# Report to Full Council 

## Date: 20 September 2023

## Title: Committee Proportionality Review

Author and/or contact officer: Sarah Ashmead, Monitoring Officer
Ward(s) affected: All
Recommendations: That: -

1. The Council approves the allocation of seats on council committees to political groups at Appendix 1
2. As a result of a tie with the most marginal seat on the BOB (Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, and Berkshire West) Joint Health Scrutiny and Overview Committee, the Council decides which Political Group to allocate the final seat to (Conservative Group or IMPACT Alliance)

## Background

1.1 A request has been received from the Conservative Group Leader to conduct a proportionality review. Since the last proportionality review in May 2023, Cllr Jaspal Chhokar has been elected via by-election and subsequently joined the Conservative Group. Additionally, Cllr Nabeela Rana has left the Alliance Grouping and joined the Conservative Group. These political group changes have resulted in a change in proportionality as detailed below.
1.2 This report seeks approval to the proportionality arrangements for committees of Buckinghamshire Council established in the constitution as follows:

- Strategic Sites Committee and the Area Planning Committees
- Licensing Committee
- the Pensions Committee
- the Senior Appointments and Pay Committee
- the Standards and General Purposes Committee
- the Audit and Governance Committee
- the Select Committees


## Political Proportionality

1.3 The distribution of seats on Committees is governed by Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, which require the allocation to accord with the rules on proportionality. The Regulations state that seats on Committees must be allocated to each political group in the same proportion to the number of seats held by each of those groups on the Council (rules of aggregation as well as being in the correct proportions on each Committee individually, in so far as this may be practicable).
1.4 The political balance of the Council is currently 113 Conservatives, 16 Liberal Democrats, 6 Independents, 6 Labour, 3 Wycombe Independents, 2 Independent Network and 1 Green Party. There are 3 political groups comprising 113 (The Conservative Group), 19 (The Alliance Grouping) and 15 (IMPACT Alliance) Members. There are no ungrouped Members. Following the agreement of all political groups the final allocations proposed are listed in Appendix 1.
1.5 The allocation of total seats in line with political proportionality is as set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1 - Total Seats

| Political Group | Seats on <br> Council | \% of whole | Seats actual | Seats rounded |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conservative | 113 | $76.9 \%$ | 165.27 | 165 |
| Alliance Grouping | 19 | $12.9 \%$ | 27.79 | 28 |
| IMPACT Alliance | 15 | $10.2 \%$ | 21.94 | 22 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ |

1.6 The initial allocation of seats to committees in line with political proportionality (before adjustments) is as set out in Table 2 and 3 below.

## Table 2 - Initial calculations before adjustments

| Committees | No | Conservative |  | Alliance <br> Grouping |  | IMPACT <br> Alliance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\hbar} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { U }}{\stackrel{\text { U }}{ \pm}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm}}{\omega}$ |  |
| Pension Fund | 7 | 5.381 | 5 | 0.905 | 1 | 0.714 | 1 |
| Senior Appointments | 7 | 5.381 | 5 | 0.905 | 1 | 0.714 | 1 |
| Strategic Sites | 12 | 9.224 | 9 | 1.551 | 2 | 1.224 | 1 |
| Audit \& Governance | 12 | 9.224 | 9 | 1.551 | 2 | 1.224 | 1 |
| Standards | 14 | 10.762 | 11 | 1.810 | 2 | 1.429 | 1 |
| Licensing | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Area Planning North | 12 | 9.224 | 9 | 1.551 | 2 | 1.224 | 1 |
| Area Planning East | 12 | 9.224 | 9 | 1.551 | 2 | 1.224 | 1 |
| Area Planning West | 12 | 9.224 | 9 | 1.551 | 2 | 1.224 | 1 |
| Area Planning Central | 12 | 9.224 | 9 | 1.551 | 2 | 1.224 | 1 |
| Area Planning South | 10 | 7.687 | 8 | 1.293 | 1 | 1.020 | 1 |
| Select Committee - Health \& Adult Social Care | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Select Committee Children \& Education | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Select Committee - <br>  <br> Climate Change | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Select Committee Communities \& Localism | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Select Committee - <br>  <br> Housing | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Select Committee - <br> Finance \& Resources | 15 | 11.531 | 12 | 1.939 | 2 | 1.531 | 2 |
| Aggregate | 215 | 165.272 | 167 | 27.789 | 31 | 21.939 | 24 |
| Adjustment required |  |  | -2 |  | -3 |  | -2 |

Note - Committees with 15 seats are over-allocated by one seat, due to rounding (those marked in bold)

| Committee | Size | 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  | ¢ ¢ - ¢ ¢ O ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buckinghamshire \& Milton Keynes Fire Authority | 12 | 9 (9.22) | 2 (1.55) | 1 (1.22) | 0 |
| BOB (Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West) Joint Health Scrutiny and Overview Committee | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \text { or } 5 \\ & (4.61) \end{aligned}$ | 1 (0.78) | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \text { or } 1 \\ & (0.61) \end{aligned}$ | -1* |
| Chilterns Conservation Board | 5 | 4 (3.84) | 1 (0.65) | 0 (1) (0.51) | $-1 *$ |

* In the case of a remainder of -1 , the most marginal seat is lost. Adjusted figures are shown in bold above. In the case of the BOB JHOSC, there is a tie for the most marginal seat and as such, it falls to Council to decide which political group the final seat is allocated to.

Table 4 - Committee size \& model allocation of seats by Group

| Size | Conservative | Alliance <br> Grouping | IMPACT <br> Alliance | Remainder |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 4 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 5 | 1 | 1 | -1 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 9 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 12 | 12 | 2 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |

## Legal and financial implications

1.7 The legal implications are as detailed within the body of the report.

## Consultation and communication

1.8 Consultation on the proportionality and appointments has taken place with the Group Leaders.

Final allocations of Seats (figures in bold indicate where adjustments have been made)

| Committee | Size | ² 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pension Fund | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Senior Appointments | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Strategic Sites | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Audit \& Governance | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Standards | 14 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Licensing | 15 | 11 (12) | 2 | 2 |
| Area Planning North | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Area Planning East | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Area Planning West | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Area Planning Central | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Area Planning South | 10 | 8 | 1* | 1* |
| Select Committee - Health \& Adult Social Care | 15 | 12 | 2 | 1 (2) |
| Select Committee - Children \& Education | 15 | 11 (12) | 2 | 2 |
| Select Committee - Transport, Environment \& Climate Change | 15 | 12 | 1 (2) | 2 |
| Select Committee - Communities \& Localism | 15 | 12 | 1 (2) | 2 |
| Select Committee - Growth, Infrastructure \& Housing | 15 | 12 | 1 (2) | 2 |
| Select Committee - Finance \& Resources | 15 | 12 | 2 | 1 (2) |
| Total | 215 | 165 (167) | 28 (31) | 22 (24) |

[^0]Figures in brackets show the original calculated proportionality seats. Due to rounding, this results in an over-allocation for the Conservative Group of 2 seats, an over-allocation of 3 seats for the Alliance Grouping, and an over-allocation of 2 seats for the IMPACT Alliance Group. Figures in bold indicate where committee seats have been manually adjusted with the agreement of Group Leaders to arrive at the correct committee seat entitlements for Groups overall.

Compared with the last proportionality review in May 2023, the net effect is that the Conservative Group gain a seat on the Communities \& Localism Select Committee at the expense of an Alliance Grouping seat.

Final allocation of seats on other committees and outside bodies

| Committee | Size | $\mathbb{0}$ $\substack{0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buckinghamshire \& Milton Keynes Fire Authority | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| BOB (Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West) Joint Health Scrutiny and Overview Committee | 6 | 4 or 5 (4.61) | 1 (0.78) | 0 or 1 (0.61) |
| Chilterns Conservation Board | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 (1) |

Figures in brackets show the original calculated proportionality seats. The proportionality calculations result in an over-allocation of one seat to the BOB Joint Health Scrutiny and Overview Committee and Chiltern Conservation Board - in each case, the most marginal seat is lost (adjusted figures are shown in bold). In the case of the BOB JHOSC, there is a tie for the most marginal seat and as such, it falls to Council to decide which political group the final seat is allocated to.


[^0]:    * By mutual agreement between Group Leaders, the Alliance Grouping seat on Area Planning South will be taken up by the IMPACT Alliance

