
Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel
2022

A review of Allowances at West Midlands Combined Authority

Contents

	Page
The Regulatory Context	3
Background	4
Approach	5
Analysis and Conclusions	6 - 10
The Mayor	6
The Deputy Mayor	7
Portfolio Lead Members	8
Transport Delivery Committee	8
Other Allowances	9
Indexation and elements	10
Recommendations	10 - 11
Appendices	12 - 17
A -Combined Authority Orders	12
B – Terms of Reference	13
C – Evidence considered	14

The Regulatory Context

- 1.1 This report contains the analysis and recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Panel or IRP) appointed by West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) to make recommendations to the Combined Authority Board (Board) on a number of matters as set out in the Panel terms of reference.
- 1.2 The West Midlands Combined Authority was established in 2016 through [The West Midlands Combined Authority Order 2016 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)
- 1.3 There have been numerous subsequent Orders which are detailed in Appendix A of this report. [The West Midlands Combined Authority \(Functions and Amendment\) Order 2017 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#) set out the functions of a Combined Authority Mayor and in PART 8 - Amendment of the West Midlands Combined Authority Order 2016; incidental provisions it sets out the requirements as they relate to an Independent Remuneration Panel.
- 1.4 Full details of this provision are detailed in the Order, in short they state:
- The Combined Authority may establish an independent remuneration panel to recommend allowances payable to the Mayor and the deputy Mayor.
 - An independent remuneration panel must consist of at least three members none of whom —
 - a) is also a member of the Combined Authority or is a member of a committee or sub-committee of the Combined Authority;
 - b) is disqualified from being or becoming a member of the Combined Authority.
 - An independent remuneration panel must produce a report in relation to the Combined Authority, making recommendations as to any allowances payable to the Mayor and deputy Mayor.
 - No remuneration is payable by the Combined Authority to its members, other than allowances for travel and subsistence paid in accordance with a scheme drawn up by the Combined Authority.
 - The Combined Authority may pay the Mayor and Deputy Mayor such allowances as it may agree, in accordance with any recommendations made by its independent remuneration panel.”.
- 1.5 The Board agreed on 18 March 2022 to establish an Independent Remuneration Panel with an agreed terms of reference and agreed membership for the review.

The Panel

- 1.6 The membership of the Panel that undertook the review was as follows:
- Professor Steve Leach – Emeritus Professor of Local Government, Department of Politics & Public Policy at De Montfort University, Leicester
 - Rose Poulter – Birmingham City Council Independent Remuneration Panel Chair
 - Sylvia Parkin – City of Wolverhampton and Sandwell Independent Remuneration Panel member
- 1.7 Professor Steve Leach was appointed Chair of the Panel. Professor Steve Leach also chaired the previous Panel review in 2017 which Sylvia Parkin was also a member of.

Background

- 2.1 The terms of reference for the review are set out in Appendix B. It should be noted that, although the only allowances for which the Panel is formally empowered to make recommendations on are those of the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor, the Panel was requested to consider a range of other issues, including the package of allowances paid (for historical reasons) to members of the Transport Delivery Committee (TDC) and the case for portfolio- leads receiving additional allowances from their own local authorities, to acknowledge their important responsibilities in the WMCA.
- 2.2 The various Orders establishing the WMCA and allocating functions and responsibilities to it over the past five years are listed in Appendix A. It is not felt necessary to provide further detail here, except to note that there is a degree of variation in the responsibilities attached to the different Combined Authorities and the Mayors who lead them. In particular, the responsibilities of the Police and Crime Commissioner have been allocated to the elected mayors of the Combined Authorities of Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire, but not to the WMCA or any of the other Combined Authorities.
- 2.3 In the 2017 report of the previous Panel, three principles which it felt should underpin its work were set out. These were as follows
- ❑ the 'democratic discount' principle. It has been customary in the vast majority of members allowances reviews to acknowledge that individuals standing for election to local authorities do so on the basis (inter alia) of a commitment to 'public service'. As a result, any remuneration they receive would not be expected to cover the whole of the time they devote to their role. 50% is the discount figure invariably used.
 - ❑ the mayoral allowance should be justifiable in the light of allowances received by other elected mayors and by other elected public sector office-holders with comparable roles and responsibilities (including M.P.s)
 - ❑ the recommended allowance should reflect the nature and scope of the executive responsibilities of the Mayor, but also the longer-term transformational expectations attached to the role.
- 2.4 The Panel was of the view that each of these principles remained relevant. It noted that whilst the specific executive responsibilities of the Mayor remained limited, the transformational and networking roles had been deployed to an increasing extent and with increasing effect by the current incumbent. In addition, the scope of the WMCAs responsibilities had increased considerably since 2017, as had its budget, with expectations of further increases in the near future. It had also become clear the role of elected mayor, in the West Midlands as elsewhere, was clearly a full-time one.
- 2.5 In coming to judgements about the appropriate level of allowances to recommend for the various posts concerned, the Panel was minded to adopt the 'good practice' approach of the Birmingham IRP, which involves, once having made a recommendation as to the mayoral allowance (or in Birmingham, the leaders SRA), to ensure that recommendations for other allowances were set as percentages of that figure. This gives a coherence to the allowances schedule which it would otherwise lack and is the practice followed in this report.
- 2.6 Although there are some IRPs which have attempted to use the time commitment of members in carrying out the duties of the positions they hold, this approach was not thought to be feasible nor appropriate in this review. It would not have been possible in the time available to assemble the necessary data, and in any event time commitment is not in itself a

relevant guide to the allocation of allowances. The nature of the responsibilities involved in different positions is a much more relevant factor and it was this which the Panel focused on. The other major consideration was to draw on relevant comparative information, especially with regard to the allowances paid to other elected mayors of Combined Authorities. This was a major influence on the thinking of the three other IRP reports (Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire) which the Panel accessed.

Approach

3.1 The Panel undertook a review of written evidence and undertook a series of interviews, both in person and virtually. Full details of the range of evidence considered by the Panel is set out in Appendix C of this report, this evidence contained:

- a range of information that was formally presented to and considered by the Panel and sent to the Panel prior to its formal meetings
- individuals, such as the Mayor and WMCA Chief Executive, who made representations to the Panel and the Officers who provided factual briefings to the Panel
- benchmarking data that was review and considered by the Panel
- analysis of the existing allowances arrangements and expenses scheme

3.2 The Panel undertook a scoping meeting prior to commencement of the evidence gathering for the review in order to determine the evidence that was required and the individuals it wished to interview.

3.3 The Panel held 2 all day evidence gathering sessions at which they undertook a number of interviews as detailed below:

27 April Evidence Day

- Andy Street – Mayor of WMCA
- Councillor Ian Courts - Portfolio Lead for Environment, Energy & HS2
- Councillor Patrick Harley - Portfolio Lead for Digital and Culture
- Councillor Ian Brookfield – Portfolio Lead for Economy and Innovation
- Councillor Mike Bird – Portfolio Lead for Housing and Land

9 May Evidence Day

- Councillor Kerrie Carmichael – Portfolio Lead for Public Service Reform & Social Economy
- Councillor Izzi Seccombe – Portfolio Lead for Wellbeing
- Councillor Bob Sleight – Deputy Mayor and Portfolio Lead for Finance
- Councillor Hartley – Chair of Transport Delivery Committee
- Councillor Cathy Bayton – Chair of Overview and Scrutiny
- Laura Shoaf – Chief Executive
- Linda Horne – Director of Finance
- Satish Mistry – Director of Law & Governance

3.4 The Portfolio Leads for Transport, Skills and Productivity, and Inclusive Communities were unable to be interviewed on the designated evidence dates and were therefore approach for evidence electronically.

3.5 The Panel was provided with a range of helpful background information, including:

-
- the reports of the IRPs of the Combined Authorities of Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire and South Yorkshire
 - comparative data regarding the allowances paid to the elected mayors of other combined authorities, elected mayors of local authorities and council leaders in the seven local authorities in the West Midlands conurbation
 - the responsibilities of the different Combined Authorities
 - the Governance Review recently carried out in the WMCA and much else besides.

3.6 The Panel is most grateful to Jodie Townsend for the level and quality of support he provided, including setting up the Panel's meetings and responding to numerous 'one off' requests for information.

Analysis and Conclusions

4.1 The Panel, through the interviews and briefings it undertook and the examination of key data and documentation, considered key evidence in order to arrive at an agreed set of conclusions.

The Mayor

4.2 In 2016, soon after the establishment of West Midlands CA, an independent panel was established to make recommendations regarding the allowance which should be paid to the elected mayor, who had not at that stage been elected. The Panel's work was carried out at a time when no recommendations had yet been made elsewhere in CAs in respect of such allowances and when there was a good deal of uncertainty as to the way in which a mayor would interpret his or her roles and responsibilities.

4.3 The Panel identified a series of benchmarks against which a mayoral recommendation might be evaluated (including M.P.'s salary; allowances paid to elected mayors in local authorities; allowances paid to leaders of large urban authorities; the allowance paid to the elected mayor of the Greater London Authority). Noting that, at that time, the executive responsibilities allocated to the elected mayor were limited in extent (unlike those enjoyed by local authority elected mayors and many local council leaders), the Panel was of the view that the allowance recommended should not be greater than the highest allowance paid to a local authority elected mayor.

4.4 On this basis, a figure of £79,000 was recommended and accepted at a meeting of the Combined Authority early in 2017.

4.5 In the range of allowances allocated to CA elected mayors in 2021, West Midlands came in the middle of the range. Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire were at the higher end of the scale, at £110,000 and £105,000 respectively, but in both areas, the elected mayor operates as the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), which is not the case in the West Midlands. In some of the CAs with significantly smaller populations than the West Midlands, such as West of England and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough), the mayoral allowances are higher following recent Independent Remuneration Panel reviews.

4.6 Since 2017, the role of the elected mayor in the West Midlands has become clearer. Whilst his personal executive responsibilities remain limited to the field of transportation (most executive decisions are taken collectively by the CA or the Boards attached to it), his ambassadorial, networking and convening roles have become increasingly important and, in so far as the Panel can judge, effective.

-
- 4.7 The Panel concluded that an attempt to link the mayoral allowance to a formal performance measurement scheme was not feasible. However the success of the incumbent in securing increasing levels of funding for the CA , whose budget has increased from 160 million (revenue and capital) in 2016-17 to 700 million in 2021-22): the achievement (aided by the deputy mayor) in creating a positive working environment in a CA in which Conservative and Labour-controlled authorities have almost equal representation: the successful negotiation with central government to secure an opportunity for the further devolution of powers to the CA; and the Mayors re-election in 2021 all provide evidence of effective mayoral performance; and these are traits and skills which the Panel would expect future mayors to bring to the post.
- 4.8 In these circumstances, the Panel was of the view that a substantial increase in the mayoral allowance was justified. Because the Mayor in the West Midlands does not have PCC responsibilities, it would not be appropriate for the allowance to match those of Greater Manchester or West Yorkshire.
- 4.9 However given the population size of the West Midlands (close to that of Greater Manchester) and the size of its budget, which are in both cases higher (often much higher) than other CAs, the Panel's recommendation is that the mayoral allowance should be increased to £95,000, as from May 2021. This figure is approximately midway between the mayoral allowance paid in Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire (110,000 and 105,000 respectively) and the average of the mayoral allowances paid in the other CAs.

The Deputy Mayor

- 4.10 The current deputy mayor, who chaired the CA before the election of the current mayor, was appointed by the latter in 2018. When the panel met in 2016-17, it was uncertain whether the post of deputy mayor could be allocated an allowance. It has since become clear that it can.
- 4.11 The responsibilities of the current deputy are demanding and wide-ranging, these include:
- delegated responsibility for formulating the annual budget and steering it through the authority
 - has been instrumental in the process of finding a consensus among members of the CA on challenging issues
 - regularly deputises for the mayor in meetings with partners
 - chairs the Investment Board
 - led the work of the Governance Review Working Group.
- 4.12 The value of his contribution is widely acknowledged and appreciated throughout the authority.
- 4.13 The Panel was clear that in these circumstances, it was appropriate to recommend a deputy mayoral allowance, although it recognized that future incumbents of the post may seek or be expected to interpret the role in a different way (in which case a review of the allowance recommended may be necessary).
- 4.14 There are other CAs in which the deputy mayor is allocated an allowance – Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire – where the sum involved is £80,000 and £72,000. However both are CAs where the mayor also holds the responsibility of the PCC, subsequently the Deputy mayor leads on Police and Crime and it is likely that the demands on the role of the deputy will be greater in these circumstances.

-
- 4.15 The Panel was uneasy about recommending an allowance for the deputy mayor which would be greater than the average figure for the total allowance (SRA and basic) received by the leaders of the authorities in the West Midlands conurbation (excluding Birmingham), given the wider range of their executive responsibilities. An allowance of one third of that recommended for the elected mayor (£31, 650) would meet this criterion, and this is the recommendation tabled by the Panel.

Portfolio Lead Members

- 4.16 The posts of elected mayor and deputy are the only ones where the regulations permit the allocation of allowances. However, during the course of the interviews, it became clear to the Panel the responsibilities of a portfolio lead are considerable (with some variation) and involve a significant time commitment, which has to be found in addition to the demands of leading a large metropolitan local authority (a post which is widely regarded as in itself requiring a 'full-time' commitment). Those involved are managing to juggle the workloads involved, although for a leader with some form of paid employment, it would be extremely difficult.
- 4.17 If West Midlands CA were a directly elected authority, then a substantial SRA for the portfolio leads would certainly be justified, in the light of the responsibilities involved. This case was supported by some but by no means all of the portfolio holders interviewed. But the Panel was clear that in principle there was a strong case for dealing with this 'allowances deficit'.
- 4.18 The only way it could suggest of responding to this situation was with a recommendation that the leaders' own authorities should consider 'topping up' the SRAs they allocate to the leaders, in a way which recognizes the scope of the extra responsibilities involved in CA work.
- 4.19 There are precedents for this initiative; the Wolverhampton Panel made a recommendation of this nature in its 2021 review, which was accepted by the council; and Wellingborough Council implemented a Panel recommendation for a similar measure, when its leader was chairing the North Northamptonshire Shadow Authority.
- 4.20 The Panel's recommendation is therefore that the other six West Midlands MDCs should consider adopting a similar 'top-up' increase in their leaders SRAs to that which has been agreed in Wolverhampton. It would of course be up to each authority, taking advice from their respective IRPs, to decide the level of the top-up, but the Panel felt that an increase of 10% of the recommended mayoral allowance (£9,500) would be appropriate. This figure is based on the fact that the average SRA paid to cabinet members/portfolio-holders in the West Midlands conurbation authorities is 12,970 and 9,500 is close to 75% of this figure, an appropriate percentage, given the wider range of executive responsibilities in their parent authorities, compared with the WMCA.

Transport Delivery Committee

- 4.21 At present, a total of £147,310 in members allowances is allocated to members of the Transport Delivery Committee (TDC) per annum. All its members receive a basic allowance of £4,060. The Chair receives an SRA of £19,836 and a further five SRAs are allocated to the vice-chairs and lead members of Transport Delivery Committee. The continuation of these payments has been justified by designating the members of this committee as co-optees to the CA and relying on the legal powers to pay allowances inherited from the West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority.

-
- 4.22 The Panel understands that there remains some doubt as to whether allowances can legitimately be paid to other designated co-optees. However, this initiative has been introduced in the Overview and Scrutiny Committees in West Yorkshire CA and the Panel's assumption is that such payments are legitimate, until or unless proved otherwise.
- 4.23 The allocation of allowances to the TDC can be regarded as an historical accident. They date from the time prior to the establishment of the CA, when the West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority was the designated authority with responsibility for all public transport matters – strategy and policy, as well as delivery. In 2016, the most convenient way of dealing with this service within the CA was to incorporate it, as it stood, into the CA's organizational structure, with its current system of allowances (which had been reduced following an allowances panel report in 2015).
- 4.24 Its current status within the CA's structure is, in the Panel's view, clearly an anomaly, and it shares the perception of unfairness noted in the brief. There are other positions in the structure, for example overview and scrutiny, which have a stronger case for allowances than the TDC, in particular. the chairs of the various boards which advise the CA itself.
- 4.25 All but one of these Boards are currently chaired by portfolio holders, for whom the case for allowances were discussed in the previous section (the exception is the Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee, whose chair is not). The TDC no longer deals with transport strategy and policy, which is the responsibility of the Combined Authority Board supported through the advisory Strategic Transport Board; it is now purely an implementation/delivery body. As such, its role remains a significant one, particularly in relation to dealing with the widespread public responses to its implementation responsibilities. Bus routes, the location of bus stops, the operation of the METRO are all topics which generate much public interest and concern, but the TDC's role has reduced significantly since the Integrated Transport Authority era.
- 4.26 The Panel was also made aware that the future role of the TDC is currently the subject of a member level review of Transport Governance. However, the Panel can only express a view concerning its current responsibilities. Its view is that the current elaborate system of allowances paid to members of this committee should be discontinued, but that its chair should receive an SRA of 7% of the recommended mayoral allowance (£6,650) as co-opted member of the WMCA. The Panel was advised by WMCA legal staff that it could not legally discontinue allowances during a Municipal year, this advice has been considered in the relevant wording of the recommendation.
- 4.27 This figure reflects the Panel view that the responsibilities involved in this post, although of significance, are less than those involved in holding a portfolio or chairing a policy board. These recommendations should be regarded as interim; they will need to be reviewed in the light of the outcome of the Transport Governance Review, due to report later this year.

Other Allowances

- 4.28 Although there were different views expressed to the Panel as to the effectiveness of the overview and scrutiny arrangements in the CA, it is, in its view, important to recognize the importance in principle of this role, especially because the CA (elected mayor excepted) is not a directly elected body; its members are appointees from the seven metropolitan authorities and hence cannot be held directly accountable by the electorate.
- 4.29 The Panel recommendation is that the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should receive an allowance of 7% of the recommended mayoral allowance (£6,650), on the basis that parity with the allowance for the Chair of the TDC is felt to be appropriate. This
-

allowance can be justified, as is the case in West Yorkshire, by regarding the post holders as co-opted members of the CA. In West Yorkshire, all members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees receive a small allowance, but the Panel did not feel it appropriate to make a similar recommendation. In local authorities, it is typically only the chairs and sometimes vice-chairs who are seen as eligible for SRAs and there is no reason to depart from this practice in the WMCA.

- 4.30 The same principle can be applied to the Chair of the Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee, whose role is clearly one of undoubted significance in the work of the CA. It too should be allocated a co-optees allowance of 10% of the recommended mayoral allowance (£9,500). The chairs of the other subject-specific Boards established by the WMCA (e.g. Investment, Wellbeing, Environment and Energy etc.) are all currently held by portfolio-holders, otherwise a similar allowance would be appropriate.
- 4.31 The overall impact of these recommendations would, in the Panel's view, lead to a system of allowances which is fairer and more consistent with regard to the responsibilities attached to the various positions, and which avoids the excessive use of co-optees allowances which currently exists within the TDC.

Indexation and other elements

- 4.32 The Panel recommends the introduction of a system of annual up-rating of allowances which is based on the average increase in salaries (public and private sector) in the previous financial year in the West Midlands, as published in the Annual Survey of Household Earnings (ASHE). This is the criterion used by the Birmingham allowances panel and has the advantage of being geared specifically to circumstances in the region.
- 4.33 The Panel considered it appropriate that its recommended allowances should be backdated to May 2021, when the last mayoral election took place.
- 4.34 However the Panel was advised that allowances cannot be discontinued part way through a municipal year and it therefore reluctantly accepts that the status quo should continue until April 2023 or until a structural change impinging on the work of the TDC is implemented.
- 4.35 The Panel accepts in principle that the allowances paid to the Mayor and Deputy Mayor should be pensionable. This is not possible under existing legislation, but the possibilities of achieving this end in other ways should be explored.
- 4.36 The Panel sees no reason to depart from the current provisions for travel and accommodation and other allowances, whereby officers and members are treated equally.

Recommendations

- 5.1 The subsequent recommendations from the Panel are as follows:
- 1 The annual allowance paid to the elected mayor should be increased from £79,000 to £95,000.**
 - 2 The annual allowance paid to the deputy mayor should be set at 33% of the mayoral allowance (£31,675)**
 - 3 Independent Remuneration Panels within the seven Constituent Councils of the Combined Authority area should be encouraged to consider recommending a 'top up' to their council leaders' overall allowance (basic plus SRA) to acknowledge the time commitment and responsibilities of their role as portfolio**

holders in the WMCA. The Panel's recommendation would be to set this at 10% of the mayoral allowance (£9,500) but that will be a matter for each individual panel to decide.

- 4 The Chair of the Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee should be allocated a co-optees allowance of 10% of the mayoral allowance (£9,500) in acknowledgement of the responsibilities involved in the position.
- 5 The current scheme of allowances paid to members of the Transport Delivery Committee cease by the end of 2022/23 and be replaced by the allocation of a co-optee's allowances of 7% of the mayoral allowance (£6,650) to its Chair
- 6 The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be allocated a co-optees allowance of 7% of the mayoral allowance (£6,650).
- 7 All allowances should be up-rated annually using as an index the previous year's percentage increase in household earnings in the West Midlands as set out in the Annual Survey of Household Earnings (ASHE), published by the Office of National Statistics.
- 8 All recommended allowances should be backdated to May 2021, the date of the last mayoral election.
- 9 Eligibility for a pension scheme should in principle be provided for the mayor and deputy mayor. This is not currently possible through the CA, which is, however, encouraged by the panel to explore other options (e.g. private pension schemes)
- 10 The current schedule of travel, subsistence and childcare allowances should continue to apply to both officers and members of the CA.

5.2 The Panel commends these recommendations as a consistent and fair system of allowances, easy to understand and straightforward to administer.

APPENDIX A – Combined Authority Orders

WMCA Orders

West Midlands Combined Authority Order 2016: [The West Midlands Combined Authority Order 2016 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

West Midlands Combined Authority Order (Election of Mayor) 2016: [The West Midlands Combined Authority \(Election of Mayor\) Order 2016 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

The Value Added Tax (Refund of Tax to Tees Valley and West Midlands Combined Authorities) Order 2016: [The Value Added Tax \(Refund of Tax to the Tees Valley and West Midlands Combined Authorities\) Order 2016 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

West Midlands Combined Authority Order (Functions and Amendment) Order 2017: [The West Midlands Combined Authority \(Functions and Amendment\) Order 2017 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

West Midlands Combined Authority Order (Adult Education Functions) 2018: [The West Midlands Combined Authority \(Adult Education Functions\) Order 2018 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

West Midlands Combined Authority Order (Business Rate Supplements Functions and Amendments) 2018: [The West Midlands Combined Authority \(Business Rate Supplements Functions and Amendment\) Order 2018 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](#)

APPENDIX B – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Part A. Review of Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowance

- review of remuneration to be paid to the position of the WMCA Mayor from June 2022 that is commensurate with the responsibilities of the position;
- review of remuneration to be paid to the position of the WMCA Deputy Mayor appointed by the Mayor from amongst the members of the MCA Board;
- review of the allowances scheme that will cover expenses.

Part B. Wider Roles and Responsibilities at Board Level

- In the context of the recent Governance Review, it is recognised that greater responsibility is being placed on other Board members to carry out roles for respective portfolio areas. The review will look at this issue and make any observations or recommendations to individual constituent IRPs as part of setting their allowances. It would of course be up to each individual Constituent Authority to decide if they wish to follow such observations.

Part C. Other Allowances in the Organisation

- The review of allowances be extended to examine the roles and responsibilities of other positions within the Combined Authority Governance Structure in order to make observations on whether allowances could and should be provided. Recent reviews at West of England and West Yorkshire have examined allowance issues for other positions such as Overview & Scrutiny.
- In addition, at the Inaugural Meeting of the WMCA Board in June 2016 the Board was advised that because the members of the Transport Delivery Committee were co-opted members of the Committee and not members of the WMCA Board, the prohibition on the payment of allowances did not apply and the allowances formerly agreed by WMITA could continue to be paid.
- The Transport Delivery Committee has continued to receive basic and special responsibility allowances that were agreed by the former West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority before the WMCA was established. The arrangement has not been reviewed since 2016. This is quite clearly an anomaly in the organisation and has led to some perceptions of unfairness.
- Examination of the roles and responsibilities of other positions across the Combined Authority will provide an opportunity to examine the allowances currently paid to members of the Transport Delivery Committee. A Review of Transport Governance at Member level will also assist in deciding what to do in relation to these payments.

APPENDIX C – Evidence Considered

- ❑ WMCA Orders
- ❑ WMCA Constitution
- ❑ 2021 Review of Governance Report
- ❑ 2021/22 schedule of meetings
- ❑ 2022/23 DRAFT schedule of meetings
- ❑ 2016 WMCA report of the IRP
- ❑ Most recent reports of IRPs at Greater Manchester Combined Authority, West Yorkshire Combined Authority, South Yorkshire Combined Authority, West of England Combined Authority

Comparative Data

Remuneration paid to Elected Mayors in English Combined Authorities 2021	
Combined Authority	Remuneration (Allowance)
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough	£75,000 (IRP rec to increase to £86k)
Greater Manchester	£110,000 *
Liverpool City Region	£80,631
North of Tyne	£65,000
South Yorkshire	£79,000
Tees Valley	£65,000
West Midlands	£79,000
West of England	£65,000 (will be £87k by 24/25)
West Yorkshire	£105,000 *

* = includes PCC & Fire responsibilities

Annual Allowance of City Mayors

Council	Mayor (since)	Allowance pa (2021/22)
Bedford	Dave Hodgson (2009)	£62,551
Bristol	Marvin Rees (2016)	£79,468
Copeland	Mike Starkie (2015)	£50,000
Doncaster	Ros Jones (2013)	£66,080
Hackney	Philip Glanville (2016)	£85,375
Leicester	Peter Soulsby (2011)	£77,063
Lewisham	Damien Egan (2018)	£78,118

Liverpool	Joanne Anderson (2021)	£83,539
Mansfield	Andy Abrahams (2019)	£55,762
Middlesbrough	Andy Preston (2019)	£63,560
Newham	Rokhsana Fiaz (2018)	£86,589
North Tyneside	Norma Redfearn (2013)	£67,321
Salford	Paul Dennett (2016)	£68,701
Tower Hamlets	John Biggs (2015)	£80,175
Watford	Peter Taylor (2018)	£67,05

Remuneration paid to other Public Posts 2021	
UK/ Devolved Nations Elected Representative	
UK Member of Parliament (MP)	£81,932
Minister of State (UK)	£116,019
UK Parliamentary Under Secretary	£106,409
Member of the Northern Ireland Legislative Assembly	£50,500
Member of the Scottish Parliament	£64,470
Member of the Welsh Assembly	£67,649
Greater London Assembly	
Mayor of London	£152,734
Deputy Mayor	£105,269
Chair of London Assembly	£70,225
London Assembly Member	£58,543
NHS Non-Executive Appointment	
NHS Non-Executive	£13,000
NHS Trust Chair	£43,000 - £60,000*
* NHS Trust Chair salary dependent upon annual turnover of Trust	
West Midlands Police and Crime Commissioner	£100,000

Combined Authority Populations 2021 (Office of National Statistics)	
Combined Authority	Population
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough	859,800
Greater Manchester	2,848,300
Liverpool City Region	1,564,000
North of Tyne	839,500
South Yorkshire	1,415,000
Tees Valley	667,200
West Midlands	2,939,900
West of England	950,000
West Yorkshire	2,345,200

Combined Authority Devolved Powers

Combined Authority	Devolved Powers
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough	<input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Skills & Adult Education budget <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development/Business Support <input type="checkbox"/> Non-statutory spatial planning
Greater Manchester	<input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Economic development/ Business support <input type="checkbox"/> Regeneration and Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic spatial planning <input type="checkbox"/> Skills and training <input type="checkbox"/> Police and Crime Commissioner <input type="checkbox"/> Fire and Rescue <input type="checkbox"/> Waste <input type="checkbox"/> Public health co-ordination powers <input type="checkbox"/> Power to create Mayoral Development Corporation
Liverpool City Region	<input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Economic development <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & environment <input type="checkbox"/> Skills, Adult Education and apprenticeships <input type="checkbox"/> Culture <input type="checkbox"/> Power to create Mayoral Development Corporation
North of Tyne	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development/Business Support <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Power to create Mayoral development Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Skills and adult education budget <input type="checkbox"/> Tourism/culture <input type="checkbox"/> Transport
South Yorkshire	<input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Skills, training & Adult Education <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Economic development/ Business Support <input type="checkbox"/> Non-statutory spatial planning <input type="checkbox"/> Tourism/Culture <input type="checkbox"/> Power for to create Mayoral Development Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Employment
Tees Valley	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development/ Business support <input type="checkbox"/> Skills and Adult Education Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Power to create Mayoral development Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Tourism/culture <input type="checkbox"/> Housing
West Midlands	<input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Regeneration <input type="checkbox"/> Productivity & Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Culture & Digital <input type="checkbox"/> Environment & Energy & HS2

	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Strategy
West of England	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic development <input type="checkbox"/> transport <input type="checkbox"/> Skills, apprenticeships and adult education <input type="checkbox"/> Power to create Mayoral development Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Employment
West Yorkshire	<input type="checkbox"/> Economic development <input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Power to create Mayoral development Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Police and Crime <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Education and Skills

Constituent Allowances

Role	Birmingham (2021)	Coventry (2021)	Dudley (2021)	Sandwell (2018)	Solihull (2022)	Walsall (2018)	Wolverhampton (2021)
Leader	£56,579 + basic £18,681	£26,081 + basic £14,490	£25,213 + basic £10,737	£26,278 + basic £10,620	£24,215 + basic £10,000	£22,841 + basic £11,146	£25,000 + basic £9,763
Deputy Leader	£45,265 + basic £18,681	£18,832 + basic £14,490	£19,940 + basic £10,737	£23,650 + basic £10,620	£11,623 + basic £10,000	£14,916 + basic £11,146	£20,000 + basic £9,763
Portfolio Holder	£28,289 + basic £18,681	£11,593 + basic £14,490	£14,355 + basic £10,737	£15,768 + basic £10,620	£9,686 + basic £10,000	£11,431 + basic £11,146	£15,000 + basic £9,763
O&S Chair	£14,145 + basic £18,681	£11,593 + basic £14,490	£9,560 + basic £10,737	£8,751 + basic £10,620	£7,748 + basic £10,000	£7,430 + basic £11,146	£15,000 + basic £9,763
O&S Member	£900 + £18,681	-	-	-	-	-	-