



Report for:	<b>Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>
Date of meeting:	<b>9 March 2021</b>
Part:	<b>1</b>
If Part II, reason:	

Title of report:	<b>REPORT BY THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL 2021 - MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES FOR DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL</b>
Contact:	Layla Fowell – Member Support Officer Farida Hussain – Group Manager Legal & Corporate Services Mark Brookes – Assistant Director – Corporate & Contracted Services
Purpose of report:	To formally receive the proposals of the Independent Remuneration Panel 2020 for a revised Scheme of Members' Allowances.
Recommendations	It is requested that the Committee: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Considers the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel following its review of the Council's existing Members' Allowances Scheme.</li> <li>2. Decides whether or not it wishes to make comments to Cabinet on the recommendations suggested by the Independent Remuneration Panel in its report Annex A</li> </ol>
Corporate objectives:	The role of Local Councillor is a major part of Dacorum Borough Council's delivery of an efficient, effective and modern Council. As such the remuneration that councillors receive should reflect this central role and assist in attracting the calibre of Council Member the residents of Dacorum deserve.
Implications:	<u>Financial</u>  The estimated cost of the IRP recommendations is £428,782.50 for the Financial Year 2021/2022.
'Value for money' implications	The scheme of SRA payments recommended by the Panel (assuming all are claimed) will be £142,927.50, an increase of £714 over the current scheme  The above figure is an increase of £2142 from the estimated cost of £426,640.50 for the Financial Year 2019/2020 due to

	the proposal to implement a 0.5% budget increase to the scheme of allowances (Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowances) as recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel.
Risk implications	<p>This is an opportunity for the Council to develop conditions that encourage participation in the democratic process and contribute to its strategies for engaging with and empowering the community.</p> <p>Failure to produce a relevant and appropriate Member Allowances Scheme could have an impact on the calibre and performance of Members.</p>
Community Impact Assessment	There are no community impacts resulting from this report
Health and safety Implications	None
Consultees:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Independent Remuneration Panel</li> <li>• Members</li> </ul>
Background papers:	The Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel (Annex A)
Historical background <i>(please give a brief background to this report to enable it to be considered in the right context).</i>	The Local Authorities (Members Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended) requires the Council to put in place a policy for members' allowances. Before it can agree the policy, the Council is required to have regard to the views and recommendations of an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP)
Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report:	<p>IRP – Independent Remuneration Panel</p> <p>BA - Basic Allowance</p> <p>SRA - Special Responsibility Allowances</p> <p>LGPS - Local Government Pension Scheme</p> <p>HMRC - Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs</p>

## 1. Background

1.1. 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 this revision will be effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021.

1.2. The scheme covers:

- The Basic Allowance (BA)
- Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs)
- Dependent Carers Allowance
- Travel and Subsistence Allowances

- Co-optees 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).
- 1.3. 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.
- 1.4. In the case of making allowances pensionable, the Regulations provide that the Council can only do so based on a recommendation from the IRP that this should happen. It follows that the recommendation from the IRP to the effect that allowances should not be made pensionable will, in effect, be binding on the Council. (Note that it has not at present been clarified as to whether Councillors will be included in Auto Enrolment under Government Pension legislation, and therefore if the above-mentioned Regulations will remain in place).
- 1.5. The Independent Remuneration Panel met on 14<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> December 2020 to consider its recommendations on the scheme. The Panel consisted of:
- Lynda Evans (Chair), 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 daughter Lynda has lived in Dacorum for 23 years.
  - Brendan Henry who lives in Hemel Hempstead and has been a Dacorum Resident since 1995.
  - Carla Brandon who lives in Dunstable, Bedfordshire. Carla has worked in Dacorum for 20 years and was previously a resident for 26 years.
- 1.6. The Panel considered a copy of the Council's current Members Allowances Scheme. It was also provided with the following relevant papers, as reference documents:
- What is an Independent Remuneration Panel
  - Programme 2020
  - What we would like from the Panel
  - Cabinet Portfolios and Directorates
  - Membership of Cabinet and Committees
  - List of Councillors
  - Timetable of meetings 2019-2020
  - Government Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances
  - I&DeA Members' Allowance Survey 2008
  - HM Revenue & Customs – Mileage and Fuel Allowances
  - Payment of Members Allowances 2019/20
  - Members' Allowances Scheme 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012
  - Report by the Independent Remuneration Panel 2016
  - Minutes from the Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017
  - Cabinet Agenda Report 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017

- Cabinet Minutes 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017
- Other Hertfordshire Remuneration Information
- Other Hertfordshire Member Allowance Schemes
- Last IRPs and their recommendations
- Members Questionnaire Analysis

1.7. In arriving at its recommendations, the Panel considered the replies given to a Members Questionnaire on the Scheme. Those members expressing a wish to meet with the panel were invited to attend the meeting.

1.8. The Panel met with:

- Councillor Ron Tindall – Leader of the Opposition
- Councillor Colin Peter
- Councillor Adrian England
- Councillor Andrew Williams – Leader of the Council

## **2. Terms of Reference**

2.1. 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 14, above.

## **3. The IRP Approach in 2020**

3.1. The IRP considered the existing scheme was working satisfactory and decided to leave it in place with an annual increase based on September CPI figure. An increase of 0.5% which is the CPI figure for September 2020 is therefore the panel's recommendation.

3.2. It was the panel's wish that the allowances remain broadly in line with those of neighbouring councils.

3.3. The panel considerations remained consistent with 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, and should not, be seen as 'payment' for work undertaken in the sense that applies to ordinary employment.

3.4. The Panel agreed two key tenets, which governed its overall approach to its review of Members Allowances.

3.5. Firstly, it was made clear that it was open to the Panel to recommend change to 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.

3.6. The second tenet 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 that applies to ordinary employment.

3.7. 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.

#### **4. The Questionnaire Survey**

4.1. The results of the 2020 survey are given in detail in Appendix A.

4.2. The remainder of this report describes the Panel’s recommendations and the reasons behind them.

#### **5. The Basic Allowance (BA)**

5.1. In the questionnaire survey, a majority of Councillors responding thought that the current level of BA should be increased by 2.75% in line with staff pay. The September CPI figure is 0.5% and the panel recommends increasing the BA by that amount. The panel agreed that in the current climate that the CPI figure of 0.5% was the most appropriate to recommend.

5.2. The indexing arrangement should be changed whereby the allowances are increased in April in line with the Consumer Price (CPI) as at the previous September and last until to the end of the following financial year

#### **6. Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) – General Considerations**

6.1. In looking at the current SRA payments the Panel felt that the current levels and relativities were still appropriate and should remain in place. Special Responsibility Allowances should however be increased by 0.5% in line with the Basic Allowance.

6.2. Current SRAs appeared to comply with the DCLG (Department for Communities and Local Government) 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.

6.3. 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.

6.4. The Panel recommends that the Leader of the Council continues to receive three times the BA, the Cabinet Members receive twice the BA, the Cabinet Support Member receive one times the BA and Committee Chairs receive between a quarter and one times the BA. Some Committee Vice-Chairs also

receive a half times the BA. These multiples were based on the observation of the additional work required to perform these functions. We believe that this allows for a fair and equitable distribution of the available allowances.

- 6.5. 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. With regards to the Special Responsibility Allowances for the Opposition Group Leaders, the scheme stipulates that an Opposition Group leader must be leading a group of 5 before an SRA is payable as agreed by Full Council 14 July 2010.
- 6.6. In 2011 the IRP recommended that the formulae for remuneration for the First Opposition Group Leader be simplified to a multiple of the BA. The Panel suggested a multiple of 1.25, which left the actual amount payable largely unchanged. The 2013 Panel recommend no changes to the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Opposition Group Leader.
- 6.7. The Panel further recommends no change to the current arrangement of there being no additional remuneration to the 2<sup>nd</sup> or subsequent Opposition Group Leader.

## 7. Summary of Proposed SRA Payments

The Panel note that the current SRAs to be paid for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 are as follows:

Role	BA Multiplier	SRA 2017/18	Number payable	Total Cost
Leader	3	16,815	1	16,815
Cabinet members(* see note 23 above)	2	11,210	5*	56,050
Cabinet Support Officer	1	5,605	1	5,605
Chairman of Development Management Committee	1	5,605	1	5,605
Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee	1	5,605	1	5,605
Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Sub Committee <b>Or, and only if this allowance is unclaimed,</b> Vice Chairman of Licensing and Health and Safety Enforcement Committee	0.50	2,802.50	1	2,802.50
Chairman of Appeals Committee	1	5,605	1	5,605
Vice Chairman of Appeals Committee	0.50	2,802.50	1	2,802.50
Chairman of Audit Committee	1	5,605	1	5,605
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	1	5,605	3	16,815
Vice Chairmen of Overview and Scrutiny Committees	0.50	2,802.50	3	8,407.50
Vice Chairman of Development Control Committee	0.50	2,802.50	1	2,802.50
Chairman Standards Committee	0.25	1,401.25	1	1,401.25
1 <sup>st</sup> Opposition Group Leader	1.25	7,006.25	1	7,006.25

## **8. Care Allowances**

- 1.1. The IRP recommends retention of the Council's current care allowances, as it may continue to 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.
- 1.2. The IRP recommend that the hourly rate payable for child care should be in line with the National Minimum Wage which will be £8.72 from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020 up to a maximum of £906.88 for the year. The hourly rate and annual maximum should increase in line with any future increases in the National Minimum Wage.
- 1.3. The IRP recommend that the Dependent Carer's Allowance continue at £13.32 per hour up to a maximum of £1281 per year.

## **9. Travel and Subsistence Allowances**

- 9.1. No change is proposed to the existing scheme of subsistence allowances or the indexation methods. However, the Panel recommend that the mileage payments made in respect of all "approved duty" journeys undertaken by members in their own vehicles be kept in line with the current per mile operating cost of the vehicle concerned determined by the Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC). (Changes in line with HMRC approved rates can be made without reference back to the IRP).

## **10. Allowances for Co-opted Members**

- 10.1. It is proposed that co-opted committee members continue to be paid an allowance for the time they spend in meetings. The allowance for co-opted members of any committee, who are not Chairman of the Committee, should stay at £400 p.a.
- 10.2. We understand that there are no current plans to co-opt a person to chair a Committee. Should such a co-option be made in the future we propose that the co-opted Chairman's allowance should be 0.5 of a Councillor's Basic Allowance.
- 10.3. The allowances payable to co-optees should continue to be covered by the same indexing arrangements that apply to the Basic Allowance.
- 10.4. Co-opted members should continue to receive the same rates of travel allowance in respect of travel to and from meetings as Councillors.

## **11. Ceasing Payments of Allowances to Members Who Have Been Suspended**

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

## **12. Pensions**

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

## **13. Date of Implementation**

13.1. The effective date of implementation for this scheme is 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021.

## **14. Backdating of Allowances**

14.1. The Panel recommends that the Council continue with its current policy of making retrospective payments of SRAs to individual members where circumstances justify it.

## **15. Office Equipment**

15.1. The Council will consider the provision of Broadband to those who do not already have it. It also offers them an “allowance” of £200 every four years to cover the cost of any office furniture or equipment (such as a paper shredder) 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 Support 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.

This will be an item to look at in more detail in the future

## **16. Financial Implications**

16.1. The following represents the Panel’s assessment of the overall financial implications of the revised scheme.

16.2. The Panel’s recommendation is that the BA should be increased in April 2021 by 0.5%.

16.3. Basic Allowance is paid to 51 Councillors and (assuming all claim) has a total cost of £285,855, an increase of £1,428 over the current scheme.

16.4. The scheme of SRA payments recommended by the Panel (assuming all are claimed) will be £142,927.50, an increase of £714 over the current scheme.

16.5. Therefore the Panel estimates that the overall financial impact of its recommendations would result in a total cost of £428,782.50 for the financial year 2021– 2022. This represents an increase of £2142 over the current scheme for the CPI increase.

## **17. Accountability**

- 17.1. The Panel feels that much of the work done by Councillors is still not appreciated by their electorate and that more readily available information on the varied work that they undertake would enable the public to be better informed and may even encourage more people to consider becoming a Councillor themselves.
- 17.2. The council meeting minutes list those present and those who have offered apologies for non-attendance. The Council Website now gives the opportunity for this 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 should help to promote the work done by Councillors and educate and inform the public.
- 17.3. Whilst our remit does not include training and development, the Panel appreciates the significant support available to Councillors and would encourage them to make full use of it. Increasing public awareness of the training and support available may also help to encourage more people to come forward as candidates.
- 17.4. The panel acknowledges there was a view among a significant number of councillors that allowances should be increased by a percentage in keeping with staff salary increases. Although noting this, the panel's view remained that allowances for neighbouring councils was the most appropriate comparison and any link to staff may make the distinction between an allowance and salary less clear.
- 17.5. The panel heard there could be a significant difference in both meeting attendance and contributions by council members. The panel felt that making a formal link between these two duties and the paying of an allowance was outside of its remit. However it felt the point should be noted and the council asked to review its policies to ensure that appropriate actions are taken - in a timely fashion- to address the situation of a councillor not performing their duties without good reason.

## Appendix-A: 2020 IRP Questionnaire

### Responses to 2020 Questionnaire

1. Replies were received from 34 members out of a possible 51, this represents a 67% return.

How long have you been a borough councillor?

- 0 - Less than 1 year
- 16 - 1-3 years
- 3 - 3-5 years
- 5 - 5-7 years
- 2 - 7-9 years
- 8 - More than 9

2. Please tell us how many hours a week on average you spend on your various duties as a councillor. (Please note this does not include activities you may have under any Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) arrangements you may have, as you will be asked about this later in the survey)

	Less than 1 hour per week	1 to 3 hours per week	3 to 5 hours per week	5 to 7 hours per week	7 to 9 hours per week	9 hours or more per week
Ward work (including phone calls, emails, visiting constituents etc)	0	4	10	5	7	7
Preparation for committees	1	9	14	6	0	3
Attendance at committees	0	9	12	7	2	2
Any other activity (please give details in box below)	3	8	3	3	4	1

3. Do you regard the level of activity on Council work as ...?

- 0 – Less than I anticipated
- 17 – About the same as I anticipated
- 15 – More than I anticipated

4. Do you regard the level of activity and time commitment expected of your Council work as:
- 2 – Less than it should be
  - 28 – Reasonable
  - 3 – More than it should be
5. The Basic Allowance has been increased every year since 2017 and the allowance for 2020/2021 is £5,577. Which of the following proposals for basic allowances would you support
- 3 – Decrease
  - 5 – Continue with current allowance
  - 20 – Increase allowance of £5,577 by 2.75% in line with staff pay
  - 5 – Increase by another amount (please specify)
6. The posts shown below attract a Special Allowance (SRA). Please indicate whether you consider the different SRAs are appropriate or not in each case:

\*No member is allowed to draw more than one SRA at any one time

	Too High	Fair	Too Low
Leader (£16,731)(3 x basic)	3	19	12
Cabinet members (£11,154)(2 x basic)	4	23	7
Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committees (£5,577)(1 x basic)	3	27	4
Vice Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committees (£2,789)(0.5 x basic)	4	23	7
Chair of Development Committee (£5,577)(1 x basic)	3	23	8
Vice Chair of Development Committee (2,789)(0.5 x basic)	3	22	8
Chair of Licensing and Health and Safety Committee (£5,577)(1 x basic)	5	22	7
Vice Chair of Licensing and Health and Safety Committee (£2,789)(0.5 x basic)	6	22	6
Chair of Appeals Committee (£5,577)(1 x basic)	8	22	4
Vice Chair of Appeals Committee (£2,789)(0.5 x basic)	7	23	4
Chair of Audit Committee (£2,789)(0.5 x basic)	4	19	11
Chair of Standards Committee (£1,394)(0.25 x basic)	2	23	9
Opposition Group Leader (£6,971)(1.25 x basic)	2	24	8

7. Please indicate which roles, in addition to those listed, you consider should receive SRA and supply any comments or supporting evidence below – 16 comments received on this question.

Written responses:

- None (x8)
- DMC members as there is a lot of paperwork to get through and preparation if done properly. Also it is a big responsibility making key strategic decisions.
- Chair and vice chair of the member development steering group, this group heavily influence the quality and training of councillor's and should be recognised for it's value to all members. The 'Mother and father' of the council too, in recognition of long service to Dacorum
- Chair of Health Scrutiny Committee
- All members of scrutiny committees should receive an allowance. That would stop the scrutiny committees filling up with (semi) active chair and lots of members who contribute nothing apart from showing up on the night.
- Opposition lead on Scrutiny Ctees Chair Member development Cttee
- Mayor because (I assume) the member concerned would lose other responsibility allowances while in office.
- Shadow Portfolio-holder
- Small SRA for short term additional duties such as Task and Finish groups

8. Please indicate any roles for which a SRA is currently paid which, in your view, should not receive such an allowance and supply any comments or supporting evidence below – 12 comments received on this question.

Written responses:

- None (x8)
- I am not sure that vice chairs do in terms of preparation and extra work. I'm not convinced a vice chair needs a big allowance, maybe they should instead receive a small allowance for each time they chair a meeting instead?
- Advisor to the cabinet – why does the role even exist? Disappeared this year but needs not to return, especially in this climate
- Chair/Vice Chair of Appeals Committee. Few meetings and insignificant workload
- Mayor Deputy Mayor Most Councillors are desperate to become Mayor. They do it for the status and the perks, like free meals at events and the mayoral car. Surely this is enough reward without a salary as well.

9. How many hours per week do you estimate you spend on each of the following Council activities as a direct consequence of your special

responsibilities, separate from your involvement as a member elected to represent your constituency?

	Less than 1 hour per week	1 to 3 hours per week	3 to 5 hours per week	5 to 7 hours per week	7 to 9 hours per week	9 hours or more per week
Attending committees	0	6	0	2	1	0
Meeting preparation	0	2	4	3	0	0
Dealing with members of the public about matters relation to the areas you have responsibility over	1	3	1	3	1	0
Any other activity	0	3	0	1	0	0

10. Do you feel that your time commitment and responsibility that you carry is adequately reflected in the current level of SRA applicable to you?

- 4 – Yes
- 5 - No

11. If no, on what basis do you feel it is inadequate?

3 comments received on this question. Written response:

- Your time is taken up by other things not in survey
- It is totally inadequate – it does not even comply with the legal minimum wage! To comply, it should be a Minimum of £300 / WEEK
- Too low in view of the amount of background research needed to do the job properly.

12. Do you consider that the current scheme for Child Care Allowance is:

- 1 – Too high
- 26 - Satisfactory
- 6 - Too low

13. Do you consider that the current scheme for Dependent Carers Allowance is:

- 1 – Too high
- 22 - Satisfactory
- 10 – Too low

14. Do you consider that the levels of the allowances generally are:

- 0 – Too high
- 28 - Satisfactory
- 5 - Too Low

15. Please leave any evidence or comments below if necessary:

5 comments received on this question. Written responses:

- The allowance for meals: too low. BUT re imbursement in full as stated for journeys on trains etc, is fair.
- In 2 places in this survey, we are asked to specify, but there is no box to do so. More attention needs to be paid to the amount of time spent on research (including attendance at other committees eg cabinet) adequately to carry out SR's. We have excellent Council officers, but Members are not adequately incentivised by comparison with other District Councils to do the work to keep up with and maintain the standards of our Officers' output.
- Allowances should be set at a level to attract professionals to be able to dedicate sufficient time to scrutinise the council's work. I would like to be able to take time off work to do this. My employer will allow me to take unpaid leave if I want to, but cannot afford it.
- Travelling time and use of own vehicle to/from meetings and parking should be paid
- The allowances no longer reflect the real price of subsistence and some hotel accommodation

16. Were you aware of the level of remuneration available before you became a borough councillor?

- 10 – Yes
- 24 – No

17. Did your level of remuneration have any influence on your decision to become a borough councillor?

- 1 - Yes
- 33 – No

18. Do you incur any significant costs which you believe are not covered by your present allowance?

- 9 – Yes
- 25 - No

19. If Yes, please leave any comments below

12 comments received on this question. Written responses:

- It's not significant but I spend £240 a year on a mobile phone that I did not use before so I have a separate one for council business.
- Number of hours that I have to take off work is not sustainable for the level of remuneration received.
- Excess time
- Managing community centres can be a full time job and this is not remunerated
- Opportunity cost of working elsewhere due to workload of the council.
- Domestic Broadband, printing the documents as still better IMO than on-screen document for detailed checking etc.
- Inability to accept consultancies and to pursue investment opportunities owing to lack of time.
- I have avoided taking time off work (which would mean I would lose pay) which often means I cannot attend day time meetings. Though my employer is extremely flexible.
- As DBC is paperless it is necessary to print certain documents to take part in meetings as only have one DBC screen
- Own equipment (including home office), electricity, travel etc, In line with other Council employees I believe the compensation is woeful compared to others having to work from home on Council business.
- Attending Parish and Resident related issues in terms of time, fuel costs, telephone and correspondence.

20. When considering whether or not to stand for re-election in the future, how significant a factor would the level of allowance be to you? (1 being not at all significant and 5 being extremely significant)

Average number - 2