) and as to the amount of such an allowance;
- c) The responsibilities or duties for which travelling and subsistence allowances can be paid and as to the amount of such allowances;
- d) whether a Co-optees' Allowance should be paid and as to the amount of such an allowance;
- e) Whether a Dependants' Carers' Allowance should be payable to elected Members, and as to the amount of such an allowance;
- f) Whether, in the event that the scheme is amended at any time so as to affect an allowance payable for the year in which the amendment is made, payment of allowances may be backdated in accordance with regulation 10(6);
- g) Whether adjustments to the level of allowances may be determined according to an index and if so which index and how long that index should apply, subject to a maximum of four years, before its application is reviewed;

6. In addition the IRP has been asked to consider a number of Rushmoor Borough Council Specific requirements, namely:

- a) To consider the level of allowances within the Scheme in the context of the need for financial sustainability requiring reductions to base budget over time
- b) To review the SRAs for Chairs of Committees particularly in light of changes to the committee structure

- c) To review the allowances for Member Champions
- d) To benchmark the existing allowances scheme including special responsibility allowances.
- e) To check that the Basic Allowance continues to make appropriate allowances provision for IT and Telecommunications
- f) Review the allowance provision for IT and telecommunications and to consider the implications for the Members' Allowances scheme if the Council introduces an arrangement to provide Members with IT equipment.
- g) To check that allowances for the Co-opted Members of the Audit & Governance Committee and Designated Independent Person (IP) are appropriately paid at the Co-opted Member rate.

The IRP

7. Rushmoor Borough Council reconvened its IRP and the following Members were appointed to carry out the independent review of allowances, namely:
- Stuart Elsdon: Owner of a local IT company and a former trustee of a number of local charities
 - Dr Declan Hall (Chair): A former academic at the Institute of Local Government, The University of Birmingham, now an independent consultant specialising in Members' Allowances and support with experience of reviews across the United Kingdom
 - Alan Thorpe: Chartered Accountant by profession, worked mainly for British Aerospace and Computer Sciences Corporation in various finance roles and currently Treasurer for Rushmoor Voluntary Services
8. Logistical and practical support to the Panel was provided by Jill Shuttleworth, Corporate Manager – Democracy and Deputy Monitoring Officer and Adele Taylor, Team Leader – Members Services, at Rushmoor Borough Council.

Process and Methodology - Evidence Reviewed by the IRP

9. The IRP met at the Council Offices, Farnborough on 10th and 11th December 2025. The meetings were in private session to enable the IRP to meet with Members and Officers and conduct deliberations in confidence. In accordance with the terms of

reference, in arriving at its recommendations, the IRP took into account a wide range of evidence, both oral and written. All Members who wished to meet with the IRP were accommodated as far as practically possible. In addition all Members were sent a short questionnaire so that no Member was denied a voice in the course of review. The IRP received one written response. The questionnaire was also used as the template for Member interviews to ensure a common set of questions were being asked.

10. The IRP also met with relevant Officers for factual briefings on the Council, governance structures and challenges facing the Council.
11. The IRP also reviewed relevant written information, such as council and committee meetings schedules, relevant reports and information on the new governance arrangements, the 2006 Statutory Guidance on Members' Allowances, etc.
12. For full details of whom the IRP met and full range of information reviewed see:
 - Appendix 1: for Members who met with the IRP
 - Appendix 2: for Officers who provided factual briefings to the IRP
 - Appendix 3: for a list of the full range of evidence considered by the IRP
 - Appendix 3: for more details on the Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances (2025/26) paid in the 11 Hampshire District Councils and the three District Councils adjacent to Rushmoor BC referred to by the IRP for benchmarking purposes, referred to as the benchmarking group.¹

Key Messages and Observations – Case for change - limited

13. A case can be made to revise most the allowances currently payable, albeit not an overwhelming case. However, by and large the IRP did not receive a great deal of feedback that the allowances scheme was in need of fundamental reform. The broad view was that the allowances scheme and levels of allowance were appropriate, with some exceptions. The IRP also received the message that even where there was a case for change now was not the time to do so due to the budgetary constraints facing the Council, and the need to find savings going forward. Indeed the IRP notes that the need to be cognisant of the broader financial context is in its terms of reference. While the IRP has not been driven by financial constraints, indeed the recommendations will marginally increase the cost of allowances by just

¹ The IRP has maintained its benchmarking group consisting of the 11 Hampshire District Councils and three District Councils adjacent to Rushmoor BC as the most relevant comparator group or peer councils. The South East Employers annual survey of allowances was not fully utilised for this review, partly due to the unreliability of some of the data, which in turn arises out of the survey being filled in by the districts with no cross referencing for veracity.

over £2k, it has reinforced the key message that now is not the time to fundamentally revise all the allowances currently payable.

Minority view expressed to the IRP – abolish or drastically reduce all SRAs

14. The IRP acknowledges a minority view expressed, namely that the financial context meant that all SRAs currently payable should be abolished or at least drastically reduced by over 50-70 per cent. The IRP has not taken this view on board. To do so would automatically lead to recommending lower SRAs which would undermine the whole purpose of a Members' Allowances scheme, which is to support the roles that all elected Members are required to undertake. It would in effect put in place a financial barrier to being a Member who holds a post of responsibility.
15. This IRP has always sought to work on the guiding principle that allowances should seek to minimise financial barriers to being and remaining a Member while not standing for or remaining on Council for financial gain. By and large the Basic Allowance and majority of SRAs payable are not for most people a barrier to public service.

Questioning the roles in place

16. The IRP did receive a number of comments that questioned the necessity of certain posts. It is beyond the remit of the IRP to comment on how the Council has set up its political governance structures. All it can do is make recommendations regarding the posts that are in place.

Prime Function of this review – to address anomalies

17. Despite the recommendations leading to a marginal increase on the total spend on Members' Allowances, the IRP feels that its recommendations are justifiable, defensible and fair and equitable which in turn was another key message emerging from the representations received.
18. As such the main task of the IRP has been not to fundamentally restructure the allowances scheme but to address anomalies arising in the current scheme.

Recommendations – recalibrating the Basic Allowance

19. To test the robustness of the 2025/26 Basic Allowance (£6,813) the IRP has recalibrated the Basic Allowance by replicating the original methodology that forms the basis of the current Basic Allowance. This methodology is laid out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance (paragraph 67) which states:

Having established what local councillors do, and the hours which are devoted to these tasks the local authorities will need to take a view on the rate at which, and the number of hours for which, councillors ought to be remunerated.

20. The Statutory Guidance (paragraphs 68-69) expands on the above statement by breaking it down to three variables for Panels to consider in arriving at a recommended Basic Allowance, namely time taken to fulfil all the roles of a backbench Member, an element of public service to be recognised in the Basic Allowance and a rate of remuneration. The IRP has recalibrated the Basic Allowance by bringing the three operative variables up to date as set out below.

Time required in carrying out duties associated with the Basic Allowance

21. The Basic Allowance is primarily a time-based payment (see 2006 Statutory Guidance paragraph 10). Obviously Members work in different ways and have varying commitments and the time spent on council duties varies. Yet, the Basic Allowance is a flat rate allowance that must be paid equally to all Members in the first instance so the time assessment is typically taken to be that which is deemed necessary at a minimum to carry out all those duties for which the Basic Allowance is paid, including preparing for and attending meetings of the Council and its committees/panels (formal and informal), addressing constituents' concerns, representing and engaging with local communities, external appointments and other associated work including telephone calls, emails and meetings with Officers.
22. Historically, based on Member feedback, for the purposes of recalibrating the Basic Allowance in line with the 2006 Statutory Guidance the IRP has adopted 12.5 hours per week, or 650 hours per year, as the expected time input from Members in return for the Basic Allowance. The LGA 2022 Councillor Census shows that on average Members of district councils who hold no positions of responsibility put in 15.2 hours per week on "Council business". The IRP has decided to maintain the expected time input at 12.5 hours per week as the Councillors Census figure of 15.2 hours per week would be bumped up by those individuals who choose to put in more time than was necessarily required. Thus, this average figure is inflated by those who have the capacity and wherewithal to put in more time than demanded.
23. Moreover, in the feedback from Members to the IRP on this issue the reported time requirement while ranging from anywhere from 6-20 hours per week, with the majority view being between 10-15 hours per week. By maintaining a time expectation of 12.5 hours per week, it represents the mid-point of the main range expressed by Members to the IRP.
24. Thus, for the purposes of recalibrating the Basic Allowance the IRP has maintained the time assessment of 12.5 hours per week as the required minimum input per week on average for a Member to fulfil all duties associated with the Basic Allowance. This equates to 650 hours per year.

The Public Service Discount (PSD)

25. The 2006 Statutory Guidance advises that not all the time expected from Members should be remunerated to recognise there is a public service element to being an elected Member. To recognise the public service principle an element should be unpaid, known as the Public Service Discount (PSD). The normal range for this public service discount is between 35% - 40%, largely on the basis this is broadly in line with the proportion of time backbenchers spend dealing with constituents and ward issues and local and community matters. The historical PSD that has been applied in Rushmoor Borough Council is 40%. The IRP received no evidence to revise this historical figure.
26. Thus, of the expected time input of 650 hours per year 40% of that time, or 260 hours per year, are deemed to be public service and not paid, leaving 390 remunerated hours per year.

The rate for remuneration

27. This variable refers to the worth of a Councillor's time. The IRP has historically based the rate for remuneration on the average earnings of the full time employed residents of the Borough as the figure that is the most robust and readily defensible. The most recent data available shows that in 2024 the median hourly earnings (excluding overtime) of Borough residents who are in full time employment is £17.85.²
28. Following the methodology as set out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance with the updated variables produces the following recalibrated Basic Allowance:
- 650 annual hours minus 40% PSD (260 hours)
 - = 390 remunerated hours multiplied by £17.85 per hour
 - = £6,962
29. Thus, by recalibrating the Basic Allowance which arrives at a figure of £6,962, while slightly above the current Basic Allowance payable (£6,813), the IRP considered the difference so marginal as not to be of significance.

Benchmarking the Basic Allowance

30. As a further test of the current validity of the current Basic Allowance (£6,813) the IRP carried out a benchmarking exercise, against all 11 Hampshire Boroughs/Districts and the three geographically adjacent Districts as well as the

² This is based on median weekly earnings of £713.80 which equates to £17.85 per hour when divided by 40 working hours in a week. See Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), Table 8.2a, Weekly pay – excluding overtime – for full time employee jobs (home geography), Office of National Statistics, provisional results 2024. The ONS advises that the median rather than the mean figure is a better measure of the average due handful of very high earners which skews the statistical mean.

summary of the South East Employers (SEE) annual survey of allowances, 2025. This benchmarking exercise showed the following:

• Benchmarking group Basic Allowance mean	£7,528
• Benchmarking group Basic Allowance median	£7,684
• SEE Basic Allowance mean	£6,522
• RBC current Basic Allowance	£6,813

31. The benchmarking presents a somewhat mixed picture – when compared against other Hampshire/geographically adjacent Districts the current Rushmoor Basic Allowance is somewhat on the low side. However, when looking across all Districts in the South East the opposite is true. However, the SEE mean Basic Allowance comes with a caveat – a great many of the district councils in this benchmarking group while having a comparatively lower Basic Allowance will pay a great many more SRAs, effectively raising the baseline remuneration for the majority of their Members whereas in Rushmoor the SRA is schedule is tight with only 16 standing SRAs payable for 39 Members. Elsewhere it is not unknown for over 75 per cent of Members to be paid an SRA.
32. A Basic Allowance somewhat below that paid to peers is not necessarily a compelling reason to recommend an increase to the Basic Allowance. In the past the Rushmoor Basic Allowance was significantly below that paid in peer councils – the difference is not so great now. Moreover, recalibration shows there is not a strong case to revise the Basic Allowance. Finally, because the representation received made it clear that there was no appetite to increase the Basic Allowance at this time. The compelling argument for the IRP was the general view that the current Basic Allowance did not represent a barrier to public service for most people.
33. **The IRP recommends that the Basic Allowance for 2026/27 remains at £6,813, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

Basic Allowance – continuing to include Information Technology & Telecommunications (ITT) costs

34. At the time of the 2022 review all Members received an Information Technology and Telecommunications (ITT) Allowance of £392 as a contribution to cover such council related costs incurred by Members such as
- Use of personal landline and mobile telephones
 - Broadband
 - IT hardware, peripherals and consumables
 - Other ICT related costs
35. This allowance was discontinued following a recommendation from the IRP in the 2022 review. The rationale behind this this recommendation was twofold:

- The Council was going to provide all Members the option of having a Council provided laptop
 - These days with broadband and telephone packages the additional cost for telecommunications on Members was marginal
36. Consequently, in the context of an increased Basic Allowance in 2022, the ITT allowance was discontinued and the Basic Allowance was deemed to cover any associated ITT costs incurred by Members. There was no representation to change this approach. Moreover, this is now the common approach across English local authorities. The only council in the benchmarking group where a similar separate allowance could be identified was Hart (£250 per year). Consequently, the IRP concluded that the Basic Allowance should continue to be deemed to cover such costs.
37. **The IRP recommends that the current Basic Allowance continues to cover Members personal Information Technology & Telecommunications costs.**

Special Responsibility Allowances – addressing anomalies and where raised

The Chairs of the Audit & Governance and Licensing & Corporate Business Committees

38. The principal anomaly for the IRP to address was to recommend an appropriate SRA for the new Audit & Governance and Licensing & Corporate Business Committees. Currently, their respective Chairs receive the following SRAs:
- | | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------|
| • Chair of Audit & Governance Committee | £6,374 |
| • Chair of Licensing & Corporate Business | To be determined |
39. The background to this issue was that in October 2025 the Council discontinued the Corporate Governance, Audit & Standards (CGAS) Committee and split its functions across two new Committees – Audit & Governance plus Licensing & Corporate Business Committees. The SRA (£6,374) previously paid to the Chair of CGAS was simply transferred to the Chair of the new Audit and Governance Committee, while the Chair of the Licensing & Corporate Business Committee was not paid an SRA as the Council wanted to hear from the IRP in light of an imminent review.
40. The starting point for the IRP was that the Chair of the new Audit & Governance Committee simply did not have same responsibility as the former Chair of CGAS, as the new committee has a lesser remit and set of responsibilities. Therefore the current SRA of £6,374 was inappropriate. In the representation received this conclusion was overwhelmingly supported.
41. Benchmarking shows the following average SRAs paid to Chairs of similar Committees
- | | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------|
| • Benchmarking group Chair of Audit mean SRA | £4,425 |
|----------------------------------------------|--------|

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|
| • Benchmarking Group Chair of Audit median SRA | £4,282 |
| • SEE Chair of Audit mean SRA | £3,883 |
42. Benchmarking clearly shows that the current SRA (£6,374) paid to the Rushmoor BC Chair of Audit and Governance is significantly on the high side. However, the IRP has decided not to be wholly driven by the benchmarking figures. Unlike in some councils, the Chair has a dual remit – Audit plus Governance. In some of the other councils the Audit Committee is a single function committee. For instance, Guildford has a separate Corporate Governance Committee with the Chair receiving an SRA of £4,290, in addition to their Chair of Audit also receiving the same level of SRA.
43. The IRP has arrived at the recommended SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee by following its historical methodology utilised to arrive at recommended SRAs namely the ‘pro rata’ approach. In effect, the Leader’s role and therefore their SRA, is adjudged to be at 100 per cent – no other role is larger. Nearly all other roles attracting an SRA are assessed at a proportion of the Leader’s role/SRA. The pro rata approach is also set out in the 2006 Statutory Guidance paragraph 76 for IRPs to follow when arriving at recommended SRAs.
44. Due to the enhanced importance of the Audit function in local government in recent years and the dual nature of the Audit & Governance Committee the IRP has decided to reset the SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee at 25 per cent of the Leader’s SRA (18,900) which equates to £4,726.³ This places the SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee on a par with the SRA currently paid to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
45. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee is reset at £4,726, to be backdated to the date the post was established on 26 November 2025 and subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

The Chair of the Licensing and Corporate Business Committee

46. Clearly, there is a case to pay the Chair of the Licensing & Corporate Business Committee an SRA; to not remunerate such a post would be extremely unusual to say the least. It is a post of significant responsibility. Benchmarking shows the average SRA paid to equivalent posts:
- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|
| • Benchmarking group Chair of Licensing mean SRA | £3,939 |
| • Benchmarking group Chair of Licensing median SRA | £3,792 |
| • SEE Chair of Licensing mean SRA | £2,835 |
47. The IRP considered whether it should simply take the old SRA (£6,374) that was paid to the Chair of CGAS; subtract the recommended SRA (£4,726) for the Chair

³ The figures arrived at by the pro rata approach do not exactly reflect the exact percentages used due to rounding up.

of the Audit and Governance Committee, leaving a residue of £1,648 for the Chair of Licensing and Corporate Business. This approach has an attraction as the remit of the two new Committees is not any larger than that of the old CGAS Committee. However, the IRP has not taken this simplistic approach for two reasons:

- To do so would leave the Rushmoor BC Chair of Licensing & Corporate Committee significantly adrift from peers
- The SRA (£6,374) paid to the Chair of the old CGAS Committee was in all reality probably on the low side for a Committee that had developed over the years to take on a multitude of functions

48. The IRP has decided that the SRA for the Chair of the Licensing & Corporate Business Committee should be judged on its own merits. It has not been driven by the mean/median SRA in the Hampshire/adjacent councils benchmarking group largely on the grounds that the Licensing function in Rushmoor has additional support through the payment of an SRA of £549 to Members of Licensing who attend four or more Licensing Sub Committees in any one year, which does not occur elsewhere in the benchmarking group. It is noted that the Licensing and Corporate Business Committee in Rushmoor also has the Standards remit but over the past 12 years this element has been very limited with nearly all complaints against Members resolved informally between the Monitoring Officer and Independent Person in accordance with the intent behind the Localism Act 2011.
49. The IRP decided to set the SRA for the Chair of the Licensing & Corporate Business Committee at 15 per cent of the Leader's current SRA (£18,900) which equates to £2,835 – this is exactly in line with the mean SRA for equivalent posts in the SEE allowances survey 2025.
50. **The IRP recommends that the SRA the Chair of the Licensing and Corporate Business Committee is set at £2,835 to be paid from the date the post was taken up on 21 October 2025 and subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

Leaders of Opposition Groups – Main and Minority Opposition Groups

51. Currently, the Leaders of all Opposition Groups are paid an SRA of £3,846, historically set at 20 per cent of the Leader's SRA, regardless of group size as long as they meet the qualifying criteria of having four Members. This is an anomaly; it is typical practice to distinguish between the Leader of Main Opposition Groups and Minority Opposition Groups. Benchmarking shows the following:
- Benchmarking group Leader Main Opposition Group SRA mean £6,278
 - Benchmarking group Leader Main Opposition Group SRA median £6,502
 - SEE Leader Main Opposition Group SRA mean £4,915

 - Benchmarking group Leader Minority Opposition Group SRA mean £2,954

- Benchmarking group Leader Minority Opposition Group SRA median £3,080
 - SEE Leader Minority Opposition Group SRA mean £1,889
52. The anomalous situation in Rushmoor whereby Opposition Group Leaders receive the same level of SRA regardless of group size arose because it was never a particular issue in the past. It was extremely rare for more than one Opposition Group to reach the qualifying criteria. Nonetheless, as benchmarking shows, it is typical practice to make such a distinction. The view usually taken by IRPs is that the Leader of the Main Opposition Group has the primary responsibility to provide challenge to the ruling administration; such an expectation is not so compelling on a Leader of a Minority Opposition Group. This distinction was also generally supported in the representation received.
53. Consequently, the IRP has decided to reset the SRA for Leaders of Opposition Groups as follows:
- Leader Main Opposition Group SRA – reset at 25 per cent of the Leader’s current SRA (£18,900) = £4,726 – putting it on a par with the current SRA for the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny and recommended SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committees
 - Leader Minority Opposition Group(s) SRA – reset at 15 per cent of the Leader’s current SRA (£18,900) = £2,835
54. **The IRP recommends that the SRA for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group is reset at £4,726 and the SRA for the Leader of a Minority Opposition Group is reset at £2,835 subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**
55. **The IRP also recommends that the qualifying criteria of having at least four Group Members is removed for the payment of the SRA for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group but remains in place for Leaders of Minority Opposition Groups.**

Where there are two or more Main Opposition Groups of equal size

56. To future proof the allowances scheme the IRP has decided to make a recommendation for a scenario where they may be two or more Main Opposition Groups of equal size. Where this situation may arise the IRP simply decided to aggregate the recommended SRAs for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group (£4,726) and the Leader of the Minority Opposition Group (£2,835), which equates to £7,561, and divide by two, which would equate to £3,781 apiece, If there were three Main Opposition Groups of the same size then the recommended SRA for a Leader of a Minority Opposition Group should be doubled and then aggregated with the recommended SRA for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group, which equates to £10,396. This figure should then be divided by three, which equates to £3,465, and so on if there was more than three Opposition Groups of the same size.

57. **The IRP recommends that where there are two Main Opposition Groups of equal size then the SRAs paid to the Leader of Main Opposition Group and Leader of the Minority Opposition Group are aggregated and then divided by two, equating to £3,781 apiece. The same principle should also apply where there are three or more Main Opposition Groups of the same size. In this scenario the qualifying criteria of having a minimum of four Group Members does not apply.**

Member Champions (x3)

58. Currently the Member Champions are paid an SRA of £1,923 which was originally set at 20 per cent of the SRA paid to the Portfolio Holders. They were appointed by the Leader to take a lead on promoting the topic for which they were appointed Champion, originally Armed Forces and Pride in Place. They were seen partly as supporting the executive function and partly as a potential developmental role for future Portfolio Holders.
59. There was some representation questioning the payment of an SRA for these roles, largely on the grounds of lack of transparency regarding their accountability. Yet, by definition as Member (Cabinet) Champions were accountable to the Leader the accountability of these roles would not be apparent to most Members.
60. It is noted that the Council has decided to maintain the Member Champion role but now they are appointed by the Council which should widen out their accountability. Moreover, the Member Champion roles are set out in the Council's Constitution and on balance in the majority of representation received it was felt that they were useful roles to undertake that add to the work of the Council and addressing its priorities. Benchmarking is of limited value in this instance as there is only very limited comparative roles that are similar. The IRP is content the role of Champion is above and beyond what is required from an ordinary Member and merits an SRA. Consequently, the IRP has decided to maintain this SRA at its current level (£1,923).
61. **The IRP recommends that the Member Champions continue to be paid an SRA of £1,923, up to a maximum of three payable at any one time, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

The Chair/Mayor of the Council

62. There was some representation to the IRP that the current SRA (£1,813) paid to the Chair of the Council was just too low. The main arguments behind this view were largely twofold:
- I. It was a small SRA for chairing up to seven Council meetings per year, especially now in a situation of no overall control

- II. That there was a great deal of time commitment required by being Mayor of the Council through the necessity to attend civic events and represent the Council at large
63. Indeed benchmarking on the face of it shows that the current SRA paid to the Chair/Mayor of the Council is very low comparatively:
- Benchmarking group Council Chair SRA mean £5,008
 - Benchmarking group Council Chair SRA median £5,012
 - SEE Council Chair SRA mean £3,123
64. The IRP has not been guided by the benchmarking or argument made in the representation in this case. What the benchmarking does not show are those Councils where a Council Chair/Mayor is paid an SRA only, i.e., no other support is provided to a Chair apart from their SRA. In Rushmoor, the Council Chair/Mayor has a separate civic fund of £9,000 they can draw from to support their civic role such as buying tickets to events and reimbursement of donations such as raffle tickets at local fetes, etc. Moreover, the time commitment by being the Civic Head of the Council varies dramatically between Mayors and traditionally this time commitment is seen as voluntary. Finally, the role of chairing Council meetings does not require a great deal of commitment outside the formal meetings unlike say for instance being Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
65. Nonetheless, given the composition of the Council, the extent of public feeling round a variety of contentious issues at present and the very large variation in the SRA paid to the Council Chair compared to the benchmarked averages the IRP concluded that a small increase in this SRA was merited. Consequently, the IRP decided to reset this SRA at 15 per cent of the Leader's SRA (£18,900), which equates to £2,835.
- 66. The IRP recommends that the SRA the Chair of the Council is reset at £2,835, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

SRA for Group Whips

67. Once again, through the representations received, albeit not significant, the IRP was asked to consider recommending an SRA for the Group Whips. The logic behind this submission was that they have an important role to carry out in ensuring the business of the Council is carried out efficiently.
68. The IRP accepts that the Group Whips of both main groups on Council have a role in Council management, in assisting with the allocation of places on committees to ensure political balance. However, the IRP is not making a recommendation in this regard for the following reasons:
- Historically the IRP has eschewed making recommendations for posts that may be deemed primarily political in nature

- They are not paid in any of the councils included in the benchmarking group

69. **The IRP does not recommend that an SRA is paid to the Group Whips.**

Vice-Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (X2) and the Policy and Project Advisory Board (x2)

70. Currently, there is a somewhat unusual arrangement regarding Vice-Chairmen of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Policy and Project Advisory Board in that each have two Vice-Chairmen. Historically they each received an SRA set at 30 per cent of their respective Chair's SRA.
71. They were remunerated after the establishment of the single Overview and Scrutiny Committee and a Policy and Project Advisory Board that replaced a more extensive set of scrutiny and policy development arrangements so the new structure actually worked out cheaper than the structure in place prior to 2018. Nevertheless, the IRP recommended that the Vice-Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Policy and Project Advisory Board were to be paid an SRA on the grounds that, unlike other Vice-Chairmen, they had discrete tasks to undertake mainly through being expected to lead on specific projects and to chair task and finish groups.
72. However, since the last review these SRAs were discontinued as the work of chairing such groups is now primarily done via Cabinet working groups. Moreover, the IRP received no representation that these SRAs should be restored.
73. **The IRP does not recommend that the two Vice-Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and two Vice-Chairs of the Policy and Project Advisory Board are paid an SRA.**

All other SRAs currently payable

74. In considering all other Rushmoor BC SRAs the IRP noted that in most cases, except the Chair of the Development Management Committee, they were all somewhat below the averages in the benchmarking group, although when compared to the mean SRAs in the SEE allowances survey they are all more or less in line. Regardless, whatever the marginal merits in increasing all other SRAs, in the representations received there was no support to increase them – the general view was that they did not represent a barrier to public service at their current levels.
75. **Therefore the IRP recommends that the following SRAs should be maintained at their current levels subject to any applicable indexation going forward:**

• Leader of the Council:	£18,900
• Deputy Leader of the Council	£10,878
• Other Cabinet Members/Portfolio Holders	£9,395
• Chair of Development Management Committee	£6,374

• Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee	£4,726
• Chair of Policy & Project Advisory Board	£4,726
• Members Licensing Sub Committees (if attend at least four meetings per year)	£549

Maintaining the 1-SRA only rule

76. The 2003 Regulations do not prohibit the payment of multiple SRAs to Members. However, since SRAs are not insignificant sums, Councils typically have adopted the '1-SRA only' rule. In other words, regardless of the number of remunerated posts individual Members may hold they can only be paid one SRA. By allowing Members to receive multiple SRAs it obscures the real level of remuneration received by Members therefore lacking transparency. For instance, in some schemes where multiple SRAs are payable, the Leader's SRA may look relatively low but what it may not take into account is where the Leader also is paid a Cabinet Members SRA and in some cases an additional Group Leaders SRA. It can also lead to the counter intuitive situation where a Member might be being paid more than the Leader.
77. Rushmoor Borough Council has adopted a 1-SRA only rule and no evidence was received to change this position. **The IRP recommends that the Council maintains the 1-SRA only rule within the Rushmoor Borough Council Members' Allowances Scheme so that a Member cannot receive more than one SRA.**

Co-optees' Allowances

78. Currently there is a Co-optees' Allowance of £604 per year. This is an allowance specifically permitted by the 2003 Regulations paid to non-voting independent members appointed specific committees, normally for bringing an external expertise to the table. Currently there is provision to appoint three Co-optees to the Audit & Governance Committee. The IRP received no evidence to revise the Co-optees' Allowance, it was not reported to be a barrier.
79. **The IRP recommends that the Co-optees Allowance is maintained at £604, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

Remuneration for the Independent Person (IP)

80. Under the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011 all English councils are required to appoint at least one Independent Person (IP) whose role is to act as a source of advice to the Monitoring Officer when a complaint is made against a Member and to provide further advice in any subsequent hearings and appeals. The Independent Person has to have some experience in assessing complaints and to be able to exercise objective judgement. They are not formally co-opted Members of the Council or Standards Committee and their remuneration does not fall within

the 2003 Regulations. However, in the absence of any other external validation IRPs are often asked to make a recommendation regarding the remuneration of the IP, as in this case.

81. Currently, the IP in Rushmoor BC is remunerated at the same level as the Co-optees, £604 per year, plus associated travel expenses. The IRP noted that this level of remuneration is comparatively par for the course for a District Council IP (insofar as comparative practice can be discerned). Furthermore, the IRP received no evidence that this sum required revising.
82. **The IRP recommends that the annual remuneration of the Independent Person for Rushmoor Borough Council remains at £604, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

The Allowances for expenses: Travel and Subsistence Allowances

83. The IRP received no evidence that the current scope, terms and conditions and maximum rates that are reimbursed under the Travel and Substance Allowances require revision. Currently, Members are unable to claim Travel and Subsistence Allowances for attending in-Borough duties, which is common practice in most district/borough councils now that the Basic Allowance is not an insignificant sum. The IRP took the opportunity to explore whether there was a case to restore in-Borough Travel and Substances but the unanimous view in the representations received was that there was no case to be made. In addition, no evidence or representation was received to alter the terms and conditions and applicable rates for which Members can claim Travel and Subsistence for attending approved duties outwith the Borough.
84. **The IRP recommends that the conditions and maximum rates under the Travel and Subsistence Allowances can be claimed are maintained, subject to any applicable indexation going forward.**

The Dependants' Carers' Allowance (DCA)

85. The Local Government Act 2000 explicitly clarifies the right of local authorities to pay a Dependant Carers' Allowance (DCA), which Members can claim to assist in meeting costs for care of their dependants while on approved Council duties. It is an allowance explicitly designed to enable a wider range of candidates to stand for and remain on the Council. The IRP notes that the vast majority of councils now pay a DCA. Although it is rarely claimed in Rushmoor, in the representations received there was overwhelming support to maintain the DCA largely on the grounds that it helps to reduce barriers to public service for traditionally under-represented groups. No evidence was received to recommend any amendments to the DCA rates that can be claimed, which is paid at two rates: a childcare element paid at the National Living Wage and other care element paid at the hourly rate charged by Hampshire Adult Services for a carer.

86. The only issue that was raised with the IRP was the concern that informal childcare could not be claimed under the DCA. The IRP was informed that if a Member did claim for the cost of informal childcare while undertaking an approved duty that they would be able to make a claim under the DCA as long as a receipt was produced – which is only good practice. Nonetheless, this is not made clear in the allowances scheme and should be rectified.
87. In addition, the IRP noted an oversight in the allowances scheme regarding the approved duties for which the DCA may be claimed. In Part 8, sub paragraph (a) it states that regarding the payment of the DCA that “The approved duties to which the allowance relates are set out in in Schedule 2 to this scheme.” However, the heading for Schedule 2 relates only to “Travel and Subsistence Allowance – Approved Duties.” It does not include the DCA. This is simply a common administrative oversight that should be rectified.
88. **The IRP recommends that the DCA is maintained at the current rates and terms and conditions subject to any applicable indexation going forward and the following amendments:**
- **That the DCA should be clarified that where a Member seeks to claim reimbursement for childcare costs that they are able to claim for informal childcare upon the production of a receipt**
 - **That Schedule 2 of the Allowances Scheme is amended to state that it also includes the approved duties for which the DCA is claimed within the Borough**

Confirmation of Indexing

89. There was general acceptance of maintaining the principle of indexing allowances and the current indices that are in place. By uprating the majority of allowances on the same basis that Officer Salaries are indexed it treats Members and Officers the same and helps ensure that Members’ allowances and expenses do not lose value over time.
90. The IRP notes that in three of the past four years the annual uplift in staff salaries as agreed by the National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government Services has increased by a flat rate sum, for instance it was of £1,290 in 2024/25, producing a higher percentage increase at the lower pay grades or Spinal Column Points (SCPs) than the higher SCPs. The most common response by IRPs to this situation is to link indexation to the highest SCP, which is currently SCP 43. Thus, where there is a flat rate increase in Officer Salary’s linking increases in Members’ Allowances SCP 43 will result in the lowest percentage increase in Members’ Basic Allowance and SRAs, as such this level of increase is the most justified and cannot be deemed excessive. Members are not receiving a higher percentage increase in their allowances than any member of staff. Lest the same approach occurs in the future regarding the annual cost of living increase in salaries for local government staff and

for clarification purposes the IRP has decided to follow this approach.

91. **The IRP confirms and recommends that the following allowances are indexed for four years (the maximum period permitted under the 2003 Regulations before the Council has to seek further advice from the IRP) from 2025/26 to 2028/29, as follows:**

- **Basic Allowance, SRAs and Co-optees' Allowances:**
 - Updated annually in line with the annual percentage pay increase given to Rushmoor Borough Council employees (and rounded to the nearest £) as agreed for each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Staff as agreed at SCP 43.
- **Out of Council Area Mileage Allowance:**
 - Indexed to the Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) Approved Mileage Allowance Payments (AMAP) mileage rates.
- **Out of Council Area Other Travel and Subsistence:**
 - Reimbursement of actual costs taking into account the most cost effective means of transport and/or accommodation available and the convenience of use with the maximum rates indexed to the same periodic percentage increase that may be applied to Officer Subsistence Allowances.
- **Dependants' Carers' Allowance (DCA):**
 - The maximum hourly rates to be indexed to the government's national living wage applicable to the age of the carer (childcare) and Hampshire County Council's hourly rate for a Home Care Assistance (care of other dependants).

Implementation

92. **The IRP recommends that the new scheme of allowances based on the recommendations contained in this report is adopted from the date of the Annual Meeting on 26th May 2026 with the following exceptions:**

- The recommended SRA for the Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee – to be implemented from the date the Chair took up the post of this Committee on 26 November 2025
- The recommended SRA for the Chair of the Licensing & Corporate Business Committee – to be implemented from the date the Chair took up the post of this Committee on 21 October 2025

Appendix One: Members who met with the IRP

Cllr G. Austen:	Portfolio Holder for Finance & Resources (Labour)
Cllr C. Card:	Leader of Liberal Democrat (Minority) Opposition Group
Cllr J. Crossley:	Leader of Rushmoor Independent Group (Minority) Opposition Group
Cllr T. Day:	Chair of Development Management Committee (Labour)
Cllr K. Dibble:	Portfolio Holder for Housing & Planning (Labour)
Cllr H. Koohestani:	Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Rushmoor Independent Group)
Cllr G. Lyon:	Leader of Conservative (Main) Opposition Group
Cllr B. O'Donovan:	Chair of Audit & Governance Committee (Labour)
Cllr S. Masterson:	Chair of Policy & Project Advisory Board (Conservative)
Cllr C. Stewart:	Mayor/Chair of the Council (Independent)
Cllr S. Trussler:	Shadow Portfolio Holder for Finance (Conservative)
Cllr J. Vosper:	Chair of Licensing & Corporate Business Committee (Conservative)
Cllr G. Williams:	Leader of Council, Portfolio Holder for Policy, Strategy & Performance (Labour)

Written Submissions - Elected Members

The IRP received one written submission

Appendix Two: Officers who provided factual briefings to the IRP

Ian Harrison: Interim Managing Director

Jill Shuttleworth: Corporate Manager – Democracy & Deputy Monitoring Officer

Adele Taylor: Team Leader – Members Services

Appendix Three: Information Pack Index

The IRP received an Information Pack containing the following information and data that was referred to in its considerations and deliberations:

1. IRP Terms of Reference
2. Rushmoor Borough Council Members' Allowances Scheme 2025/26
3. Rushmoor Borough Council, statutory publication of allowances and expenses paid to Members, including sub-totals for each category 2024/25
4. "A Review of Members' Allowances for Rushmoor Borough Council" the Seventh Report by the Independent Remuneration Panel, January 2022
5. Rushmoor Borough Council, relevant sections of Part 3 of Constitution showing roles and responsibilities, functions and terms of reference of main committees, namely Section 6
6. Rushmoor Borough Council, Councillor Role Descriptions – Special Responsibility Allowance, Council Constitution Part 3 – Section 10
7. Rushmoor In Numbers paper, August 2025
8. Flow diagram of Rushmoor Borough Council Committee structure and decision making process
9. Calendar of Meetings 2025/26 including
 - Meetings that were cancelled in 2025
 - Licensing Sub-Committee meetings for the last 4 years including who attended
10. Membership of Cabinet, Committees and Panels 2025/26 including membership and who chairs them, October 2025
11. December 2025 IRP Briefing Paper summarising main governance changes and issues for the IRP to consider
12. Hard copies of written submissions by Members (x1)
13. South East Employers (SEE), Annual Survey of Members Allowances 2025 final version:
 - a. Basic Allowances
 - b. SRAs
 - c. Other Allowances
 - d. Extra Information

14. Power point presentation by Panel Chair (Dr Declan Hall), “Reviewing Members’ Allowances: Patterns, Approaches and Issues to Consider”
15. National Census of Local Authority Councillors 2022 (LGA), breakdown of weekly hours by councillors by number of positions held and type of council, in email from S. Richards, LGA 17th May 2023
16. National Employers for Local Government Services: Local Government Pay Agreement 2025/26, showing pay award of 3.2% (on all NJC Pay points 2 and above)
17. New Council Constitutions; Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances, 5 May 2006, Department of Communities and Local Government (extract)
18. The Local Authorities (Members’ Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 1021)
19. Hard copies of allowances schemes from 13 other district councils included in the benchmarking group - Other Hampshire and adjacent District Councils, 2025/26, including summary of benchmarking data
20. Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), Table 8.2a, Weekly pay – excluding overtime – for full time employee jobs (home geography), Office of National Statistics, provisional results 2024, showing median weekly salary of £713.80 or £17.85 per hour (on a 40 hour week)
21. Rushmoor Borough Council Constitution, Part 3 – Section 2 – Executive functions, including Member Champions Role Profiles
22. Rushmoor Borough Council, Report to Council, Constitution and Committee Review Update, Council meeting 10th July 2025

Appendix Four: Rushmoor BC Benchmarking 2025/26

BM1 Rushmoor - Other Hants/adjacent DCs: BA + Exec + Scrutiny SRAs (2025/26)										
Comparator Council	Basic Allowance	Leader	Leader Total Package	Deputy Leader	Exec Mbers	Deputy Execs or Lead Mbrs	Chair Main O&S	V/Chr Main O&S	Chairs or Lead Scrutiny	Vice Chairs Scrutiny
Basingstoke & Deane	8,511	29,793	38,304	19,365	14,892		7,449	747	7,449	747
East Hants	7,480	22,440	29,920	12,823	9,617	2,671	6,689			
Eastleigh	8,681	25,710	34,391	11,888	10,189		3,395	849		
Fareham (23/24)	8,003	24,008	32,011	13,338	13,338				8,336	1,000
Gosport	8,514	18,206	26,720	NA	committee system					
Guildford	8,579	17,158	25,737	8,579	6,434				4,290	
Hart	5,357	18,753	24,110	9,376	8,439		3,750			
Havant	6,289	20,178	26,467	11,602	9,757	2,824	6,417			
New Forest	7,888	24,453	32,341	14,672	12,227				6,113	
Surrey Heath	5,834	15,168	21,002	7,584	6,067		4,550		3,792	
Test Valley	9,999	22,498	32,497	14,061	12,374		10,124	2,025		
Waverley	6,020	14,735	20,755	11,885	8,420		4,210	2,105		
Winchester	7,426	21,686	29,112	11,928	9,760		9,760		2,168	
Rushmoor	6,813	18,900	25,713	10,878	9,395	1,923	4,726			
Mean	7,528	20,978	28,506	12,152	10,070	2,473	6,107	1,432	5,358	
Median	7,684	20,932	27,916	11,888	9,757	2,671	5,572	1,437	5,202	
Highest	9,999	29,793	38,304	19,365	14,892	2,824	10,124	2,105	8,336	
Lowest	5,357	14,735	20,755	7,584	6,067	1,923	3,395	747	2,168	
Mean Ratios	mean Leaders SRA 2.8 X mean BA	100%		58%	48%	25%	29%		26%	
Rushmoor ratios	2.8	100%		58%	50%	20%	25%			

BM2 Rushmoor - Other Hants/adjacent DCs: Planning & Licensing/Regulatory SRAs (2025/26)									
Comparator Council	Chair Planning	Vice Chair Planning	Chair Licensing &/or Regulatory	Licensing V/Chair	Chair Audit	V/Chair Audit	Chair HR or Employment	V/Chair HR or Employment	Chair Standards
Basingstoke & Deane	8,937	897	7,449	747	7,449	747	7,449	747	7,449
East Hants	6,689	2,671	2,671		4,274		2,671		2,671
Eastleigh	4,247	1,060	2,126		3,395	849			
Fareham (23/24)	12,004	1,000	8,336	1,000	5,002	1,000			
Gosport	6,023	3,012	6,023	3,012	3,012	1,506			3,012
Guildford	6,434	2,145	2,145		4,290				4,290
Hart	5,627	1,810	1,876		2,814		1,876		1,826
Havant	5,802		1,294		6,417		4,219		
New Forest	8,559		2,445		2,445		2,445		
Surrey Heath	5,309	2,123	3,792		4,550		3,792		
Test Valley	7,874	1,575	4,500	900	3,375	675	3,375	675	
Waverley	4,210	2,105	4,210	2,105	4,210	2,105			4,210
Winchester	9,760	3,254	4,337		4,337				
Rushmoor	6,374		TBC		6,374				
Mean	6,989	1,968	3,939	1,553	4,425	1,147	3,690		3,910
Median	6,404	2,105	3,792	1,000	4,282	925	3,375		3,611
Highest	12,004	3,254	8,336	3,012	7,449	2,105	7,449		7,449
Lowest	4,210	897	1,294	747	2,445	675	1,876		1,826
Mean Ratios	33%	28%	19%	39%	21%	26%	18%		19%
Rushmoor Ratios	34%		NA		34%				

BM3 Rushmoor - Other Hants + adjacent DCs: Group & Misc SRAs (2025/26)						
Comparator Council	Main Opposition Group Leader	Minor Opposition Group Leader	Chairs Areas or Local Forums	Chair Council	Council V/Chair	Other or Comment
Basingstoke & Deane	8,937	4,473		7,449	1,866	<i>Vice Chair Standards £747</i>
E. Hants	£481 p Mbr					<i>Chair Planning Policy £4,305, BA inc IT allowance</i>
Eastleigh	6,793		4,247			<i>Area Vice Chairs £1,060, ICT provided direct</i>
Fareham (23/24)	8,003	4,002		5,335	1,000	<i>Opposition Spokespersons £333</i>
Gosport	6,502	1,300				<i>Vice Chair Standards £1,506</i>
Guildford	4,290	2,145		6,434	2,145	<i>Chair Corporate Governance £4,290, Licensing Sub Chairs £71 p/meeting, >1 SRA payable</i>
Hart	2,814	£18 p/group Mbr		4,688		<i>IT Allowance £250 p/yr</i>
Havant	4,107	3,080				
New Forest	9,170	1,834		9,781	2,445	<i>Main Opposition Group Deputy Leader £1,834</i>
Surrey Heath	5,309	2,655		6,067	1,820	
Test Valley	7,874			4,500	900	<i>2 Area Planning Committees ea Chair £7,874 & V/Chair £1,575</i>
Waverley	4,210			756		<i>Vice Chair Standards £12,105, > 1 SRA payable</i>
Winchester	9,760	3,254	2,158	3,254		<i>Group Managers £2,168, Chairs Policy Committees £4,337</i>
Rushmoor	3,846	3,846		1,813		<i>If Chair >4 Licensing Panels £549, If Other Opposition Group has ≥4 Members Leader gets SRA £3,846, Chair Project Advisory Board £4,726</i>
Mean	6,278	2,954		5,008	1,696	
Median	6,502	3,080		5,012	1,843	
Highest	9,760	4,473		9,781	2,445	
Lowest	2,814	1,300		756	900	
Mean Ratios	30%	14%		24%	34%	
Rushmoor Ratios	20%	20%		10%		