



Leicester
City Council

HONORARY ALDERMEN

Nomination Criteria

Name of meeting: Council

Date of meeting: 19 February 2020

Lead director/officer: Kamal Adatia – Monitoring Officer

Useful information

- Ward(s) affected: All
- Report author: Matthew Reeves
- Author contact details: Matthew.Reeves@Leicester.gov.uk
- Report version number: 1

1. Summary

To consider amendments to the criteria for appointment to the position of Honorary Alderman.

2. Recommended actions/decision

That the amendments to the nomination criteria for the title of Honorary Alderman indicated in paragraph 5.4 of the report be approved.

3. Scrutiny / stakeholder engagement

N/A

4. Background and options with supporting evidence

- 4.1 Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972 allows the City Council to “**confer the title of Honorary Alderman on persons who have, in the opinion of the Council, rendered eminent services to the Council as past Members of that Council but who are not then Councillors of the Council.**” Such a decision must be made by a resolution passed by not less than two thirds of the Members voting thereon at a special meeting of the Council.
- 4.2 An Honorary Alderman may attend and take part in such civic ceremonies as the Council may from time to time decide, but does not, as such, have the right to attend meetings of the Council or to receive any allowance or other payment under the Members Allowances Scheme.

5. Detailed report

- 5.1 Council first made arrangements for the appointment of Honorary Aldermen on 30 November 2006 based on the rules contained with the legislation, but also with the intention of only considering nominations every 4 years following discussions between political group leaders.
- 5.2 Further, Council agreed some additional criteria on 24 November 2011:
- the title of Honorary Alderman should be awarded to a Councillor at the end of their front-line political career (i.e. they should not seek public office after being awarded the title if they should do so they should forgo the title).

- It should be awarded after significant service (for the avoidance of doubt this should be a minimum of 8 years as a Councillor); and
- the Councillor should not have previously held the position of Lord Mayor as former holders of this office are already recognised by the Council and the title of Honorary Alderman is to recognise those who have contributed but not have attained the title of Lord Mayor.

5.3 The criterion were further amended on 23 May 2013 to have the effect of allowing nominations to be considered up to once per year and to permit nominations to be received from Councillors who are not part of a political group.

5.4 Council is now asked to make a further amendment to amend the “*significant service*” criteria from:

- “a minimum of 8 years as a Councillor”
- to
- “a period of more than one full term as a Councillor”

5.5 It is submitted that this modification to the qualifying criteria represents a more proportionate and less arbitrary assessment of “*significant service*.”

6. Financial, legal, equalities and other implications

6.1 Financial implications

The only financial implication is the cost of the appointment of Honorary Aldermen, for which the council has specific statutory power to incur. This cost should not be significant and can be met within existing budgets.

Colin Sharpe, Head of Finance

6.2 Legal implications

The legal implications are dealt with in the body of the report.

6.3 Equalities implications

There are no direct equality implications arising from this report.

Corporate Equalities Team

6.4 Climate change and carbon reduction implications

There are no climate change implications associated with this report.

Aidan Davis, Sustainability Officer

6.5 Other implications (You will need to have considered other implications in preparing this report. Please indicate which ones apply?)

None.

7. Background information and other papers:

None.

8. Summary of appendices:

None.

9. Is this a private report (If so, please indicate the reasons and state why it is not in the public interest to be dealt with publicly)?

No.

10. Is this a “key decision”? If so, why?

No.