

Members' Allowances Scheme

for

Dacorum Borough Council

Report by the

Independent Remuneration Panel

August 2008

Independent Remuneration Panel Report

Table of Contents

Summary	2
Background	2
Method adopted for the review	2
Conclusions	2
Recommendations	3
Other Recommendations	5
Consideration of a full time Leader of the Council	5
Detailed Commentary And Recommendations	6
The IRP approach in 2008	8
Summary of proposed SRA payments	11
Financial implications	15
Accountability	15
The Unauthorised Changing Of The Scheme	17

Independent Remuneration Panel Report

Independent Remuneration Panel (the Panel) Report on Members'

Allowances

For
Dacorum Borough Council

Summary

Background

An Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP), comprising Chris Swinson (chairperson), Mrs Lynda Evans, Mr Mick Crews and Mr Mike Barry were assigned to review the existing scheme for remuneration of Council Members and reimbursement of their out of pocket expenses. The IRP were to recommend changes to the scheme where appropriate. The IRP met on 11th and 12th August 2008.

Method adopted for the review

The IRP

- Received a comprehensive briefing from Jim Doyle at the beginning of the session
- Met with the Chief Executive of the Authority, Daniel Zammitt
- Reviewed responses to the Questions for Members Allowances review circulated to all Council members prior to the Panels meeting
- Reviewed all relevant documentation as listed below
 - Regulations for Member's Allowances
 - 2006 IRP Report
 - DBC's current scheme of Allowances
 - Comparative Data
 - Questionnaire
 - Member Role Descriptions
 - Case Studies for a possible full time leader.

Conclusions

The IRP drew the following conclusions:

- The existing Scheme appears to be working satisfactorily in most areas
- The current Scheme should remain in place for the Financial Year commencing April 1st 2009
- Allowances should be adjusted by the annual percentage increase in the Retail Prices Index as at September 2008.
- Differences between the workloads of assigned roles should be recognized in a more formal but simpler set of weightings
- There was no evidence of substantial disquiet over the differences in Councillors' workloads, which are not reflected by the allowance system.

Recommendations

Allowances and Expenses

The Council is requested to approve the changes to the existing scheme of allowances for Councillors as set out below. The revised allowances, if approved, to be effective from 1st April 2009. The figures will increase by any increase in the RPI as at September 2008.

The estimated cost of the IRP recommendations is £376,755 for the Financial Year 2009-10, before any increase to reflect an increase in the RPI as at September 2008.

1. Increase the Basic Allowance (BA) payable to all Councillors from £4,830 per annum by any increase in the RPI as at September 2008.
2. Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA) should be calculated as multiples of the BA, and that the following SRAs be paid:

Role	Number payable	SRA 2009/2010 Before RPI	BA Multiplier	Total Cost
Leader of the Council	1	14,490	3	14,490
Cabinet members	6	9,660	2	57,960
Chairman of Development Control Committee	1	4,830	1	4,830

Independent Remuneration Panel Report

Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee	1	4,830	1	4,830
Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Sub Committee	1	1,210	0.25	1,210
Chairman of Appeals Committee	1	3,630	0.75	3,630
Chairman of Audit Committee	1	1,210	0.25	1,210
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	4	4,830	1	19,320
Vice Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	4	2,415	0.50	9,660
Vice Chairman of Development Control Committee	1	2,415	0.50	2,415
Chairman of Standards Committee	1	1,210	0.25	1,210
Opposition Group Spokesman	0			
Liberal Democrat Opposition Group Leader	1	6,380	See note 3	6,380
Labour Opposition Group Leader	1	3,280	See note 3	3,280

3. With regard to the SRAs for the opposition Group Leaders, the scheme should stipulate that an Opposition Group leader must be leading a group of 2 before an SRA is payable (in accordance with the definition of a political group in SI1990 number 1553). The scheme's existing formulae for calculation of the SRA should continue unchanged.
4. No member of the Council should be entitled to receive more than one of the SRAs listed above (in addition to their BA).
5. The indexing arrangement should last to the end of the financial year commencing on 1st April 2009.
6. The Council's existing Care Allowances scheme should continue to operate in its current format for the financial year commencing 1st April 2009.

7. The scale of rates for Subsistence allowances remains the same as those, which the Council currently pays, and should increase on the 1st April 2009 in line with the increase in the Retail Prices Index (RPI) for September 2008.
8. The mileage payments made in respect of all “approved duty” journeys undertaken by members in their own vehicles continues to be kept in line with the per mile operating cost of the vehicle concerned determined by the Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (HMRC).
9. When Councillors use public transport in connection with an approved duty, they are entitled to claim the standard class fare in respect of such journeys.
10. The present Scheme in respect of co-opted members remains in place.

Other Recommendations

11. The IRP recommends that Councillors are not given the option of joining the Local Government Pension Scheme.
12. Each member accepting a role should be encouraged to assess their effectiveness in that role at least annually on the basis of guidelines agreed by The Council.
13. Any deviations from the IRP’s recommendations should be recorded in the minutes at the time the report is considered by the Council.

Consideration of a full time Leader of the Council

In the absence of a formal proposal for the appointment of a full time Leader of the Council the IRP has not considered the implications of such an appointment for the scheme of allowances.

Acknowledgements
The panel would like to thank Jim Doyle, the Council’s Member Support Manager, for organising our meetings, ensuring that we had all the necessary paperwork, an adequate supply of excellent biscuits and looking after us on the days we met.

Independent Remuneration Panel Report on Members' Allowances
for
Dacorum Borough Council

Detailed Commentary And Recommendations

Background

1. The Local Authorities (Members Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended) requires the Council to put in place a policy for members allowances. The policy is valid for a period of up to 4 years and hence this revision will be effective from 1st April 2009.
2. The scheme covers:
 - The Basic Allowance (BA)
 - Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs)
 - Dependent Carers Allowance
 - Travel and Subsistence Allowances
 - Co-optees Allowances
 - Indexation of allowances
 - Any arrangements to backdate allowances
 - Any arrangements to withhold or recover allowances in the event that a member is suspended or disqualified
 - Arrangements (if any) to make Basic or Special Responsibility Allowances pensionable under the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS).
3. Before it can agree the policy, the Council is required to have regard to the views and recommendations of an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) on all of the above issues, with the exception of the withholding or recovery of allowances.
4. In the case of making allowances pensionable, the Regulations provide that the Council can only do so on the basis of a recommendation from the IRP that this should happen. It follows that a recommendation from the IRP to the effect that allowances should not be made pensionable will, in effect, be binding on the Council.
5. The Independent Remuneration Panel met on 11th and 12th August 2008 to consider its recommendations on the scheme. The Panel consisted of:

Chris Swinson, the Chairman and a Chartered Accountant, is currently and Comptroller & Auditor General of Jersey. He was formerly Senior Partner of BDO Stoy Hayward and President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants. Chris and his wife Christine have lived in Dacorum for 6 years.

Lynda Evans, a graduate in Computer Science has been a technology professional working at Reuters in the 1990s, a mother and a paid and unpaid project worker in the charity sector. Married with one young daughter Lynda has lived in Dacorum for 11 years.

Mick Crews, a Chartered Fellow of the Personnel and Management Development. Following 18 years with Proctor and Gamble, 3 with Plessey and 13 with Ellerman Shipping, Mick created his own consultancy working on strategy with several multi-national companies. Mick has lived in Dacorum for 9 years.

Mike Barry, a semi retired IT Business Consultant for a global corporation. Mike spent several years working in Europe and the USA helping other large corporates progress their IT systems. He has a grown up family of 3 girls and 7 grandchildren. Mike and his wife, Veronica have lived in Dacorum for over 34 years.

6. The Panel considered a copy of the Council's current Members Allowances Scheme. It was also provided with the December 2006 IRP report as a reference document, and other relevant papers including :

- Regulations for Member's Allowances
- DBC's current scheme of Allowances
- Comparative Data
- Questionnaire for Members Allowance Review
- Member Role Descriptions
- Case Studies for a possible full time leader.

7. In arriving at its recommendations, the Panel reviewed the working of the existing scheme, invited all members of the Council to meet with the Panel and considered the replies given to a Members Questionnaire on the Scheme. The Panel also met with Daniel Zammit (Chief Executive Officer) and Jim Doyle (Senior Member Support Officer)

Terms of reference

8. The Independent Remuneration Panel was asked by the Council to review the existing policy and recommend a revised Member Allowances scheme for the Council, in accordance with the requirements for such a scheme set out in the 2003 Regulations. The Panel was therefore required to review each of the issues set out in paragraph 2, above.

The IRP approach in 2008

9. The Rationale



The IRP decided to leave the existing scheme in place for the financial year 2009–2010, with modifications only in those areas that were perceived to require immediate attention.

10. The Panel agreed three key principles which governed its overall approach to recommending the new scheme of allowances.
11. Firstly, it was made clear that it was open to the Panel to change any aspects of the current scheme in any way that seemed appropriate. The Panel took the view that, where elements of the existing scheme were operating in a manner which all concerned thought was satisfactory, there was little point in change for the sake of change. Thus it would be sensible to amend only those parts of the scheme which were felt to be inadequate.

12. The second principle was the Panel's support for the continuation of the concept that allowances were provided to enable members to recover the immediate costs they incurred in their duties, and to provide some recompense for the time spent on those duties, accepting that a proportion of that time would be given voluntarily. In this context, allowances are not to be seen as "payment" for work undertaken in the sense which applies to ordinary employment.
13. It was clear to the Panel that such a concept had been applied in deriving the existing allowance scheme, and that the great majority of members continued to support it. The Panel was thus anxious to maintain the principle that the Councillors role is essentially about service to the local community, not private gain.

The questionnaire survey

14. The results of the 2008 survey are given in detail in Appendix A. In general there was broad agreement that the current scheme was working satisfactorily. The response to the questionnaire had been 29%, 15 forms had been returned out of a possible 51.
15. The remainder of this report describes the Panel's recommendations and the reasons behind them.

The Basic Allowance (BA)

16. In the questionnaire survey, a significant majority of Councillors responding thought that the current level of BA was reasonable in relation to the duties all Councillors are expected to undertake.
17. None of the Councillors responding expressed any strong view that the current level of BA was inadequate or unfair.
18. The basic allowance proposed by the 2003 IRP report of £4050 was increased by £200 by the Council and has since then been increased by 3% in 2005/6, and a further 3% for 2006/7. The 2003 IRP Report recommended that the basic allowance (and hence all the other allowances) should be increased each April (from April 2005) in line with the rate of increase in the Retail Prices Index (RPI) for the preceding September. This was agreed by the Council (no minute can be found recording a contrary view) but not implemented. Instead arbitrary percentages were chosen loosely based on council staff pay rises, and rounded, to make them "easy to implement".

Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) – general considerations

19. In looking at the current SRA payments the Panel felt that the current levels and relativities had lost some of their coherence and felt that it would be preferable to use a simplified set of BA multiples. Current SRAs appeared to comply with the ODPM guidance that they should be paid only to those members who have a significant additional responsibility over and above the generally accepted duties of a Councillor. There were no suggestions that certain roles for which an SRA is currently paid should not receive one in the future.
20. The Panel also noted that, whilst the Regulations do not prohibit the payment of more than one SRA to any one member, the Council's existing scheme provided that no member is able to draw more than one SRA at any one time. The Panel felt that this was a sensible provision, as it tends to safeguard against individual members seeking to accrue too many roles or an undue number of allowances. The Panel agreed to recommend that the allowance scheme should continue to provide that no member is able to draw more than one SRA at any one time.
21. The Panel firmly recommend that it would be advantageous for the Council to adopt fully the practice of making all SRA payments a simple multiple of the BA, so that, for example, the amount of SRA would be expressed as three times, or double or half the BA, as the case justified.

There are two advantages to such an approach:

First, that it makes decisions about the level of SRA more intuitive, so that, if the Panel and members feel that the work carried out by the Leader is three times as demanding as that carried out by the ordinary "backbench" Councillor, then the SRA will be worth three times the BA, and so forth;

Second, it makes the indexing of the SRAs unnecessary, as, if the BA is index-linked and the SRA is automatically a multiple of the BA, then there is no need to index the SRA specifically.

22. The Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 defines a political group as constituted if 2 or more members of a Council wish to be treated as a political group. The IRP recommends that a SRA should be paid to the Leader of each properly constituted group within the Council. It also recommends that the existing formulae for the calculation of the SRA payable should continue to apply. The formulae have 2 parts:

- o 0.25 x BA ; and
- o A per capita proportion of 1.5 x BA produced by dividing this amount by the total number of opposition councillors and multiplying the result by the number of councillors in the relevant opposition group.

At the current level of group membership this produces an SRA of £6,380 for the Liberal Democrat group leader and an SRA of £3,280 for the Labour group leader.

Summary of proposed SRA payments

23. The Panel note that the current SRAs paid for the period 1st April 2008 to end-March 2009 are as follows.

Basic Allowance paid to 51 Councillors, £4,830, total cost £246,330.

Role	Number payable	SRA 2008/2009	BA Multiplier	Total Cost
Leader of the Council	1	13,820	2.86	13,820
Cabinet members	6	9,140	1.89	54,840
Chairman of Development Control Committee	1	4,560	0.94	4,560
Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee	1	4,560	0.94	4,560
Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Sub Committee	0			
Chairman of Appeals Committee	1	3,430	0.71	3,430
Chairman of Audit Committee	1	1,140	0.24	1,410
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	4	4,290	0.89	17,160

Vice Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	4	2,840	0.59	11,360
Vice Chairman of Development Control Committee	1	2,290	0.47	2,290
Chairman of Standards Committee	1	1,220	0.25	1,220
Opposition Group Spokesman	0			
Liberal Democrat Opposition Group Leader	1	3,980		3,980
Labour Opposition Group Leader	0			

24. The IRP recommends that the following table of payments is made with effect from 1st April 2009.

The Council is requested to approve the changes to the existing scheme of allowances for Councillors as set out below. The revised allowances, if approved, to be effective from 1st April 2009. The figures will increase by the RPI as at September 2008.

The estimated cost of the IRP recommendations is £376,755 for the Financial Year 2009-10 before any increase for a rise in RPI in September 2008 is taken into account. This represents an increase of £12,065, or 3% over 2008-09.

- Increase the Basic Allowance (BA) payable to all Councillors from £4,830 per annum by the RPI at September 2008.
- Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA) should be calculated as multiples of the BA, and that the following SRAs be paid:

Role	Number payable	SRA 2009/2010	BA Multiplier
Leader	1	14,490	3
Cabinet members	6	9,660	2
Chairman of Development Control Committee	1	4,830	1

Independent Remuneration Panel Report

Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee	1	4,830	1
Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Sub Committee	1	1,210	0.25
Chairman of Appeals Committee	1	3,630	0.75
Chairman of Audit Committee	1	1,210	0.25
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	4	4,830	1
Vice Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	4	2,415	0.50
Vice Chairman of Development Control Committee	1	2,415	0.50
Chairman Standards Committee	1	1,210	0.25
Opposition Group Spokesmen	0		
Liberal Democrat Opposition Group Leader	1	6,430	See note 3
Labour Opposition Group Leader	1	3,280	See note 3

Indexation of BA and SRAs

25. The questionnaire survey and interviews indicated strong support for the indexation of allowances, so that they are increased annually in relatively small amounts, thereby avoiding the need for larger “catch up” increases every four years.
26. The indexing arrangements recommended for allowances other than the BA/ SRAs are set out under the relevant allowance. In all cases, it is recommended that the indexation arrangement should apply until the end of the financial year commencing on 1st April 2009.

Care allowances

27. The questionnaire and interviews showed strong support for the retention of the Council's current care allowances scheme, as it may provide some marginal encouragement for a wider range of people to consider becoming Councillors, and may mean that existing members do not have to stand down simply because they have acquired caring responsibilities. The Panel therefore has no hesitation in recommending that the new allowances scheme should include retaining the existing Care Allowance scheme in its current format, and at the current levels of allowances.
28. However, the Panel judged that, in line with other allowances, the levels of the allowances payable under the scheme should be indexed to Retail Prices Index (RPI). It therefore recommends that the allowances be increased in April 2009 in line with the RPI for September 2008.

Travel and subsistence allowances

29. No change is proposed to the existing scheme of travel and subsistence allowances or the indexation methods. Changes in line with HMRC approved rates can be made without reference back to the IRP.

Allowances for co-opted members

30. The Panel recommends that the present Scheme in respect of co-opted members remains in place.

Ceasing payments of allowances to members who have been suspended

31. The Panel recommends the current regulations continue to apply.

Pensions

32. The Panel recommends that Councillors should not be given the option of joining the Local Government Pension Scheme

Date of Implementation

33. The effective date of implementation for this scheme is 1st April 2009.
34. Backdating of Allowances: The Panel recommends that the Council continues with its current policy of making retrospective payments of SRAs to individual members where circumstances justify it.

Office equipment

35. The Council currently loans members IT equipment, a Broadband connection and provides them with sundries. It also offers them an “allowance” of £200 every four years to cover the cost of any office furniture or equipment they need to purchase for use in their homes in their Councillor role. The Panel understands that, whilst the latter is called an allowance, it is not paid to members as a cash sum, but is held as an account by the Member Services section, which will make or fund purchases from the account on the member’s behalf. This means that it falls outside the member’s allowance scheme, as it is more akin to the Council agreeing to provide members with office equipment of a value of up to £200 over their 4-year term of office.
36. In the Panel’s view, the Council should continue to assist members in undertaking their duties with the loan of IT equipment, and the funding of the purchase of office equipment for use in their home up to a value of £200 over their 4-year term of office.

Financial implications

37. The following represents the Panel’s assessment of the overall financial implications of the revised scheme.
38. The Panel’s recommendation is that the BA should be increased in line with the RPI.
39. The scheme of SRA payments recommended by the Panel (assuming all are claimed) will rise to £130,425 against the current level of £118,360, an increase of £12,065, or 3%, although it should be remembered that this includes the impact of an SRA for the Labour Opposition Group Leader.
40. Therefore the Panel estimates that the overall financial impact of the review of the scheme we are recommending should result in a total cost of £376,755 for 2009/2010, before any increase to reflect a rise in the RPI as at September 2008. This represents an increase in Council’s overall expenditure on members’ allowances of £12,065 for the full year. This is equivalent to an increase of 3% on the current allowances budget

Accountability

41. There continues to be some disquiet over the huge discrepancies in Councillors’ workloads which are not reflected by the allowance system. Now that the allowances which members receive are no longer linked to attendance at meetings, there is a perceived risk that some members may do little for the allowances they receive. This gives rise to concerns that there should be accountability mechanisms in place to

ensure that members are performing their expected duties in return for the payments they receive.

42. These concerns should not be exaggerated, as the vast majority of members perform all their roles conscientiously and diligently, with many putting in time and effort which goes beyond any reasonable expectation.
43. The Panel gave considerable thought to possible mechanisms to ensure or improve accountability. It was however, unable to come up with any startling new solutions. For the most part, it will be down to electorate and peer group pressure to ensure that members perform to expectation.
44. The Panel feels that much of the work done by Councillors is not appreciated by their electorate and that more readily available information on the varied work that they undertake together with the training and support that Members of the Council receive would enable the public to be better informed and may even encourage more people to consider becoming a Councillor themselves.
45. In 2003 the Panel recommended the publication of an annual register of attendance at Committee, Cabinet and other formal meetings. These would show the number of meetings a Councillor was expected to attend, the proportion of those meetings they actually attended, and, for those meetings they did not attend, the proportion where they indicated in advance a good reason for not doing so (e.g. illness, or the need to attend another meeting which clashed with the meeting in question).
46. It would appear that, although such a register is not kept, the council meeting minutes list those present and those who have offered apologies for non attendance. The Council Website now gives the opportunity for such information to be readily placed in the public domain, along with details of ward work and other meetings/consultations that individual Councillors attend. Such web pages would help to promote the work done by Councillors and educate and inform the public. Hard copy would need to be made available on request for those without access to the Internet.
47. The strong training and development support available to Councillors is also largely unknown to the Public and more should be made of it. Again, this should encourage more people to come forward as candidates.

48. In 2003 the Panel recommended the practice, which is increasingly common in Councils, of writing a “responsibilities and objectives” document which defines the expectations Councillors are required to achieve in any role they are asked to undertake. In the light of the changes proposed for 2008 the Panel can only reiterate that for them to carry out a full review they will need to have a defined starting point from which they can then evaluate any increases in the Councillor’s roles and responsibilities.

This 2008 Panel recommends that each member accepting a role should be encouraged to assess their effectiveness in that role at least annually on the basis of guidelines agreed by The Council.

The Unauthorised Changing Of The Scheme

49. Apart from the question of Pensions (where the IRPs’ decision on whether they can be paid at all, are binding) the IRP can only make recommendations, and it is up to the Council to decide whether to accept, or to amend, its proposals. However the Panel cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of making this a transparent and proper procedure which is a matter of public record. Since the 2003 Report was accepted in part and amended in part by the Council, changes have been made to all of the remunerative allowances with no proper authority given by the Council and without reference to the IRP Panel. These changes also contravened the agreed remuneration scheme as published on the Council’s own website. This is not acceptable.
50. All deviations from the Panel’s recommendations should be minuted at the time the report is considered. The Scheme as amended should be adhered to until the next Panel reports. In exceptional circumstances it may be necessary to refer back to the Panel to give interim recommendations. Any properly agreed changes must be published on the Council’s own website.
51. Consideration must be given to which Officers of the Council should have the initial responsibility of ensuring that Members adhere to properly agreed and published decisions on their remuneration.

**Independent Remuneration Panel Report on Member's
Allowances
For
Dacorum Borough Council**

Appendix-A: The Questionnaire Survey

1: The Survey

The first of the principles referred to in the main report was a key factor in the IRP assessment of the questionnaire. This had been circulated to all Councillors, in advance of its meeting, thus giving an opportunity to every member of the Council to make representations to the Panel.

A number of questions in the questionnaire asked Councillors whether they were satisfied with the elements of the current scheme. The objective of the questions was to determine whether there was general satisfaction the current scheme, to highlight any issues that required amendment and to ensure that any new requirements arising subsequent to implementation of the existing scheme be explored, and included if appropriate.

15 Councillors completed the questionnaire. The IRP concluded that the level of response is an indication that most of the Members are satisfied with the current formula and levels of allowances.

2: Summary of Results:

Question:	Responses:	
1. Does the Basic Allowance represent an adequate level of remuneration?	Yes = 13	No = 2
2. Do you support the application of the "Voluntary Principle" to the work the members put in?	Yes = 14	No = 1
3. Do you agree with the list of roles for which SRAs are currently paid?	Yes = 13	No = 2
4. Do you agree that the amount of Special Responsibility Allowance paid is about right?	Yes = 9	No = 5
5a. Your Allowances are currently updated in line with an agreed index. Do you agree they should be indexed in this way?	Yes = 14	No = 1
5b. Index should be in line with:		
- RPI Inflation		Yes = 6
- Average UK earnings		Yes = 2
- Average earnings in local economy		Yes = 1
- Cost-of-living awards to Council employees		Yes = 7
- Some other arrangement		Yes = 0
6. Provision to join the Local Government Pension Scheme:		
- No members should be given the opportunity to join.		Yes = 9
- All members should be given the opportunity to join		Yes = 6
- Only members with SRAs to join		Yes = 0
7. Travel & Subsistence Allowances:		

Independent Remuneration Panel Report

- Should be based on current allowances plus inflation	Yes = 8	
- New Travel & Subsistence to be recommended by IRP	Yes = 0	
- Same as those paid to Council employees	Yes = 7	
- No Travel & Subsistence to be paid in future	Yes = 0	
8. Dependent Carers Allowance:		
- Current provision to remain unaltered	Yes = 12	
- Current provision should be scrapped	Yes = 1	
-	No response = 2	
9. Co-optees allowance to be paid for attendance at Conferences and meetings	Yes = 6	No = 7
10. Council should be able to withhold payments to Suspended or partially suspended members	Yes = 14	No = 1
11. Broadband:		
- Basic Allowance increased to include whole cost	Yes = 10	No = 5
- Basic Allowance to include only part cost	Yes = 4	No = 4

Commentary on the results:

- The two members who felt the need for some change in the Basic Allowance put forward suggestions for an increase.
- There is a considerable difference of view as to what this proportion of the member's time should be subject to the "voluntary principle", varying from 20-75% and with an average of 37%.
- One proposal was put forward that all members of the Development Control Committee should receive an SRA.
- A significant minority (5 out of 15) thought that the relativities between some of the SRAs needed review, particularly in respect of the Chairmen of the Appeals Committees, with a negative reaction to the SRAs for Vice-Chairmen of the OSCs. In addition, an increase was envisaged for the Leader of the Council following implementation of the White Paper.
- With one exception, it was felt that indexation arrangements should be applied to allowances so that they were increased each year; there was a fairly even split among respondents for the indexing mechanism to use between RPI and cost-of-living pay awards to the Council's Employees.
- Just over one half of the members responding wished the existing scheme of Travel and Subsistence allowances to be retained, with the remainder favouring a scheme giving the same allowances as the Council's employees.
- There was a fairly even split among respondents over the payment of allowances to co-opted members, with those in favour suggesting an allowance of between 20-30%.

3: Other Issues & Comments

Members were given the opportunity to make any other comments or to raise any issues that they felt should be considered by the IRP. Among these were:

- The promotion of role rotation at a senior level.
- A more equal division of Committee work, with a minimum level of member involvement suggested allied to a sliding scale of allowances.
- Recognition that there would inevitably be personal use of the Broadband service provided to members.

A cautionary note was raised concerning the Council's budget requirements for savings elsewhere making it unfair to increase member's allowances other than for inflation.