

### **1 PHG Penny - Local councillor or other elected official**

I wish to object to the proposed increase in remuneration for all councillors and elected council officials. The proposed increase of +6.2%, whilst it may be an average of pay increases across Wales, is far in excess of what most public sector employees have been awarded across the UK group of countries.

Professions that Wales is already short of, and has difficulty in recruiting, such as teachers in mathematics and science subjects, high quality university staff, and medical doctors and surgeons, have been held to between +4.0%, (in England), and +3.2%, (Local government staff). Whilst, in the long run, any employing organisation has to pay the going rate for staff, it seems particularly inappropriate for elected officials to be granted an increase considerably beyond that granted to other public sector groups.

### **2 On behalf of a local authority**

Llangollen Town Council appreciates the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the Draft Annual Remuneration Report 2026–27. Having considered the content of the report, the Council has no specific comments to raise at this time.

However, the Council wishes to seek confirmation from the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru as to whether, given that the Town Council's annual income or expenditure now exceeds £200,000, it will accordingly move from Group 4 to Group 3.

### **3 Member of the public**

In order to consult I would need to know :-  
Who or what you are independent from?  
Who appoints the board ?  
Is there any measure of efficiency?

### **4 On behalf of a local authority**

I am writing on behalf of Portskewett Community Council with regards to the above.

Members have considered the report and agreed that the proposals are reasonable and allowances adequate to meet councillors needs.

### **5 On behalf of a local authority**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the draft annual remuneration report.

The Council's Democratic Services Committee noted the Commission's proposals for 2026-27 at its meeting on 4 November. The Committee is also looking forward to receiving more information about the Commission's priorities during next year and is anxious to be notified in good time of any intention to make significant structural changes for 2027-28. There was

particular interest in understanding more about the proposal to consult on remuneration for members of corporate joint committees.

#### **6 Cllr Robert Wood - Local councillor or other elected official**

From my own observations and perspective, I believe resettlement payments are an excellent idea.

My reasons are that it will encourage younger councillors into the democratic process, something that is desperately needed given the unique skill set of many younger councillors. It would also encourage those who may already have skills that would benefit councils to seek re-election, as opposed to perhaps taking new more secure employment, knowing if they fail to get re-elected, then they will at least have some time to seek new employment or to train for another career.

#### **7 On behalf of a local authority**

Llanllawddog Community Council at its meeting on 3 November 2025 considered the Draft Report of the Commission on Remuneration and is supportive of the Determinations therein.

#### **8 Gareth Jones - Local councillor or other elected official**

I am e-mailing you as a member of Powys County Council and also a member of Aberedw CC, in respect to the draft remuneration report and would like to provide the following comments.

Principal Council Proposals - I note that the basis of the proposed remuneration is based on 3 days employment paid on the average mean wage in Wales, which is equivalent to just over £18 per hour if a member undertakes the equivalent of 3 days per week work undertaking their duties. I feel that as there is a significant percentage of the working population of Wales both employed and self-employed who earn significantly below this hourly rate that the basis of the Average calculation should be changed from the "mean" to the "median" or at least it should be a consideration for the 2027-28 changes.

I also feel that your actual report should also include an explanation of the reasons for the proposed payments in respect to senior members and those holding a civic paid position, which I feel it does not at the moment.

Town and Community Councils - Although your proposals for the mandatory payment to Town and Community Councillors is small and after tax is the equivalent of just £2,50 per week, I would like the word "Mandatory" replaced with the words "Recommended payments".

#### **9 On behalf of a local authority**

I am emailing to inform you that the Council has no comments to make on the draft report.

## **10 On behalf of a local authority**

### **Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru – Draft annual remuneration report 2026-2027**

I refer to the draft Annual Report 2026/27 received from the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (DBCC), and we are grateful that the Council has had an opportunity to comment on its contents.

The draft report has been considered by a panel of Members and the Council's observations are as follows:

#### **1. Basic Salaries**

It is noted that the proposal is to increase basic salaries by 6.4% bringing the basic salary to £21,044.

The Council understands the need for balance when considering Councillor salaries.

On one hand, we could say that the equivalent of 3 days used by the DBCC does not adequately reflect the role of a Councillor i.e. ensuring that all training has been completed, their community role, as Governors etc. It could be argued that the role of a Councillor is at least equivalent to 5 days a week.

However, on the other hand, at a time of increasing budget pressures and challenges on public finances, the Council believes that the increase should be equal to rate of inflation. It should be on a par with the increase for Local Government employees. This is the second year of a significant increase for Members, over and above the pay increase received by Council employees, who in 2025/26 received a 3.2% increase.

We raised this issue last year, but the DBCC may also wish to consider a flat rate increase (rather than a percentage) in order to reduce the differential between the various roles, but to keep the overall increase the same, but at the same time, taking into account the ongoing financial pressures on Council budgets.

The Council acknowledges that any increase will be criticised by taxpayers and there needs to be clear communications from the DBCC to explain this as it's often the Council that's criticised for increasing salaries when many in society are struggling with living costs.

#### **2. Senior Salaries**

The Council asks whether the 'Council Groups' based on population are still relevant for the roles of Leader, Deputy Leader and Executive Members? All Band 1 and 2 Members will have the same responsibilities and similar challenges and it could be argued that those in smaller authorities are pulled in all directions – having to attend more meetings, regional working e.g. Corporate Joint Committees and Growth Deals.

Is population the correct measure for how much Band 1 and 2 Members are remunerated given that the responsibilities are exactly the same. Is it therefore time for all Band 1 and 2 Members to be paid the same?

### **3. Other proposals**

The Council has noted, and accepts, the other proposed determinations contained within the draft annual report.

### **4. Other comments**

a. As with any role, not all Councillors give the same dedication to the role as others. Is it now time to consider whether Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 needs to be updated and a review of the requirement to attend at least one meeting of that Authority within a six-month consecutive period unless permission for the absence is granted by the Authority in advance. As a Council we believe that this period should be less than six months.

b. The Council would also like to highlight the changes due in 2027 to Town and Community Councils and the potential impact this will have on County Councillor workload and also the ability of Town and Community Councils to take on services.

c. The Council welcomes reference to resettlement payments and looks forward to hearing more in next year's report.

### **11 On behalf of a local authority**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the consultation by the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (the commission) on Councillors' remuneration for 2026/27. I enclose the response for Cyngor Gwynedd.

- We welcome the Commission's intention to fully review and introduce substantive changes to the remuneration framework once in each electoral cycle, and to focus on annual updating in the years in between. We would be grateful to receive information as soon as possible for 2027/28 (so that it is known as soon as possible for those who are considering standing in the May 2027 election).
- We welcome that the Commission takes local authority budgets into account when considering the annual increase in remuneration for Councillors. This year, the increase in members' salaries is 6.4%, compared to 3.2% received by local government staff in 2025/26. It is welcomed that the Commission intends to look specifically at the relationship between Councillors' salaries and the ASHE Wales index during the coming year, and it is recommended that the annual increase should be considered in the context of the corresponding increase for local authority staff.
- Unlike previous years, there are no details in the report indicating whether each Member will receive remuneration automatically, nor details regarding circumstances when an individual member does not wish to receive the sum (or part of it), and the arrangements that should be in place for that to happen. Confirmation of this situation is requested in the final report.
- There are no details as to whether or not the roles of Civic Head and Deputy Civic Head (if paid) are included within the limit. (It was clear in the past that these were not within the limit.) Confirmation of the situation regarding higher salaries for Civic Head and the Deputy Civic Heads is requested as part of the final report.

- We are glad that the Commission believes it is necessary to encourage payments to members of Town and Community Councils and we recommend that the Commission acts accordingly in future years.

- There is no change to the recommended rates for co-opted Members and lay Members for 2026/27. It is noted that the rates for co-opted Members and lay Members have not increased for some years. However, there is a particular emphasis on an 'appropriate officer' within the authority to set in advance whether a meeting is programmed for a full or half day, and to decide when it will be appropriate to apply a day or a half day rate or to use an hourly rate where it is sensible to aggregate a number of meetings. Given that the hourly rate was originally introduced to reflect a new way of working (e.g. briefing meetings lasting three-quarters of an hour), it is recommended that the Commission emphasises the need to use the hourly rate, rather than generate additional work for officers in identifying whether the half day or full day rate applies – this indicates that county councils are financially prudent and pay fairly for work that is carried out.

- We are glad that the Commission had already recognised that payments for co-opted Members and lay Members are a specific issue to be addressed in 2026/27. We emphasise the need for this issue to receive fair consideration since it is difficult to attract lay Members who carry out extremely important work, so there must also be annual increases in remuneration for these Members, as is the case for Elected Members.

- The work for 2026/27 as set out in chapter 1 is welcomed, with the following comments:

- o Resettlement payments – there are no further comments

- o Remuneration for senior roles across principal councils and corporate joint committees – it is strongly recommended that this work be carried out in 2026/27 in order to recognise the additional work that has fallen mainly on the shoulders of Cabinet members due to new requirements that apply to corporate joint committees. Some of the other higher salaries could also be reviewed, given the actual demands of these roles compared to the remuneration given, for example, to committee chairs.

- o The measure used to decide the uprating of remuneration levels – see the comments above, especially for keeping them up to date with salary increases for staff.

- o Payments for co-opted members and lay members – see the comments above in support of this work, the need to promote hourly rates, and an annual increase in remuneration rates for lay members for their work.

## **12 On behalf of a local authority**

Thank you for your recent email regarding the draft Annual Remuneration report; I would like to make the following comments:

1. I note that the increase given to all bands is 6.4%; how is this justified when CPI is 3.8% (September 2025 figures), CPIH is 4.1%, and RPI is 4.5%; benefits, including state pensions are being increased by 4.8%, which is the growth in average earnings as per September's figures

2. I would be grateful if you could take over the remuneration for Community Council Clerks salary increases which from April 2025 (backdated) is 3.2%; as CC Clerks are the backbone of Community Councils, most of whom do many extra unpaid hours of work as they work for their Community, an increase of 3.2% as opposed to 6.4% seems to be unfair; it is little wonder that CC Clerk vacancies are being advertised on a regular basis.

### **13 On behalf of a local authority**

Good afternoon – thank you for contacting us – the Town Council has no comments to make on the draft annual report.

### **14 On behalf of a local authority**

I'm writing on behalf of Bangor-on-Dee Community Council regarding the mandatory member payments for community and town councils.

Our **current precept is £25,821**. With **10 councillors**, we estimate the mandatory elements would cost **£2,080 per year** (10 × £208), plus a **small contingency** for eligible claims (e.g., costs of care). That equates to **just over 8% of our precept** at a time when budgets are already very tight for the core services and small grants we provide locally.

Our councillors have consistently expressed that they **do not wish to take these payments**. Making them mandatory would require us to divert funds away from local priorities and would **materially impact the services** we can deliver for a small, close-knit community.

We would be grateful if you could consider:

- Allowing a **local opt-out** (individual or council-wide) where members decline the payment; or
- Providing **flexibility/exemption** for small councils under a defined precept or electorate threshold; or
- Enabling a **phased or reduced rate** for smaller councils to limit service impact.

We're keen to remain fully compliant while safeguarding essential community services. We would therefore welcome inclusion in the policy of practical options that balance remuneration principles with the financial realities of very small precepts.

### **15 On behalf of a local authority**

The Democratic Services Committee has considered the proposals set out in your draft Annual Report for 2026–27 and wishes to submit the following representations:

#### **1. Proposed Basic Salary Increase**

While we acknowledge the Commission's rationale for aligning councillor remuneration with average earnings, the Committee has significant concerns regarding the proposed 6.4% increase for 2026–27.

- This level of increase is considered unpalatable in the current economic climate, particularly when compared to pay settlements for public sector workers.
- We recommend that any uplift should be linked to inflation or aligned with average public sector pay awards, ensuring fairness and public confidence.
- We feel the time to introduce a large increase should be next year when you consider the framework as a whole in readiness for the 2027 election.

## 2. Co-opted Member Payments

The Committee notes that payments for co-opted members have remained unchanged since 2022. We believe this requires review to reflect their contribution and responsibilities. We request that the Commission considers an appropriate adjustment in future determinations.

## 3. Recruitment and Diversity

We recognise the importance of fair remuneration to attract a diverse range of candidates, including younger individuals and those without alternative income streams. However, we believe this objective should be balanced against affordability and public perception. We support a comprehensive review of the remuneration framework ahead of the 2027 local elections, as indicated in your report.

## 4. Timing of Major Changes

The Committee agrees that substantive changes to the framework should be introduced next year to provide clarity for prospective candidates before the 2027 elections.

In summary, the Committee does not support the proposed 6.4% increase for 2026–27 and urges the Commission to adopt a more modest, inflation-linked approach. We also request a review of co-opted member payments and welcome further engagement on the wider remuneration framework.

Thank you for considering our views. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further clarification.

## **16 On behalf of a local authority**

The commission's draft annual report was reported to WCBC Democratic Services Committee and debated yesterday.

The following comments were made by our Councillors in attendance:

1. The optics and timing are appalling, and a councillor queried the justification of the rise.
2. Another councillor felt the rises were embarrassing and made them feel uncomfortable.
3. One councillor felt they would benefit by having more input and prior engagement into proposed rises.
4. One councillor mentioned this was a contentious issue and sought clarification that the body making the decision was an independent body – which was confirmed in the report to the committee.

5. One councillor was mindful remuneration needs to be balanced to encourage and enable younger generations to consider becoming a county councillor.
6. Councillors asked could the draft annual report be sent to them upon publication. We will attend to this internally, and regarding the same, I would be grateful if you could add my colleagues, [REDACTED] to WCBC recipient list, [REDACTED]. I am copying [REDACTED] into this email.

#### **17 On behalf of a local authority**

The above issue was discussed at the Council's monthly meeting. It was decided that there are no comments to make.

#### **18 On behalf of a local authority**

I write on behalf of Llanengan Community Council to inform you of the decision that the Members had no objection to the recommendations, although they themselves do not accept payments.

#### **19 On behalf of a local authority**

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on this draft report. The Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority has no comments to make.

#### **20 On behalf of a local authority**

The consultation was discussed at the Council meeting in November, and it was decided that there are no comments to make.

#### **21 On behalf of a local authority**

The **Draft Annual Remuneration Report 2026-2027** was considered by the Democratic Services Committee on 29 September 2025. The Draft Report was shared with all Elected, Independent and Co-Opted Members of Cardiff Council, who were advised that they could respond to the consultation individually, as a political group or contribute to a response being collated by the Committee.

There was no specific feedback from the Committee on the draft report but the Committee were keen to see how the Welsh Government's objectives for remuneration would be progressed. The objectives which included the possibility of resettlement payments, revisiting the Remuneration of Senior Roles and the current links to the Annual Survey of Hourly Earnings would potentially present a number of challenges not only for Local Authorities for funding and management of these proposals but for the wider Member Community.

If further consultation were to take place on these objectives I am sure Cardiff Council would be interested in taking part.

## 22 On behalf of a local authority

### Extract of the Determinations of the IRPW Draft Annual Report 2025-2026 and the Vale of Glamorgan's comments

**Note:** This report only outlines the salary figures of Group B Councils to which the Council belongs.

<b>Determination 1</b>	The basic salary for Elected Members of Principal Councils is set at £21,044
<b>Comments</b>	The basic salary will be aligned with three fifths of the All Wales 2022 ASHE (Annual Survey for Hours & Earnings), the latest figure available at drafting. This is in line with the DBCCs stated aims. The Authority feels there should be a freeze, and that payments should freeze and remain in line with 2024/25.

<b>Determination 2</b>	The salary of a leader of the Group B council will be £71,025. All other payments have been determined with reference to this.
<b>Comments</b>	<p>The limit on the number of senior salaries payable (the cap) will remain in place. The All Wales 2022 ASHE (Annual Survey for Hours &amp; Earnings) applies to Band 1 (Leader of Council &amp; Deputy Leader of the Council) and Band 2 (Executive Members), Band 3 (Committee Chairs), Band 4 (Leader of the largest opposition Group, Band 5 (Leader of other political Groups) where pay is frozen and the basic salary increase will apply.</p> <p>The Authority feels there should be a freeze, and that payments should freeze and remain in line with 2024/25.</p> <p>Determination 2 of the DBCC would have the following effect:</p>

Senior Salaries (inclusive of Basic Salary) – Group B Councils	2025/26	Proposed 2026/27
<b>Band 1</b>		
Leader	£66,727	£71,025
Deputy Leader	£46,709	£49,717

<b>Band 2</b>		
Executive Members	£40,036	£42,615
<b>Band 3</b>		
Committee Chairs (if remunerated) and Civic Head	£29,657	£31,567
<b>Band 4</b>		
Leader of the Largest Opposition Group	£29,657	£31,567
<b>Band 5</b>		
Leader of Other Political Groups and Deputy Civic Head	£23,726	£25,253

<b>Determination 3</b>	<b>The salary level for a Chair of a Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Vice-Chair</b>
<b>Comments</b>	The proposed amounts are £10,522 and £5,261 respectively.  The Authority feels there should be a freeze, and that payments should freeze and remain in line with 2024/25.

<b>Determination 4</b>	<b>Payments to National Park Authorities &amp; Fire and Rescue Authorities</b>
<b>Comments</b>	The Authority makes no comment on the increase as it is a matter for those authorities.

<b>Determination 5</b>	<b>Co-opted Member Payments</b>  The fees for co-opted members of Principal Councils, National Park Authorities and Fire and Rescue Authorities and lay members of Corporate Joint Committees are set out in Table 4.
<b>Comments</b>	The Authority makes no comment on the proposal.

<b>Determination 6</b>	<b>Payments to Community and Town Council Members</b>  The optional financial loss compensation for Community and Town Council members is increased to up to £67.45 for each period not exceeding 4 hour and up to £134.90 for each period exceeding 4 hours but not exceeding 24 hours. All other payments to members of Community and Town Councils are unchanged from previous years.
<b>Comments</b>	The Authority makes no comment on the proposal.

Whilst unrelated to the determinations, the Committee also noted the proposals surrounding resettlement payments, and indicated that they did not support the introduction of this payment for Councillors.

## **DEMOCRATIC SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a Remote meeting held on 25th November, 2025.

[REDACTED]

### **DEMOCRACY AND BOUNDARY COMMISSION CYMRU DRAFT ANNUAL RENUMERATION REPORT (HDS)**

The Head of Democratic Services presented the report and noted that Members will be familiar as it is presented to the Committee on an annual basis, detailing the proposed payments for Councillors in the next financial year. The Committee was advised that this is the first report around remuneration, as the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru has taken over the responsibilities of the Independent Remuneration Panel for Wales. The Head of Democratic Services noted the suggestion of the Commission exploring resettlement payments and advised that the Committee will receive more information surrounding this change as it becomes available. He further indicated that Members could make individual representations, and that Appendix B represented the Council's views to the proposed determinations, with the responses based upon previous years, with determinations 1 and 2 echoing wording from previous years, and determinations 3 to 6 offering no comment as they are areas which do not directly impact upon us as a Council, noting that determination 5 is for co-opted Members pay to be frozen as Welsh Government are planning to undertake a systematic review of co-opted payments across all levels of Government. He advised that following the Committees agreement of a response to the consultation, a formal response would be shared with Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru alongside the minutes of the meeting.

Councillor Dr I. J. Johnson added that the Committee continue to use ASHE (Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings) to inform their proposed baseline salaries for Members.

Councillor Mahoney commented that he had personally refused pay rises over several years, and that the proposed remunerations are eye-watering, with the need to give taxpayers a break in the current economic environment. He urged the public to look at the amounts being paid to Councillors and reflected that the same Commission is also looking to increase the number of Councillors from 54 to 59 at the next Election, which he felt would be at increased cost to residents. He further indicated that he would not be in acceptance of the increase in May and urged other Members to follow suit.

Councillor Dr I. J. Johnson clarified that this was the opportunity to shape the Council's response to the proposals, and that the proposed increase to salaries was 6.4%, which would mean that the basic salary for elected members would increase to £21,044, alongside the basic salary for the largest opposition groups and committee chairs increasing to £31,567, with a full breakdown by all positions available in the report.

Councillor Carroll indicated that he was unable to support the proposals or responses outlined within the consultation response, as he felt they are not suitable, sensible or appropriate, and

moved that the Committee recommend Members in receipt of salaries as outlined within Determinations 1, 2 and 3 should receive a pay freeze for the upcoming year. This was seconded by Councillor Bruce.

Councillor Thomas noted that the Committee has the same discussion every year, and that recommendations from the Commission are based on a three-day working week, with many Chairs and Senior Members doing more hours than this. He further added that whilst lots are under pressure financially, the proposals are evidence based and reflect the wider nature of increasing salaries and noted that whilst many Members of the Council are involved in the work of Town and Community Councils, many do not take the allowances which are available.

Councillor Hanks believed that this was a significant increase and the Commission should increase the number of constituents within wards if increasing salaries to reflect additional workload, and felt there was no need to increase the number of elected Members.

Councillor Bruce reflected upon the salary being based on a 20-hour working week, and that she believed some Members do a lot more than this; whilst also noting that it was not possible to know how many hours individual Members worked as this information was not recorded and collated.

Councillor Dr I.J. Johnson responded that a framework to monitor Members working arrangements would be difficult to implement and manage and emphasised that the Council generally follows on through with the recommendations from the Commission.

Following a request from a Member for a Recorded Vote the vote took place about the proposed amendment to the consultation response as follows:

<b>Member</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Gillian Bruce	√		
George Carroll	√		
Sally Hanks		√	
Ian Johnson			√
Kevin Mahoney	√		
Neil Thomas		√	

Councillor Hanks additionally raised that this did not agree with the proposed resettlement payments, with Councillor Mahoney in agreement and stating that if Members are not voted in, they should lose their salary. Councillor Carroll also expressed opposition to the principle of resettlement payments and confirmed that these arrangements already existed in the Senedd. Councillor Dr. I.J. Johnson indicated that the Committee disagreeing with the principle of resettlement for Members who lose their seat in an ordinary election of Council could also be added to the consultation response.

RESOLVED –

(1) T H A T the Committee noted the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (DBCC) Annual Report

(2) T H A T the consultation response to the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (DBCC) Annual Report (Determinations 1 to 3) be updated to include that the Vale of Glamorgan Council feels that there should not be a 6.4% increase in Members' salaries, and that they should remain unchanged from 2024/25.

(3) T H A T members of Vale of Glamorgan Council does not support the proposals for resettlement payments for Councillors being explored by Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru.

Reason for decisions

(1,2&3) To ensure that Members of Democratic Services Committee had had opportunity to share their viewpoints surrounding any proposed changes and reflect discussions at the meeting.

[REDACTED]

**23 On behalf of a local authority**

Flintshire County Council's Constitution and Democratic Services Committee considered the Draft annual remuneration report 2026 – 2027 at its November meeting.

In the absence of any specific questions as in previous years, it was suggested that the Committee focussed on five main aspects from the draft annual report, and comment on each. These were: Resettlement payments; Salaries for senior roles; the basis for setting remuneration levels; Corporate Joint Committees; and, Determinations from previous years.

Therefore, please find below the Committee's comments for each.

**1. Resettlement payments**

*Q. Do the committee have any views to submit to the Commission in response to proposals to introduce resettlement payments.*

A. The Committee did not agree with the introduction of 'resettlement payments'.

It was felt that it would encourage individuals to stand just to receive the resettlement payment.

There was also the feeling that where a sitting Councillor standing for re-election does not get re-elected, the electorate had effectively 'sacked' them. No other profession / industry pays individuals who have been 'sacked' and it gives the wrong impression to the local residents.

**2. Salaries for senior roles**

*Q. Do the committee have any views to submit to the Commission in response to proposals to review the remuneration of senior roles in local authorities.*

A. See response to Point 3 below.

### **3. Basis for setting remuneration levels**

*Q. Do the committee have any views to submit to the Commission in response to proposals to the continued use – or otherwise – of the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings as the basis for setting the remuneration levels.*

A. The Committee did not agree that the level of proposed increase to the remuneration levels (6.4%) was appropriate in the current climate; specifically the current and significant financial pressures facing Local Authorities. It was suggested that any increases should not be above the level of inflation.

The Committee suggested that any increases should be better aligned with public sector workers, and cited the 'Green Book', NJC rate increases.

An alternative view expressed at the meeting was that the remuneration for a Councillor (with no additional responsibilities) continue to be set at a level that would attract new, younger individuals to consider standing for council.

The SRA payments for senior roles should then be increased at the rate of inflation or in accordance with the public sector workers.

### **4. Corporate Joint Committees (CJC)**

*Q. Do the committee have any views to submit to the Commission in response to the remuneration of members of a CJC.*

A. The Committee felt it was part of the Councillors role to attend meetings of the CJC, so no remuneration should be made. Expenses can be claimed, and it was felt this was sufficient.

### **5. Determinations from previous years**

*Q. Do the committee have any views to submit to the Commission in relation to the previous years' determinations.*

A. No comments were made by the Committee in relation to this aspect, although there was a view expressed that 'dual' role Councillors (those who are both a County and Community/Town Councillor) should not receive payment for their role on the Community/Town Council.

## **24 On behalf of a local authority**

I am writing to provide the views of the members of our Democratic Services Committee.

They noted the report and a member provided the following comments.

I agree with most of the sentiment of the report

Para 4. Resettlement payments. Something I raised with the then panel quite a few years ago. Compared to the way that MS's/MP's are treated councillors are certainly treated as inferior beings. The fact that there is no payment whatsoever means that there is a real cliff edge, especially for councillors in a leadership role who lose their seats.

I recall that around three elections ago that, I think, seven council leaders failed to get re-elected. Without discussing the merits or otherwise of why they were not re-elected it does put

councillors who suddenly have no income in a very difficult situation. This is especially the case for those of working age.

This is a real disincentive when trying to get people, especially younger people, interested in being a councillor.

I am happy that the framework of allowances be reviewed.

When a councillor takes on extra duties outside the home authority that should be recognised.

Para. 48. I note that councils should provide adequate telephone, email and internet facilities.

Para 81. The huge discrepancy between an allowance for staying in London and elsewhere. It is normally more expensive to stay in London but not to the extent indicated in this allowance.

Not particularly for CCBC but I see no indication of an increase in Community and Town council allowances.

I trust you will note the response but if you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

## **25 On behalf of a local authority**

In relation to the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (DBCC) Draft Annual Report for the municipal year 2026/27 the Committee expressed diversity of opinion in relation to the 6.4% increase to the basic salary increase for Councillors. Members highlighted that whilst this was in line with all-Wales 2024 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), the proposed increase was written at a time when the UK inflation rate was at 3.2%. Concerns were expressed about this significant gap and the fact that this could result in very negative public perception of Councillors and Local Government as a whole.

Whilst noting this, there were also concerns from the Committee that sufficient provision had to be put in place to ensure that certain groups are not disincentivised as potential candidates in the 2027 Local Government Elections. Members noted that the financial aspect should not become a barrier preventing individuals from standing, especially from marginalised groups.

The Committee felt that there was a fine balance between the two that needed to be considered and monitored, particularly for any new Framework for 2027 onwards. A balance to prevent a greater divide between the public and local government that also didn't discourage or exclude any potential candidates from putting themselves forward as a future Councillor to represent their community. Whilst appreciating that the purpose of using the ASHE was to try and align salaries to national average, the proposal was made for keeping Councillor salaries in line with current inflation rates.

Further comment was also made in relation to the disparity between Bands 1 and 2 within the report, for Leader and Deputy Leader. Members proposed that this be considered as part of the new framework and whether this gap was too large and needed addressing. Members also suggested that consideration be given to splitting the bands for Councillor salaries (as with staff), to have performance-based levels within each band.

On the subject of resettlement payments for councillors who are unsuccessful when seeking re-election, the Committee agreed that this did not sit comfortably with them. Whilst

understanding that for some roles, such as that of an Executive Member, councillors may have given up other jobs to commit to these positions, the Committee agreed that councillors are fully aware and understand the risk when putting themselves forward in an election; the risk that, whether new or returning, the title could be limited to one term of 5 years. There was also the view that councillors don't always go into roles for financial reasons and wanted to do so for the good of their community. Any financial recompense, therefore, should not be necessary and would again risk public perception of Councillors and Local Government.

## **26 On behalf of a local authority**

The draft remuneration report was considered by Conwy County Borough Council's Democratic Services Committee on 24 November 2025 and the observations are as follows:

- It was suggested that public consultation on proposals should take place once during every Council term.
- Whilst there was general agreement that Members' remuneration should be increased, the proposed 6.4% figure was deemed excessive, as it exceeded the rate of local government staff pay increases.
- Reference was made to the average increase in pay in Wales being 3.9% during 2024/2025 and 4.3% during the previous year.
- It was important to attract a diverse membership, however, a lower pay increase should be considered.

**The Committee RESOLVED that the above be shared with the Democracy and Boundary Commission Cymru (DBCC) as the Council's response to the consultation but they would also like to make it clear, in their view, remuneration for Members should not exceed average earnings during the current or previous year.**