

Independent Remuneration Panel

Phase 2 Review 2016/17

July 2017

06/07/2017

Section One

Contents

Section	Title	Page No.
One	Contents	2
Two	Membership of the Panel	3
Three	Chairman's Forward	4 - 5
Four	Terms of Reference	6
Five	Introduction	6 - 7
Six	Allowances	7 - 12
Seven	ICT	12 - 14
Eight	Changing Role of Elected Member	15 - 16
Nine	Supporting Information - Existing Level of Allowances Member Allowance Comparisons	17 18

Section 2

Membership of the Panel

2.1 The Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) comprises of the following members:

Professor Michael Clarke (Chairman)	Formerly Vice-Principal and Pro Vice-Chancellor of University of Birmingham
Leslie Gunde	Public representative
Professor Paul Jackson	University of Birmingham
Andrew Manning-Cox	Partner - Gowling WLG
Richard Quallington	Community & Voluntary Sector

Section 3



Chairman's Foreword

Professor Michael Clarke

Chairman,

Independent Remuneration Panel

3.1 We are pleased to present the second stage of this review. Worcestershire County Council like all councils is required to have an independent panel, appointed from the community, to keep Members' allowances and related matters under review and periodically make recommendations to the County Council. It is important to note that the Panel only makes recommendations with the aim of setting a fair benchmark for remuneration. Political decisions relating to the actual amount paid are then made by the Councillors themselves. Indeed, as the first part of its current review the Panel reviewed the Basic Allowance and made a recommendation for a modest uplift.

3.2 At the time of our reporting, the County Council asked us to look at two further matters. First, special responsibly allowances (given the changes to Members' roles and responsibilities over recent years), and second the ICT support available to elected Members (given advances in technology, continually broadening opportunities for its use in the day to day life of the elected member and the County Council's ambition in the exploitation of ICT in the delivery of its strategy). This report therefore covers both of these strands.

3.3 The brief given led us first to seek to understand the scale and nature of change impacting on local government and Worcestershire County Council's response to it. This is well documented elsewhere. Suffice it to say here that change has impacted on all corners of the County Council's work and that it is a very different place to what it was when the first independent panel was appointed in 2003. The impact on the role of the elected Member - executive and scrutiny - is much more complex and demands radically changed skill sets. Localism and community leadership on the one hand and commissioning on the other serve to exemplify Worcestershire County Council's ambitions for itself and its citizens; it wants to attract the very best councillors and officers.

3.4 In talking to many elected Members in the course of this review we have been struck by the importance attached to providing the best in supporting new and changing roles.

3.5 We continue to be impressed by the energy and enthusiasm of most Councillors and their willingness to go the extra mile. We worry at the difficulty of attracting younger people or those in full time work.

3.6 In all of this we continue to believe that the voluntary principle remains important where voluntary public service sits alongside a justifiable level of remuneration which recognises the value of what is given (or perhaps we should say lost) through service, in particular at the senior levels of the Council. We salute their contribution.

3.7 We have been generously served in our work by the willingness of both Councillors and officers to talk openly and frankly with us about the changes which they are wrestling with, their impact and what response is required.

3.8 Their insight has turned something which could have been a chore into something much more satisfying and interesting. We are particularly grateful to Deborah Dale, who has both organised us and our programme and made links which we would otherwise have missed, Jodie Townsend, Democratic Governance and Scrutiny Manager, and Sheena Jones, his successor, who, alongside their report writing skills, have brought a wide knowledge of local government in general and elected Member support arrangements in particular; and Simon Mallinson, Head of Legal and Democratic Services.

3.9 The final Report and all that it says however, is something we take full responsibility for. We look forward to its debate.

Professor Michael Clarke

Section 4

Terms of Reference

4.1 To review the level and extent of allowance payments currently made to county councillors having particular regard to:

- The role of the County Councillor and the importance of effective democratically accountable local government and community leadership
- The scale and complexity of the County Council's operations and changes taking place in the various roles councillors are expected to fulfil and the particular responsibilities attached to the various roles
- The time commitment required from Councillors to enable both the Council and individual Councillors to be effective in their various roles
- The importance of encouraging people from all backgrounds and circumstances to serve in local government without suffering financial loss as a consequence of their membership of the Council.

4.2 The Panel also:

- Considers the level and extent of travel and subsistence allowances
- Reviews the payment of allowances and expenses payable in relation to attendance at seminars and conferences
- Makes observations about the support required for Councillors to do their job effectively.

Section 5

Introduction

5.1 The findings of the Independent Remuneration Panel's review of the WCC Members' Allowances Scheme are detailed within this report and the Panel's recommendations are explained throughout.

5.2 The Panel entirely recognise that the Allowances Scheme is a matter for Council to decide upon, having regard to the Panel's report. This underlines the democratic and transparent nature of the process.

5.3 The Panel's role is to provide an independent perspective on the issue of allowances and its report sets a proposed benchmark which Councillors themselves can then debate, accept, amend or reject.

5.4 In short, the Panel -

- Request that elected Members see this report as recommendations, not absolutes

- Recognise the Panel's independent role and that of Council to make the final decision on Member Allowances.
- Recognise that the main body of this report has been developed during the 2013/17 administration and look forward to the debate within the new 2017/21 administration.

Section 6

Allowances

Special Responsibility Allowance

6.1 The Panel were tasked to look particularly at the level of Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs). It should be noted as part of the context that the existing allowances scheme actually permits automatic indexation of both SRAs and Basic Allowances (BA) every year. The last annual uplift was agreed at full Council in May 2008 and for understandable reasons Councillors have voted collectively to freeze the level of allowances before accepting a 1% increase to the Basic Allowance (BA) from April 2016, in line with the Panel's recommendation at that time.

6.2 The allowances have therefore been frozen voluntarily for many years (other than the recent modest increase in BA) and as a result their real value has declined by the cost of inflation. The Consumer Price Index has risen by 9.5% since the last increase in SRA allowances. The Panel considers that its recommended increases bring Worcestershire County Council in line with where it should be.

6.3 The issues are broader than purely inflation. In order to gain a good understanding of the nature of the roles reflected in the SRA Scheme and to ascertain the requirements of each SRA role, the Panel gathered evidence from a number of sources:

- Analysis of the Council's constitution
- Evidence sessions with elected Members in various SRA roles
- Analysis of elected Member 'monitoring sheets' to illustrate time commitment required for that Councillor role
- Information from Democratic Services (such as committee frequency, length, work involved in various Council roles)
- Evidence sessions and written advice from WCC Officers
- Evidence sessions with numerous elected Members including Group Leaders
- Thorough analysis of comparator evidence and benchmarking with other Local Authorities.

6.4 This means that percentage comparisons on previous allowances may be mathematically correct, but they may not reflect either the considerable changes that have taken place since they original allowances were set, or the changes in structure and responsibility since. In some allowances they may not be a like for like comparison.

Basic Allowance

6.5 From the evidence obtained through interviews with Councillors and the monitoring sheet exercise the Panel concluded that there was a general rise in the workload, time commitment required and skillset to be a Worcestershire County Councillor as well as an increase in the number of committee/member body meetings which elected Members were expected to attend.

6.6 The Panel also took into account the freeze that was placed on the allowance from 2008/9 prior to the 1% increase resolved by Council in September 2015 and during this time inflation has run in excess of 9% - therefore the Panel recommend the BA should be increased by 2% in order to bring the Basic Allowance more in line with comparable authorities and take into account the increased time and commitment required for the role.

6.7 Recommendation 1: The Panel believe the demands on time, commitment and ability for elected Members are increasing. Therefore the Panel recommends the Basic Allowance be increased by a further 2% in order to bring it in line with comparable authorities and take into account the increased commitment and skills required for the role.

Special Responsibility Allowances

6.8 The panel is required to consider those activities that are eligible for Special Responsibility Allowances. This is partly governed by the *New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances* (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003), which recognises that some councillors undertake tasks that can be defined as a 'significant additional responsibility'. Importantly, this guidance also states:

'It does not necessarily follow that a particular responsibility which is vested to a particular member is a significant additional responsibility for which a special responsibility allowance should be paid. Local authorities will need to consider such particular responsibilities very carefully. Whilst such responsibilities may be unique to a particular member it may be that all or most members have some such responsibility to varying degrees. Such duties may not lead to a significant extra workload for any one particular member above another.' (Para.73)

Note that an SRA is payable for a significant *responsibility* and not just an additional time commitment, though that may also be an important proxy for the level of responsibility.

In addition, to some extent all councillors have additional responsibilities, but these may not be construed to be significant. The guidance provided in 2003 also recognised that the patterns of remuneration would change as responsibility became concentrated in fewer councillors within the Cabinet system. Evidence from other councils in the UK further supports this. As the guidance states:

'Some councillors will be spending significantly more of their time on council duties than has ever previously been the case. On the other hand, changes in the traditional committee structure will mean that there are far fewer committees and, as a consequence, fewer councillors engaged as chairs and vice-chairs of numerous committees.' (Para.74)

Consequently this review has considered changes in the management of the council and has reflected these within the determination of the remuneration scheme, particularly within the SRAs. Note that the structure of the council and therefore the SRAs remain a political decision and not a technical one.

SRA for the Leader

6.9 The Panel concluded that the role and responsibilities of Leader had increased significantly since the SRAs were last set through the 'Stronger Leader' model.

6.10 The number of meetings for the Leader of the Council has generally increased year on year over the life of the 2013/17 Council and the monitoring sheet exercise evidenced that during June 2016 the Leader spent over 146 hours in his role as Leader. This equates to over 6.5 hours per day if spread over the working week. This shows the role is comparable to that of a virtual full-time position.

6.11 From the research undertaken and the level of inflation since the SRA was last reviewed, the Panel feels that the recommended level of increase provides an appropriate level of recompense for this role while still acknowledging the voluntary element of being an elected Member.

6.12 Recommendation 2: The Panel recommends that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Leader of the Council should be increased by 10% in order to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post and bearing in mind the loss in real term value since it was last increased.

SRA for Cabinet Members with Responsibility (CMR)

6.13 The Panel concluded that the level of commitment and responsibility associated with being a CMR had also greatly increased in the light of the financial challenges facing the Council and to some extent also highlighted by the continued increase in the number of delegated CMR decisions being taken.

6.14 Members and officers interviewed by the Panel reported that all Members, but particularly CMRs, have seen an increase in the demands and skills required for the role. The issue of a need for an increased professionalism and skillset for CMRs was raised by various Members and officers.

6.15 The monitoring sheets exercise also illustrated the large time commitment required and the scope of involvement and responsibility of being a CMR at Worcestershire County Council.

6.16 Recommendation 3: The Panel recommends that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Cabinet Member with Responsibility (CMR) should be increased by 8% in order to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post and bearing in mind the loss in real terms value since it was last increased.

6.17 At present there is no specific allowance band for the role of Deputy Leader and the Panel believe there should be such an allowance to reflect appropriately the additional responsibilities of this role in deputising for the Leader, representing the Council and making key decisions in the Leader's absence.

6.18 The Panel concluded that the current scheme should incorporate the position of Deputy Leader and recommends that a new Special Responsibility Allowance Band be created for the position of Deputy Leader of Council at 10% above the CMR level in order to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post.

06/07/2017

6.19 Recommendation 4: The Panel recommends a new Special Responsibility Allowance Band be created for the position of Deputy Leader of the Council at 10% above a CMR post to reflect its additional level of responsibility.

SRA for Overview and Scrutiny

6.20 The Panel considered the role of Chairman of OSPB was an important one; it was felt this position was the figurehead for holding the Cabinet to account. As a result the post holder could come under particular pressure from the Council, the public and the press in order to ensure that accountability was being delivered for the people of Worcestershire. The Panel agreed this additional responsibility and increase in demands upon the Chair of OSPB should be recognised within the SRA scheme.

6.21 There was evidence to suggest the breadth of the role of Scrutiny Chairs and OSPB Members was directly related to the amount of work and commitment a Chair/OSPB Member was willing to put in. There appear to be varying levels of time commitment required for Scrutiny Chairs/OSPB Member roles. The majority of elected Members interviewed by the Panel felt that training was required to develop Councillors' scrutiny skills to improve the ability for the function to add value. Elected Members also expressed concern that the scrutiny function was not sufficiently valued by senior management. **The Panel believes the Chief Executive should note these concerns.**

6.22 As a matter of principle, it is seen as correct that the leading Scrutiny Member should have the same level of responsibility allowance as CMRs.

6.23 The Panel recommends that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board should be increased by 8%. The Panel considers this reflects the level of responsibility associated with the post, particularly given the significance of the post holder's responsibility to ensure delivery of the Overview and Scrutiny function in both assisting policy development and holding the executive to account. The recommended increase therefore matches that for CMR posts to maintain consistency between the roles and to underline the responsibilities of this post.

6.24 The Panel recommends that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of other OSPB Members (lead Scrutiny Members) should be increased to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post. This equates to an increase of 4% on the existing allowance. The lead Scrutiny members are responsible for ensuring each Scrutiny Panel carries out its role effectively in more specific areas. This requires work outside the meetings themselves, liaising not only with County council officers but others outside the organisation.

6.25 Recommendation 5: The Panel recommends the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board should be increased by 8% in order to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post.

6.26 Recommendation 6: The Panel recommends the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Lead Scrutineer on OSPB (not including Chairman) should be increased by 4% in order to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post.

SRA for Group Leaders

6.27 The Panel agreed with Group Leaders that this remained under-represented within the current scheme. The 2003 Guidance allows for the provision of an SRA to political leaders and paragraph 11 states that an SRA may be paid to a person 'acting as a spokesperson for a political group on a committee or sub-committee'.

6.28 Recommendation 7: The Panel recommends the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Group Leader be increased by 4% in order to reflect the value of the role and enable Councillors to be sensibly recompensed.

SRA for Regulatory Roles

6.29 The evidence obtained by the Panel illustrated that the roles of Chairman of Pensions Committee and of the Planning and Regulatory Committee were particularly arduous and carried additional responsibilities which the other Committees did not.

6.30 The Panel did note comments and advice from officers that the role of Chairman of the Pensions Committee is particularly challenging and arduous due to the complex nature of the documents, information and material the Committee is required to consider. In addition the Panel noted comments from Members and officers concerning the responsibility involved and time commitment of being Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee. It was therefore felt the SRAs for these two particular roles should be distinguished from those of other Committees because of the additional responsibilities involved.

6.31 Recommendation 8: The Panel recommends that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the position of Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee and the Chairman of the Pensions Committee should be increased by 8% in order to reflect the level of responsibility associated with the post.

SRA for Other Committee Chairmanships

6.32 The Panel recommends an increase of 4% for the role of Chairmen of the Audit and Governance and Waste Credit Governance Committees.

Summary

6.33 The Panel recommends that new Councillors' Allowances scheme bandings and levels are implemented from 1st September 2017 as follows (full year allowances shown):

Table 1

Band	Amount	Role
1	£34,182	Leader of the Council
2	£18,150	Deputy Leader of Council

3	£17,820	CMRs Chair of OSPB
4a	£10,514	Chair of Planning & Regulatory Committee Chair of Pensions Committee
4b	£10,124	Group Leaders Lead Scrutiny Members Chair of Audit & Governance Committee Chair of Waste Credit Governance Committee
Basic Allowance	£8,772	Basic Allowance for all Councillors

6.34 During the course of the review the Panel had brought to its attention by Officers a small anomaly within the current allowances scheme. Historically, the Members' mileage provisions have mirrored those available to employees. If an employee exceeds 8,500 miles claimed in a year their mileage expenses drop from their eco band rate (i.e. Band 1 + 45p per mile) to a set 15p per mile. The scheme for Members makes no reference to this reduction.

6.35 Therefore, the Panel recommends that this be altered to bring the over 8,500 miles mileage allowance into line with the employee scheme and that the Members' Mileage Allowances scheme be amended accordingly. .

6.36 Recommendation 9: The Panel recommends the Members' mileage allowance scheme be amended to expressly bring it in line with the officer scheme with regard to claims of over 8,500 miles in a financial year.

Section 7

ICT Provision

7.1 In order to develop an understanding of the ICT requirements of Worcestershire County Councillors the Panel gathered evidence from a number of sources:

- Analysis of the Council's Constitution (Article 13)
- Evidence sessions with various Elected Members regarding ICT provision and need
- Analysis of Elected Member 'monitoring sheets'
- Information from Democratic Services (such as ICT issues and impact on department)
- Evidence sessions and written advice from WCC Officers on ICT provision including the Chief Executive and the Interim Director of Commercial and Change.

7.2 The Panel found that currently elected Members have individual preferences over the devices they use to access information and fulfil their Councillor duties, ranging from desktop to hand held devices. Evidence provided by Members and also by Officers to whom the Panel
06/07/2017

spoke indicated that the needs for fellow Councillors, WCC Officers, Partners and constituents to be able to communicate with Members quickly have increased and that trend will continue. Reasons given for this were:

- Increase in demands upon Councillors
- Councillors becoming more of a community champion within their divisions leading to increase in demand/workloads
- Increase in decisions required from Members
- Increase in meetings – Council meetings, Parish & Town Council meetings, outside bodies, stakeholders, partners etc.

7.3 The present ICT arrangements do not guarantee that a Councillor will have the equipment that they require to be a 'modern' Councillor or that appropriate security of devices or data is achieved. The current arrangements simply provide guidance on how much allowance is available to Councillors for ICT equipment bought by them and what ICT equipment can be bought using this allowance.

7.4 As a result there is a clear danger, evidenced by some Members buying equipment such as tablets and then going back to using laptops, that Members will not have the right equipment to meet the demands of being a Councillor. In addition, the Council must be able to comply with legal regulations and public expectations relating to cyber security and data protection. A failure so to do can lead to very significant financial penalties and of course reputational damage. Further, a number of devices are now supplied direct by the Council and the situation needs regularising.

7.5 The direct provision of WCC hardware has some significant benefits in relation to security and data protection. Preloaded and automatic upgrades of software, which are all provided and monitored within the corporate network, can easily be provided and maintained. By contrast, under the current arrangements the individual Councillor would be responsible for purchasing software packages and maintaining acceptable levels of virus protection through their independent support contract.

7.6 The Panel believe that it is important to make access to Committee Agendas more efficient, cheaper to manage, more accurate and more accessible, providing a better service and improving the democratic process. If Members were provided with appropriate ICT and received training to allow them to use such ICT then opportunities would exist to move towards becoming a 'paper-lite' authority, enabling Members and Officers to receive or access a larger number of agendas electronically rather than in paper form, reducing unnecessary expenditure as well as being kinder to the environment.

7.7 Recommendation 10: The Panel recommends that the Councillors' Allowances Scheme be amended to include (i) the expectations on Councillors to be able to use defined IT and equipment in order to be an effective Worcestershire County Councillor

(ii) the definition of such equipment be as follows:

- Laptop and Printer
- Broadband Internet Connection (or alternative)
- Secure connection to WCC Networks
- Smart Phone

7.8 Recommendation 11: The Panel recommends that the current provision allowing drawdown by any Councillor of up to £1000 over the lifetime of the Council to purchase IT hardware be replaced by direct provision by the Council of IT equipment defined as above.

7.9 Recommendation 12: That the Consumables Allowance be amended to provide a contribution only towards Broadband Connection (or equivalent) at £240 per Councillor per annum provided that a proof of purchase is provided to ensure that the allowance is used for the stated purpose, noting that this is a reduction in the current allowance to reflect current broadband costs and an appropriate encouragement to Councillors to reduce their use of paper and printing consumables at the expense of the Council and to use digital channels wherever possible.

7.10 Recommendation 13: That Elected Members use the new iTrent system for submitting electronic travel claims and expenses instead of submitting paper copies

7.10 Recommendation 14: The Panel recommends the Chief Executive, in consultation with Group Leaders, agrees the following to be implemented during the 2017/18 Council Year:

- what ICT equipment will be provided by the Council to use in producing and managing Committee Agendas in place of paper copies
- what provision will be made for Members who are unable to use ICT equipment to access Committee agendas
- what support will be provided to Members to adopt a paper-lite approach
- how to utilise user groups to trial a paper-lite approach during 2017/18

Section 8

The Changing Role of the Elected Member

8.1 The focus of phase 2 of the Panel's review has been on SRAs and Members' ICT Provision. Our review has shown that both these topics are impacted by the changing role of the Elected Member and the impact that this has on Councillors' workloads, how they conduct business, decisions they are required to be involved in and on the skills and abilities required to be a successful Councillor. This change has provided the evidence and the backdrop against which our findings and our recommendations have been shaped.

8.2 The Panel felt that it would be helpful to communicate to Full Council what issues it had identified as to the changing role of the elected Member so that Full Council could decide if any issue merited any further investigation or consideration.

8.3 The Panel's review has highlighted the increase in demands on elected members. The Cabinet model places enhanced 'roles' and responsibilities on elected Members such as CMR, Scrutiny Member or Planning Member all of which require an increased level of commitment and a specific skillset.

8.4 The Panel of course accepts that it is for the electorate to decide if an individual is worthy of election to public office. However, in the Panel's view, it is also wholly consistent with that principle for the Council to stipulate the specific skills, and training, needed for a particular position.

8.5 At present the Council's constitution states that 'No Member may serve on the Planning & Regulatory Committee unless and until they have undertaken training considered suitable by the Director of Resources.'

8.6 Recommendation 15: The Panel recommend the Council consider whether or not the approach taken to training for Planning Committee Membership could and should be extended to other Member roles within the Council.

8.7 A number of Members and officers told the Panel that the Overview and Scrutiny function at WCC could be more effective. The barriers preventing success appeared to be as follows:

- Lack of 'scrutiny' skills amongst Members
- Need for Member Development to enhance scrutiny skills and role that scrutiny can play
- Overview and Scrutiny function not understood or supported by WCC Officers
- Senior Officers of WCC are focused on supporting the Cabinet function

8.8 Recommendation 16: The Panel believe there are key skills required to be a 'good scrutineer' and in particular a 'good scrutiny chair', the Panel therefore recommend the Council should invest in training and development for Scrutiny Members.

8.9 Another theme which arose on several occasions during the course of the review related to the assessment of Members' performance. Several Elected Members highlighted some concern that Members who were paid an SRA were not subject to any routine performance assessment

to identify areas where Councillors may need support or training. The Panel is of the view that the ultimate assessment of the performance of elected Members will take place at the ballot box. However, the Panel considers it is for the Council itself to decide any additional requirements.

8.10 Recommendation 17: The Panel recommends the Chief Executive, in consultation with Group Leaders, considers developing or trialling an elected Member SRA performance assessment programme for implementation during 2017/18.

Section 8

Supporting Information

Existing Level of Allowance for Special Responsibilities December 2016

Band	Amount of Allowance	Role
Band 1	£31,074.47	Leader of the Council
Band 2	£16,499.71	Cabinet Member with Responsibility Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Performance Board
Band 3	£9,734.84	*Leader of the Conservative Group Leader of the Labour Group Leader of the 2013 Group Leader of the Independent Alliance Group Lead Scrutiny members (including Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee Chairman and Chairmen of Overview & Scrutiny Panels) Chairman of the Planning & Regulatory Committee Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee *Chairman of the Waste Credit Governance Committee Chairman of the Pensions Committee
Band 4	£5,820.68	None currently payable within this Band

*Not currently payable due to rule against double allowances

Members' Allowances Comparisons @ 6th April 2017

Year	Council	Basic £	Leader £	Deputy Leader £	CMR £	Ch O/S £	Ch Plg £	Opp GL £	Co Chm £	Council V-C £
Recommended	Worcestershire	8,716	34,182	18,150	17,820	17,820	10,514	10,124	14,518	3,287
Current	Worcestershire	8,515 + 505 IT consumables	31,075	-	16,500	£9,735	£9,735	9,735	14,233	3,233
No change from 2015/16	Buckinghamshire	10,825	40,106	26,767	20,373	10,192	5,096	1,349 <i>+269 per member</i>	12,736	3,187
2016/17	Cambridgeshire*	7,855	15,302	11,476	n/a*	n/a*	4,590	11,221	6,121	3,060
No change from 2015/16	East Sussex	11,080	24,618	17,232	14,771	6,153	6,153	12,307	12,307	4,927
2016/17	Gloucestershire	10,000	27,300	-	18,200	5,460	5,460	5,850	9,100	2,730
2017/18	Herefordshire	7,400	29,418	-	11,987	11,987	9,261	1,634	9,261	1,634
No change from 2015/16	North Yorkshire	8,994	24,704	15,440	13,896	1,544	3,088	4,632	9,264	3,088
No change from 2014	Shropshire	11,514	23,028	14,392	11,514	11,514	5,757	5,757	8,635	8,635
2016/17	Somerset	10,582	31,743	18,930	16,930	5,291	5,291	9,523	9,523	1,058
No change from 2014/15	Staffordshire	9,022	35,000	26,250	17,500	6,658	6,658	17,500	16,815	8,405
2015/16	Warwickshire	9,263	23,300	13,922	10,345	5,559	5,559	8,051	5,559	2,780