

**Classification:** Public

**Key Decision:** No

## **Gravesham Borough Council**

**Report to:** Standards Committee  
**Date:** 27 September 2016  
**Reporting officer:** Assistant Director (Governance & Law) and Monitoring Officer  
**Subject:** Appointments to the independent remuneration panel.

### **Purpose and summary of report:**

To confirm the results of the selection process and make the necessary recommendation to full council.

### **Recommendations:**

That the standards committee recommends to full council the appointment of the following applicants to the council's independent remuneration panel.

- Jag Sidhu
- Idowu Anthony-Ajileye
- Jasvinder Gill
- Maxine Fothergill
- David Brown

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The Constitutional reasons for re-establishing the independent remuneration panel together with the procedure for appointing the panel were set out in the previous report to this committee as recently as 27 July 2016 - copy annexed.

## **1. SELECTION PROCESS**

- 2.1 At the last meeting of this committee the monitoring officer explained that to comply with the Constitution the number of applicants that could be appointed to the panel was between three and five and that at that time there were six applicants who had expressed an interest.
- 2.2 All of the applicants were written to and asked for further career details and why they felt they met the constitutional criteria set out in paragraph 3 of the previous report. The following five of the applicants responded.
- Jag Sidhu, Director of Nick Building Contractors Ltd
  - Idowu Anthony-Ajileye of Tonidol (UK) Ltd
  - Jasvinder Gill, Senior Partner of Hatten Wyatt Solicitors

- Maxine Fothergill, Managing Director of Amax Estates (also an elected Member of the London Borough of Bexley);
- David Brown, Partner of Gullands Solicitors

2.3 The monitoring officer has satisfied himself that all of the remaining applicants meet the criteria and have sufficient standing and experience to serve as members of the independent remuneration panel.

2.4 Accordingly the recommendation is to appoint all five applicants especially in the light of the need to convene meetings of the panel in the immediate future. Having five panel members will provide the council some flexibility in setting up a panel in the event that one of two members are unable to attend. Also going forward panel members are appointed for four years and should one or two members wish to stand down the panel will still be properly constituted and continue to function.

### **3 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

3.1 The standards regime under the Localism Act 2011 has wide ranging propriety implications for the whole of the Council.

3.2 The new regime is subject to judicial review in the event of unlawful or otherwise unreasonable decisions by the Standards Committee, Monitoring Officer or Council. This will only apply if the Council steps outside the statutory framework.

**IMPLICATIONS****APPENDIX 1**

The standards regime under the Localism Act 2011 has wide ranging propriety implications for the whole of the Council.

<b>Legal</b>	The new regime is subject to judicial review in the event of unlawful or otherwise unreasonable decisions by the Standards Committee, Monitoring Officer or Council. This will only apply if the Council steps outside the statutory framework.
<b>Finance and Value for Money</b>	Negligible.
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	Low.
<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Screening for Equality Impacts</b>
	<b>Question</b>
	a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community? If yes, please explain answer. No. There is no potential to discriminate. The appointed Independent Persons have been arrived at following a Borough-wide advert.
	b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality? If yes, please explain answer. <b>No. It is unlikely that the appointment of the Independent Persons will have any effect either way to equalities issues, although it should be noted that the proposed individuals are one of each gender.</b>
	<i>In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above</i>
<b>Corporate Plan</b>	Managing the Council's business responsibly
<b>Crime and Disorder</b>	No direct implications under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
<b>Digital and website implications</b>	
<b>Safeguarding children and vulnerable adults</b>	