

Review of Political Proportionality

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Portfolio: | Non-executive function |
| Ward(s) Affected: | n/a |

Purpose

To review the political proportionality of committees.

Background

1. As a result of a change in the division of members into political groups, the Council is asked to review the proportional political allocation of places on committees and to adopt a revised scheme of proportionality.
2. Annex A sets out the political proportionality for committees and the overall political proportionality.

Political Proportionality

3. The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 requires seats on committees to be allocated in proportion to the political composition of the Council. Only with no councillor voting against such a decision, can an authority decide that it wishes to adopt an arrangement other than a proportional one. Where there has been a change in the division of members into political groups, local authorities are required to review political proportionality as soon as practical.
4. The number of seats of each group on the Council and the resulting percentages are now as follows:

| <u>Conservative Group</u> | <u>Liberal Democrat Group</u> | <u>Community Group</u> | <u>Green Group</u> | <u>Camberley Independents Group</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 16 45.71% | 10 28.57% | 5 14.29% | 2 5.71% | 2 5.71% |

5. In determining the allocation of seats on committees, the proportion that each political group forms of the total membership of the Council is applied to the total number of elected councillor seats on each committee. Fractional entitlements of less than one half are rounded down and entitlements of one half or more are rounded up. So that this process of rounding does not result in disproportionate advantage to one political group, the aggregate membership of all the committees must also be in line with the proportions on the Council.

Options

6. The Council has no option but to review political proportionality as a result of the change in the division of members into political groups. Where it is not possible to achieve absolute proportionality for each committee, the scheme agreed must achieve overall proportionality across all the committees of the Council.
7. The Executive is not required to be proportionally balanced.

Proposal

8. The Council, at its meeting on 15 May 2019, appointed the committees as set out at Annex A with the committee sizes shown, as amended at the Council meeting on 18 December 2019.
9. The possible schemes of proportionality have been discussed informally with the Group leaders. Annex A sets out 2 options which have been formulated taking into account the some of the preferences expressed. Both of the schemes achieve the required balance between the five political groups on the Council.

Resources Implications

10. There are no resource implications arising from this report.

Recommendation

11. The Council is advised to RESOLVE to
 - (i) adopt a revised scheme of proportionality; and
 - (ii) note that the revised memberships of the standing committees of the Council will be agreed by the Interim Deputy Chief Executive on the nomination of the Group Leaders.

Background Papers: None

Author: Rachel Whillis - Democratic Services Manager
rachel.whillis@surreyheath.gov.uk

Executive Head of Service: Richard Payne – Executive Head of Corporate