



**CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**PUBLIC SURVEY ON COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCES**

**March 2012**

## PUBLIC ON-LINE SURVEY ON COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCES

### Introduction

An on-line survey ran from 14<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> February asking a range of open questions around councillor allowances.

It should be noted that:

- As the survey was on-line, respondents were those who have access to and are competent with technology
- 97.1% of respondents voted in the last local election, whereas a much lower percentage of the population voted. So survey respondents are a subset of those who have an interest in democracy and are likely to have some understanding of the county council

248 responses were received. **Please note that in the breakdowns that follow, the individual category totals may not add up to the total number of responses. This is because the total number of responses counts all the comments, while the categorisation ignores comments such as “See Above” or “No comment”.**

### Summary

The questions asked were in three sections:

**1. Involvement with County Councillors (to help indicate the extent to which the remainder of the survey is based on knowledge; and a question on how challenging the role of councillor is perceived to be.**

**Q1) Did you vote in the last local election? (244 responses)**

Vote Y/N	Count	%
Yes	237	97.1%
No	7	2.9%

**Q2) Do you know who the County Councillor for your area is? (242 responses)**

Aware Y/N	Count	%
Yes	202	83.5%
No	40	16.5%

**Q3) What contact, if any, have you had with your local County Councillor? Please check all that apply**

Contact Type	Count	%
Met personally	79	49.1%
Communicated personally by letter / e-mail / telephone	60	37.3%
Parish meetings	35	21.7%
Through local news articles (For example, through newsletters, in newspapers, online, or radio interviews)	103	64.0 %
Other - Please state:	<b>Alternatives/comments given listed below</b>	
A very low key Councillor - that does not appear to engage fully with constituents.		
Gain information through leaflets posted through letterbox.		
Have met and discussed local issues with him.		
I currently work for the County Council and regularly contact approximately 21 No. Members I know of him.		
Local press		
Met many years ago as we have children of the same age.		
My county councillor is lax at communicating with the people that he represents, no communication, just sound bites in local papers.		
Neighbourhood Forums		
None that I can immediately recall, and I only know who she is because I work for the Council.		
Not had any contact since last election		
Parish magazine		
Received newsletter through letter box		
Since my County Councillor was elected I have received no contact at all in any form from myself to her or by her to her constituents in the village in which I live. As a comparison, at a District level I have had far more direct contact with my elected Member.		
Through news letters through the door		
Only saw on election day when working as a Polling Clerk.		
Shape Your Place		
regular reports received on Council activities and policies from local county councillor.		
Only know the name from the polling list and the published results.		
At County Council and Group Meetings. Socially.		

**Q4) What are your views on the challenges and time commitment of being a County Councillor?**

There were 222 responses, which have been sorted into categories and listed in **Appendix A from page 8**.

19 comments recognised the **challenges on time** of being a Councillor

97 comments put forward a variety of views on the **voluntary nature** of being a councillor, with many saying that it was a choice, and councillors knew the commitments in advance and should have taken that into account.

26 comments acknowledged that the **role is challenging**, and there are issues around balancing time

14 comments focused specifically on issues around the **time spent** as a councillor, with mixed views

27 comments were about **allowances**, though this was not the focus of the question. Of these, 17 comments to a greater or lesser extent acknowledged that there should be some fair recompense, and 10 expressed the view that there should be no increases, in a time of austerity, while others were being stretched financially, including Council employees.

2 comments stated that **communication** from councillors was inadequate

There were 35 **miscellaneous** comments.

Detailed comments (spelling errors not corrected), are under the above bold headings in Appendix A.

## 2. Questions on Member Allowances

There were two freeform questions on member allowances:

**Q5) Do you have any opinions on the current level of County Councillor allowances? (for example, do you feel current allowances are sufficient?)**

There were 231 responses, which have been sorted into categories and listed in **Appendix B from page 24**.

2 comments said there should be **no allowances**

9 comments suggested that allowance should in some way be linked to **data** of various types

14 comments proposed that councillors should only receive out of pocket **expenses**

10 people thought allowances were **too low**

119 people thought allowances were **sufficient**

34 people thought allowances were **too high**

28 comments put forward **mixed** or balanced views

There were 13 **miscellaneous** comments

Detailed comments are in Appendix B under the above bold headings

**Q6) What factors do you feel should be taken into account when deciding on the nature and level of payment?**

Factor	Count	%
--------	-------	---

Changes in roles and responsibilities of Members since the previous review	52	32.5%
Impact of decisions on the community	72	45.0%
Level of financial responsibility	54	33.8%
Councillor allowances in other, similar counties	39	24.4%
Extent to which being a councillor is voluntary	111	69.4%
Amount of time commitment	83	51.9%

Other - Please state **115 alternative factors sorted and listed in appendix C from page 39.**

**The additional comments suggested a number of factors not listed in the question.**

28 respondents felt that elements of the current **financial climate**, the pay arrangements for Council employees and/or affordability should be taken into account

14 respondents stated that **expenses only** should be paid

3 respondents felt that the **financial situation of individual councillors** should be a factor

7 respondents made a comment on how **hours worked** should be a factor

2 respondents proposed **indexing** allowances

7 respondents felt that **none of the factors listed** were appropriate

2 respondents referred to **public opinion**

9 respondents made comments relating to councillor **performance**

6 respondents commented that there should be **zero** payments

4 respondents suggested **comparison** options, e.g. with district councillors

There were 30 **miscellaneous** comments

Details are in Appendix C under the above bold headings.

### **3. General Open Question**

**Q7) Do you have any further comments you would like to be considered about the members' allowances scheme?**

There were 160 comments, categorized and sorted in **Appendix D from page 45.**

The final question invited respondents to make any other comments. Many of the comments repeated opinions previously expressed, and are listed below under **miscellaneous**.

5 respondents commented on the **timing** of any change to allowances

2 respondents felt that councillors should not be eligible for the **pension scheme**

There were 10 comments on the makeup of the **panel**, or the process it should follow

51 respondents referred to the need to take into account the **financial climate**, staff salary changes or related issues.

1 person referred to **childcare**

Detailed comments are in Appendix D under the above bold headings.

#### 4. Demographics

**Q8) What is your age?**

Age Grouping	Count	%
16 to 24	3	(1.2%)
25 to 34	31	(12.8%)
35 to 44	41	(16.9%)
45 to 64	132	(54.5%)
65+	35	(14.5%)

**Q9) Are you male or female?**

Gender	Count	%
Male	133	(55.0%)
Female	104	(43.0%)
Prefer not to say	5	(2.1%)

**Q10) What district are you from?**

District	Count	%
Fenland	30	(12.4%)
South Cambridgeshire	75	(31.1%)
East Cambridgeshire	30	(12.4%)
Huntingdonshire	54	(22.4%)
Cambridge City	52	(21.6%)

**Q11) Please could you advise us which town you live nearest to**

229 freetext locations given. In summary:

<b>Location</b>	<b>Count</b>
Cambridge	90
Ely	22
St Ives	18
Huntingdon	17
March	15
St Neots	12
Chatteris	7
Whittlesey	6
Peterborough	4
Wisbech	3
Ramsey	3
Gamlingay	3
Bar Hill	3
Sawston	2
Impington	2
Girton	2
Cottenham	2

## APPENDIX A

What are your views on the challenges and time commitment of being a County Councillor?

### Challenges

I believe this is a challenging commitment, depending upon the role of the councillor
It is a very hard job to do, with lots of reading and analysing of reports. But if they are to be paid for it then their other job (if they have one) should come second to their job as Councillor.
I understand that it is a challenging role.
I appreciate that many councillors do give up a lot of their time and may have to balance this with paid work, and, particularly in the current climate, the work may be quite challenging.
It is difficult to do alongside work and bringing up a family. It helps if there is support from a partner. To get involved requires a total commitment. It is however a great privilege to serve your community.
It must be challenging for those non-retired individuals who wish to become County Councillors. I would imagine that undertaking full time paid work is impossible, so there would be a financial issue for those who are not already retired. We need to get more younger councillors. Also, for parents with caring responsibilities, this must also impact on the ability to undertake the role of a county councillor without appropriate support.
Challenging but no doubt worthwhile
Must be significant
Recognise it is a lot of work and requires considerable commitment
It is almost impossible to have a regular 9-5 job and be a County Councillor, as almost all meetings are focused on daytime. You are therefore fishing from a pool that is mainly comprised of either retired or self-employed people. Which isn't that representative of the community.
Requires huge commitment, especially in senior roles such as Cabinet. Would be difficult to maintain a conventional career full-time if elected.
Big commitment. Large budget to spend wisely and difficult decisions to make.
Much is required of County Councillors, especially attending parish meetings and responding to electors demands
Some work very hard; others are just there for the money. How will an allowance scheme distinguish between them?
I feel they should have a varied and time consuming life in trying to keep up with what the Council employees are up too.
I think it is a challenging role and expands to fill the time available.
Depends on the quality of the particular Councillor. A poor one can spend next to no time - a good one can make it a full-time job and more.
The councillors have no more commitment than other people who work full time i.e I work approx 60 hours per week - I do not get expenses for the 'extra' work that I am obliged to do. Councillors enter this arena knowing the commitments and also the 'perks' that go with the position, many councillors are also ensuring that they qualify for the pension offered to them for a part time position which is far better than the one I have in the private industry. As for work life balance they are very lucky that they can achieve this.
They should be reasonable and proportionate. However, if they work full-time the commitment of being a County Councillor should have been taken into account by them.

### Voluntary Nature



<p>there are obviously challenges fitting in Council duties with personal commitments, but this applies to a lot of people in the local community for example those who run community groups, are volunteers within the community or are committee members of local clubs.</p>
<p>Being a Councillor is a choice, not a job, it is like any other person doing voluntary work for a charity etc and should not be paid for such, they should only receive mileage for travel.</p>
<p>I think it is extremely challenging in terms of time commitment; certainly I do not feel I would be able to work full time and be a Councillor. However I think the challenges in terms of the role itself irrespective of time should be something that a person who has chosen to stand for election be prepared to deal with.</p>
<p>It's a big task, but people know what is involved when they sign up to do it.</p>
<p>We have to remember that no one is required to become a Councillor. Balancing work, home life and the duties that come with being a Councillor are something that candidates should consider before standing for election. Difficulties in achieving that balance are no grounds for paying Councillors for an allowance. Indeed, when I was young, Councillors received nothing, many viewing the time that they had to give up from other areas of their lives as a sacrifice they were willing to make to serve the community.</p>
<p>I think Councillors can spend a lot of time dealing with issues for their community, and no doubt this does impact their lives. However, becoming a Councillor is a choice - no-one is forcing people to undertake this role. Those standing for election should know that it is a demanding role and will take a lot of time. Presumably the people standing for election are doing it because they want to make a difference for their local community rather than as paid employment? It is a shame that many councillors appear to waste a lot of time arguing with each other because of a party they represent rather than focussing on what is best for the communities.</p>
<p>I think Councillors should view their role in the same way as other members of the community give their time to volunteering for charities, church groups, etc. Most Councillors have a political persuasion and so part of the work they undertake is party political rather than purely Council related. There are plenty of people who volunteer similar, and more time, for charities, community groups such as Brownies/Scouts etc and they do this for their communities without expectation (or receipt) of payment. To many Councillors, their involvement is as much social as political.</p>
<p>These people are volunteers, how many other volunteers get allowances. If allowances are needed they should be means tested and publicised</p>
<p>It's a life choice, no different from many others that we all take on a regular basis. As such it is a choice being made by the councillor to balance personal commitments and all other things that need balancing.</p>
<p>People should only stand for election as a councillor if they know they can devote the required amount of time. It is very unlikely that someone employed full-time would be able to do this unless they spend all their non-working time on councillor duties. If that's their choice, then fine, but I prefer councillors to be retired or semi-retired. They are often former business people with a good range of skills and experience that they can bring to being a councillor, plus, if they thrive on a business environment, it can add to their enjoyment of their retirement to still feel they are contributing their expertise.</p>
<p>It is a voluntary post in that they choose to be a Parish, district or County Councillor. No-one has asked them to be and whilst they MUST be reimbursed for all expenses (and a receipt provided even if it is just a bus/train ticket)a Salary as such is NOT ON. A minimum amount per meeting attended should be paid and the amount that should be paid for the next year should be the same as has been paid in the last 12 months. WE ARE ALL IN IT TOGETHER and that includes county councillors and no pay increase should be made this year.</p>
<p>Prospective councillors should take time to consider the responsibilities carefully prior to putting themselves forward for election.</p>

<p>I agree that it must be challenging if you have paid work and family commitments but these are known about when deciding to become a county councillor. Being a county councillor should not be viewed as paid work. It should be viewed as volunteering on behalf of your community.</p>
<p>I think that County Councillors take their position entirely mindful that they are serving their wards and that they will be required to balance pre-existing commitments alongside that role. Much like a Trustee of a charity takes on extra responsibility in respect of their wanting to contribute in a specific sphere.</p>
<p>While I accept that there are considerable time commitments involved in being a County Councillor, individuals standing for public office know these ahead of their decision to run. They should be adequately reimbursed for reasonable out of pocket expenses, but they should not be "paid" for their time. It is important for Councillors to have expenses repaid to make sure that anyone, regardless of income, can run for Councillor without feeling like they cannot afford the costs which might be involved in discharging their duties. But Councillors are there to serve the people and the community they represent - it should never be seen as a job. As such I am strongly opposed to any system which seeks to pay Councillors for their time.</p>
<p>I think that most working people balance many things, although it may be a challenge and a time commitment it is a choice they take and will result in those who are truly dedicated to the work doing it, those who make a specific choice to make it work.</p>
<p>I have had several unpaid board positions on professional and charitable organisations where not even expenses were paid; I do not think that the challenges and time commitments of being a county councillor are excessive.</p>
<p>I appreciate that they do have to make time to be a councillor but that is part of the job - they know that when they stand for election.</p>
<p>Yes there are commitments on time but the councillors choose to be councillors and know what they are getting in to.</p>
<p>They know what the role involves, their time which they will have to give up. We all have to pay to travel to work (both paid and for that which some volunteer their time).</p>
<p>I believe the allowance should be designed to cover expenses occurred as a result of carrying out council business and that the allowance should not be used to recompense councillors for their time. The time spent should be on a voluntary basis in the interests of serving the community and not self serving. The nature of the work does require some self sacrifice.</p>
<p>Before considering to stand as a Councillor, I would expect that such things would be assessed and lifestyle changes would be made to accommodate the role as a Councillor. After all, do they not do it for the greater good?</p>
<p>Councillors choose to serve their areas for a variety of reasons. We have to assume that they do it for public-spirited reasons (though there's no doubt in my mind that many have different motives), in the same way that many choose to do other 'charitable' work. The difference is that volunteers for charity work generally do that work for no reward other than the pleasure of playing a part in the wellbeing of those communities or individuals that they wish to serve.</p>
<p>To stand for election means the individual goes into the process fully aware of the commitments required if they become elected. I am sure during the election process the work involved within the campaign would give an indication of what is in store should they win. Time away from paid employment should be at the discretion of the employer and discussed before the candidate stands for election.</p>
<p>Candidates are aware of commitments etc when they take on role. I was a Parish Councillor and you do it for the good that you can do not remuneration</p>
<p>In such difficult times when so many CCC employees are being made redundant and accepting pay freeze's no increase for councillors should be made, in fact a cut would be fairer as this is a voluntary role and not a job, only mileage should be paid!!!!</p>

<p>Before standing for election County Councillors are aware of the demands of the role for which they are putting themselves forward, I see this as no different to any other voluntary work that we are all being requested to consider with a move to supporting communities and localism in a difficult financial climate.</p>
<p>Time commitments are part of the role, a reasonable number of people seem keen to do this despite the time commitments, in addition time commitments to some volunteers under the big society initiative</p>
<p>Should perform their duties for the greater good of the public - NO ALLOWANCES</p>
<p>Councillors are fully aware of the challenges and time commitment when they put themselves forward for election if they don't think they have the time or temperament for the position they should not volunteer.</p>
<p>If someone decides to be a councillor they go in with open eyes. They need to be sure that they can provide the necessary commitment, a lot of which is unpaid, before going ahead.</p>
<p>They want to do it for whatever personal reasons they have, so it's their choice.</p>
<p>I think that councillors are good to give their time to serve on the council but it is their choice!</p>
<p>I agree that to perform the role of a councillor adequately the people involved will need to make a substantial time commitment to prep for meetings, attend meetings, travel, meet with constituents, etc. This will undoubtedly have a huge impact on the life balance of work, family, fun etc for the councillors. However, becoming a councillor is a choice. I think the full amount of time commitments should be made clear to those wishing to be councillors from the beginning so that they can decide whether being a councillor is something they can afford in terms of finance and time considering their own unique circumstances.</p>
<p>Before volunteering it is sensible to determine your current level of commitment to assess if you can add to it. As with almost all aspects of your life there is more demand on your time than there is time available.</p>
<p>It is a choice and one that is not for everyone. The commitment is clear from the outset.</p>
<p>The basic work of a County Councillor should be unpaid but, of course, any expenses should be refunded. As I consider that the work of a County Councillor should be unpaid, then the time commitments also needs to be limited to a reasonable level.</p>
<p>Their choice so they need to balance the pressures</p>
<p>Surely committing yourself to be a County Councillor must be a vocation to help residents locally and not to make money. Times are hard for all of us at this moment in time, and with the Council Tax on the increase (which I am not happy about) they should make do with the allowances they get at present, as pensioners we could all do with more money.</p>
<p>Members are fully aware of what they are signing on for, and shouldn't be accepting the task if they feel unprepared to commit the time necessary to be effective. I personally feel that the challenge presented is not significant enough to warrant special treatment beyond that of any normal part time job.</p>
<p>These are aspects that should be considered when making the decision to become a councillor.</p>
<p>This is something we all do if we work Please send me a list of all other commitments they have if they didn't have the time why become a councillor How many hours do they work for the council</p>
<p>if you agree to do the job, it should be to benefit the community that elected you, not for personal gain. If you are in it for the money then you are in the wrong place.</p>
<p>Being a councillor is a big commitment. However, the same is said for the many people who volunteer as trustees within a charity or as say a pre-school committee members or school governors. None of the latter receive any financial support, whereas councillors will receive travel expenses and attendance allowances. There is also the fact that the vast majority of councillors are close to retirement age and therefore don't have the same demands as a person with a young family both in terms of time and money.</p>
<p>It is a choice which people make.</p>

<p>I believe this is a time commitment councillors have volunteered to make. The role is part of a commitment to a community and before standing for election every councillor should have considered carefully how to balance personal commitments, including paid work and travelling to meetings. No councillor should undertake it unless prepared to devote personal time to the role. All claim to be eager to do this when canvassing for votes.</p>
<p>Becoming a politician is a choice and as such you need to weigh up the level of commitment required before entering the arena. Plenty of people serve society on a voluntary basis with no allowances. The majority of businesses require expense claims to be submitted with receipts and that is how County Councillors should be treated. Facilities should be made available for free such as IT equipment and admin support.</p>
<p>The time commitment is quite high but there is payment to cover this. There are similar demands for membership of other voluntary bodies, often with less in the way of support and expenses</p>
<p>Time commitment is known in advance by anyone who strives to become a councillor, whether s/he is in paid employment, self employed or retired. Any reimbursement should be entirely based on outlay; no-one should profit in any financial manner from being a councillor.</p>
<p>I am sure the challenges are substantial to people who do the work conscientiously. This is a calling to voluntary service of the community.</p>
<p>When a person puts themselves forward for election to become a representative of their community, they should already be aware of the challenges that such a role will present them with regarding other commitments that they already have. They will have to weigh-up a range of things, including the role, time, personal circumstances and look at whether any remuneration/allowances currently in place will meet what they consider to be sufficient to cover costs relating to the role that they have put themselves forward for.</p>
<p>I can understand remuneration for travel, and don't have too much of an issue with that. The person understands the role long before they actually become a Councillor - and therefore are well aware of the monetary constraints within which they have to work.</p>
<p>Similar to other voluntary roles, but there is a tendency to be self serving towards political posts.</p>
<p>it is an honour and voluntary commitment</p>
<p>Councillors choose to do this type of work we all have challenges balancing personal commitments trying to earn a decent living</p>
<p>should be unpaid</p>
<p>Councillors know what they are taking on as a service to the public and shouldn't do it for personal gain.</p>
<p>I regard this as voluntary work, in the same way as working for a Charity. Expenses should be paid.</p>
<p>Whilst I appreciate the effort made, it is a position that Councillors make an informed choice about therefore the choice is theirs</p>
<p>it is not really about remuneration</p>
<p>I would personally have considered these before I chose the position.</p>
<p>Many people support the community in an unpaid capacity whether this be at parish council level, school governor, scouts and guides or a trustee of a charity etc etc. This work is all unpaid and involves considerable commitment in time and often expense. County Councillors choose to serve the community by involving themselves in local politics which is paid. The profile of Councillors as retired men is more a reflection of society's view of politics (and perhaps the conservative party) and increasing expenses is very unlikely to change this profile. If that were the case the voluntary sector in general would reflect this profile in all areas which clearly it does not.</p>
<p>One needs to be dedicated and realistic, not expecting huge financial rewards for such a satisfying altruistic privilege.</p>

<p>Having been a town and district councillor, 1995-99, the challenge was getting released and paid time off work. Travel was reimbursed at the same rate as employees. The time commitment was accepted as being part of the role and was accepted to be part of the responsibility of becoming a councillor, i.e. it was not a career and was voluntary instead a duty to assist improve the local community.</p>
<p>It is a challenge councillors seem able to meet and are aware of being taking on the commitment</p>
<p>Being a Councillor or any other public service is voluntary, and time is given freely</p>
<p>When putting themselves up for election, they must know about challenges and commitments! If it is too much for any councillor then they can resign, there will be plenty of other very able people willing to step up</p>
<p>It was your choice to become a councillor. You get out of it what you want. I have to make sacrifices in my work / life balance. Lead by example.</p>
<p>I appreciate people providing this service, but it is their choice.</p>
<p>All cllrs are volunteers, of which there is never a shortage. I have been brought up to understand the principles of supply and demand, when the supply exceeds demand, as it does at present there is no need to increase the remuneration. Everyone is presently facing pressures on their income, why should cllres be any different.</p>
<p>I don't really have a view on this but if you have put yourself forward and been elected as a county councillor you would already be aware of the implications, planning and organisation involved with taking on the role.</p>
<p>I think if this is what they want to do there should be no problem about balancing all matters. It is just like having a hobby. If you are interested you make the time.</p>
<p>I think it is difficult, but is something someone chooses to do. Parish Councillors for example do not get any allowances, but still do the job (albeit on a smaller scale)</p>
<p>It goes with taking on the role.</p>
<p>It should be a consideration BEFORE a person chooses to become a Councillor and if they become unable to offer enough time to the role then they should resign.</p>
<p>I think that the time commitment comes as part of the job of being a councillor, and that you undertake to do the job thoroughly when you put yourself forward for election. There should be due provision made for councillors attending ill children and so forth, as there are in any job, but no special consideration should be necessary.</p>
<p>There is an obvious need for councillors (and anyone working for the public) to be recompensed for expenses. However, it is work for the public good, which people know when they stand, and payments should be limited so that they are non-profit roles</p>
<p>I view the challenges and time commitment of being a county councillor as being not immense. Perhaps... like doing something for the place where you live? And if you don't want to do it any more, you shouldn't put yourself up for election? Then you could get better paid for your "challenges" and "time commitments". What a patronising questions.</p>
<p>County Councillors are volunteers; no one is forced to become one against their will. So I am not sure I understand the question. Who would volunteer to become a County Councillor if they had not assured themselves that the 'challenges and time commitment' would be acceptable?</p>
<p>You have to accept the fact that being a councillor is not a 9-5 position</p>
<p>no more than other voluntary workers</p>
<p>The people who take on the job, do so knowing they will have to put in the time.</p>
<p>I believe most CC's work hard and give a lot of their time and professional experience to the County, however they do get paid and it is their choice.</p>
<p>I agree it is a job that takes a lot of time and commitment if you are going to do it properly, but this is something that they are fully aware of when taking on the role.</p>

<p>I can appreciate that the challenges can be significant as can the time commitment. However, providing those considering standing have a very clear idea of what is expected in this area and the allowances are fair and acceptable at that point then like any other commitment, one should accept that for at least a pre-set period of time, the Councillor should adhere to the conditions.</p>
<p>They go into the role knowing what to expect and if they are not prepared to take things as they are they should not do it.</p>
<p>Councillors volunteer to take on this roll and therefore must be aware of the commitment required.</p>
<p>Councillors know what they are undertaking when they apply for election. I feel they are well remunerated for their time and expenses.</p>
<p>Councillors' work should be voluntary with expenses reimbursed through the presentation of receipts for actual expenses incurred. Councillors should also be under a duty to mitigate their expenses - keeping costs to a minimum, for example prohibiting 1st class rail travel. Mileage expenses should also be paid at the standard county officer rate and not enhanced.</p>
<p>It should be a volunteer position with councillors giving up time to serve the community. For a limited number of councillors where there are working hours demands for attendance, there is a case for paying allowances. What we must avoid are councillors joining the gravy train by being members of more than one council and being paid by both. With current technology, there are many ways of being efficient as councillors without necessarily being present at meetings. Furthermore, there is no reason why council meetings cannot always be held in the evenings - I suspect the difficulty is getting highly paid council officers to give up some of their (excessive) spare time. I am disappointed that every councillor appears to take their allowance and I am not convinced that others would come forward or we would get better governance if the allowances were to be increased. The average hours worked by councillors across the country is 22. If some posts are virtually full time, pay an allowance but abolish the allowance for most councillors. By all means, reimburse carers' and babysitters' costs. There is no reason why councillors should get paid for what should be voluntary work. Why should councillors be any different from other volunteers?? As a school governor, I regularly put in long hours and never thought that I should have been paid.</p>
<p>Anyone wishing to be a County Councillor should be aware of the commitment they are making to represent people, if they cannot manage their time they should not consider the role.</p>
<p>Councillors choose to be elected so they should have considered the time and effort needed to be a councillor. If they cannot fulfil their commitments for any reason other than illness then their original candidacy was unfair to both the electorate and the council</p>
<p>They should be paid for travelling but should give their time on a voluntary basis.</p>
<p>I believe it to be similar to when one makes a decision to volunteer for a chosen cause - it is a personal commitment, on which one must be prepared to follow through, and should only be undertaken with due consideration to the time involved.</p>
<p>They volunteer to do it, the time challenges and commitment difficulties are for their conscience and foresight, not mine. I did not ask them to do the job, and they do it for their own benefit and would continue to do so without being paid at all.</p>
<p>They put themselves forward for the role as they are politically minded and want to be seen as leaders in the community therefore any challenges and time commitments arising are for them to resolve.</p>
<p>The role of County Councillor is a voluntary activity and it follows that the challenges and time commitment are also matters that are undertaken voluntarily. These voluntary activities should not be viewed as activities that have to be reimbursed by hard-pressed households through increased council tax (other than expenses for travel costs, etc.).</p>

## Role is Challenging

<p>I believe it is an exceptionally difficult, challenging role to undertake, and I am grateful to all that seek election to act on behalf of the people of Cambridgeshire. I think it must be extremely difficult to undertake the role successfully, and dedicate the time that is required to do a good job, whilst at the same time undertaking full time employment. However, I also believe that there are many other people in all walks of life who balance demanding volunteer work with a full time job, or alternatively choose to work part time in order to undertake volunteering roles.</p>
<p>I expect County Councillors to have put themselves up for election after careful consideration of the time commitment they will need to make. I do not expect them to be paid as though it were a commercial appointment - if that is the kind of remuneration they are seeking I would expect them to take a salaried role where appointment would be after a rigorous selection procedure against equally well qualified and experienced candidates. The open selection of candidates from differing backgrounds is one of the unique opportunities in this role and financial reward should reflect that.</p>
<p>I understand hard working Councillors must invest a considerable amount of time in meeting their responsibilities to serve the people of Cambridgeshire. For those councillors who are still in paid employment and/or have significant other personal commitments I appreciate that serving as a councillor will require even more of a sacrifice, whether in terms of time or finance.</p>
<p>I strongly believe that Cambridgeshire County Council's working practices do not allow County Councillors to balance their commitment of being a Councillor with other personal commitments. For example all Council and Cabinet meetings take place during the day and therefore it's more difficult to balance these against work commitments and as a result the overall make up of Council does not reflect the population of Cambridgeshire. Maybe the Council should consider more innovative and flexible ways of working which may encourage a wider and more diverse representation and allow potentially more capable people to enter into local politics.</p>
<p>Councillors choose to enter themselves for elective service to residents of their constituencies. They should consider, before doing so, how to balance their work or other commitments as it is indeed difficult. It is rewarding no doubt to be able to get involved and influence local government and how it is managed.</p>
<p>I think they perform a very important and increasingly demanding role. It is important that we try and get councillors across the age range including some who do balance work and councillor commitments</p>
<p>I'm sure that being a councillor involves a commitment of time that impacts on the way they live their lives. It seems entirely appropriate that people should not be discouraged from representing their local communities because of the effect of lost earnings.</p>
<p>This is not a full time post and that work will be busier than at other times, sometimes the work will be very quiet</p>
<p>I think they do a very good job in committing the time required to stand up and be heard within the community.</p>
<p>We are well satisfied with the efforts made to keep us informed about relevant business &amp; are aware that this involves extra work over &amp; above that involved directly on council matters.</p>
<p>It all depends upon the ability, integrity and commitment of the individual. Furthermore, it must be remembered that many county councillors have one or more district councillors to support them and shoulder the load. As a candidate and then a district councillor myself I was able to get quite a lot done because the county one (of a different party) had spread himself too thin ( county, district ( cabinet member) and member of police authority. There are far too many time serving councillors and no sanctions. Allowances are paid in full regardless of suspension or non attendance at meetings.</p>
<p>I don't think people should be doing it for the money though neither do I think it should just be land owning county folk who have time on their hands and want access to a little power. So it should be reasonable amount but selection should be on equal opportunities basis and include ethnic minorities, women and people with disabilities.</p>

<p>As a senior Local Govt. employee within Cambridgeshire for the past 20 years with 33 years continued service and significant Member contact, I have an extremely good understanding of the demands of being a County Councillor. It can be an extremely difficult and challenging role if the role is undertaken robustly for the benefit of the community. However likewise there are many instances where elected Members have little engagement with certain communities and provide little or no service to the people who they are supposed to represent. Therefore, while reimbursement MUST be properly provided, it must be set at a level relevant to the individual Member's level of engagement</p>
<p>Councillors should be paid for the time takes to do their job and for significant responsibilities. Those that have to make career sacrifices should be recompensed for that too. However - they are "volunteers" so allowances should not be excessive. Cllrs should be paid for mileage at the same rate as employees.</p>
<p>I am sure there are difficulties.</p>
<p>In my experience councillors are extremely hard working and committed individuals who voluntarily agree to give up many of their evenings and weekends to represent citizens not just in the council chamber but also on school governing bodies, consultations and numerous other forums. They frequently have to sacrifice family time to do so. Combining paid employment, being a carer for children or family members and a councillor would be nigh on impossible.</p>
<p>Very challenging and time consuming. Travel, family-work balance, mental strains and stresses.</p>
<p>I believe that it is a role that bears amazing pressures considering it is a volunteer job.</p>
<p>There are significant challenges which expect a substantial time commitment.</p>
<p>I respect the fact that councillors give a lot of their time, and this can be difficult to maintain a balance with work and family life.</p>
<p>As a parish councillor, I see at first hand the work involved in being a County councillor. Therefore, I have a good idea of the commitment involved in being an effective County Councillor. In the current economic climate I feel the challenges of this role are greater than they have ever been.</p>
<p>A significant amount of time is required to do the job properly and disruption to working schedules are inevitable</p>
<p>the role of a county councillor is challenging and time consuming. To carry it out effectively the councillor must be available to attend meetings and meet and deal with the problems of constituents</p>
<p>I would imagine this is quite difficult to balance your work load and the County Council work even if you have a sympathetic employer and even more difficult if you ran your own business. It would, I am sure, take up some of your own personnel time as well</p>
<p>For Councillors who have a full or part-time job in addition, they have the challenge of balancing personal commitments with council work. Those who are retired or who do not work for other reasons, do not have that problem.</p>
<p>Until last year I was a County Councillor. I was not able to do the role justice as I had a demanding job that was sufficiently operational to require short-notice interventions. A previous role (with a Regional Development Authority) was curtailed partly because they didn't like me being a councillor. It is clear to me that my career development has suffered as a result of me being a councillor. It is also clear that you can only be a 'proper' councillor if you work for yourself, are retired or work in a public sector role where they provide you with enough time off. There are exceptions, O2, for example have had a very good scheme for volunteers. If there is a large political group you are part of, if you bring other skills to the group they can help spread the load but if you are on your own then the council activity can swallow up any other life you may have. Even if employers are understanding, being a councillor, still slows down your career as you can't be as responsive at work as there are fixed meetings you must attend and places you have to be.</p>



## Time Spent

many are retired so there are no problems, in fact in some cases it becomes their "job"-- Some Councillors sit on more than one council eg Parish, District and County.
County Council meetings should be in the evenings as daytimes discourage all but the retired, unemployed and unemployable. There is a severe lack of talent.
Difficult to devote adequate time whilst being in paid work unless work is very flexible or highly paid enough to only work a few hours a week, which isn't the case for all.
Most members of the public couldn't be a councillor due to time commitment when holding down a job; easier if they have their own company which can "run itself". Problem worse if live at far end of the county so have to travel a lot to Shire Hall.
Time commitment needed to attend meetings both in the day and in the evening. This sadly excludes many people in paid work as they would be unable to get released from their jobs to attend day time meetings. Sense of responsibility to members of your community.
I suspect that there are significant time commitments in order to do their job well.
TO REALLY GIVE JUSTICE TO THE JOB AND TO JUSTIFY THE LARGE AMOUNT BEING PAID, CAN'T SEE HOW ANYONE WORKING FULL TIME CAN BE EFFECTIVE AS A COUNTY COUNCILLOR
The changes required by the County leadership to involve Members at all stages will increase the time Members have to commit to the local authority. It is becoming more important Members are able to commit more to the Authority to provide this.
If it is something you really WANT to do, like teaching, nursing and voluntary work, for example, any challenges are easily met
The commitment, especially daytime meetings, is not compatible with the lives of most working people. As a result local democracy is largely a sham, with councillors not representative of their constituents, and people of talent do not stand for election.
They spend far too much time arguing with each other when making decisions which is why they spend more time being a Councillor than they should. They are mostly retired so they do not have to balance with any other paid work.
There needs to be a commitment from the Councillor to give time to their role because they have chosen to represent their constituents.
Strategic responsibility - need to ensure not always being parochial in things they consider. Need to spend more time checking views of their local residents not just their own 'instincts' Time needed variable re role- but need to recognise it is a local service, not be seen as a fee paying consultancy job
As a number of county councillors are able to have a full time job or business, I am assuming that most of the county councillor(s) duties are carried out evenings and weekends. This being the case, it appears that hours required to their CC duties are minimal.

## Allowances

### *Fair Recompense*

Significant for those who have positions and do a lot of ward work, not for backbenchers who don't get involved locally.
It shouldn't be a full time job, but it should represent a significant investment of time and effort.

Councillors should be paid a moderate allowance; not enough to make the task desirable for the money
It is a job that needs doing but not one I would choose. Far too much time seems to be spent 'getting one over' on the opposition rather than doing what is right for the county. Yes I am sure unsociable hours are involved but in total how much time is spent I have no clue. Councillors should receive fair but justifiable remuneration for what they do.
There is the commitment of being a County Councillor, Governance for want of a better phrase, and the party based activities that tend to get merged in with that (Politics, for want of a better phrase). It would appear that allowances are currently adequate for the Governance aspect, even if they don't cover the Political and party based aspect quite as fully as some members would like to do. This is not an issue for the County Council itself.
Committed to the role, representing their constituents in a positive way, but taking account of the bigger picture. Rewarded appropriately for time and commitment made. However need to be sensitive to current economic environment and not alienating public opinion against their role.
Reimbursement of reasonably incurred costs is acceptable
They should receive the same benefits as an employee of the county council and no more
The time that councillors are now expected to give as part of their duties has increased over recent years. In part this probably discounts the impression given by some past councillors that they were merely 'sitting tenants.' It is only correct that expenses genuinely needed to undertake these duties are met and to cover additional hours, specifically evenings and weekends.
I would not like to see a situation where loss of earnings and travel expenses etc prevents some good candidates from standing for election.
When they put themselves up for election, they knew the responsibilities and commitments. The voters in Cambridgeshire have effectively taken pay cuts for the past 2-3 years and for the Council to ask for more money is wrong. They should be reimbursed for expenses not be given the equivalent of an above average salary as an allowance. I might be more sympathetic if they were doing a good job but they are not.
I think the Council should take into consideration how much/little it remunerates its own staff in terms of using own car for CCC business, travelling to meetings/training etc when looking at what is fair for Councillors.
My view is that councillor's need allowances to compensate for expenses, childcare and (to some extent) lost earnings.
I think it is reasonable for councillors to claim realistic expenses, not least because people would not be attracted to stand for election if they subsequently are out of pocket. However, in the current climate I do not think councillors should be awarded more than the current increase awarded to paid council staff.
My opinion is that councillors should be following the same approaches expected and adopted by all county council employees, to reduce time spent travelling and find more efficient and cost effective ways to participate in meetings.
I agree that cllrs should be remunerated for heir work, in order that it is open to everyone, and not just those that can afford to be a cllr.

The challenges and time commitments of being a Councillor are not a job, and Councillors should not be recompensed as though they were doing a job. While they may input a considerable amount of time and effort this does not warrant a full time salary. Councillors should be paid for reasonable expenses incurred as part of their role as a Councillor (e.g. travel), while the best and most transparent way of doing this is via receipts viewable to the public, there is an argument that this is expensive and time consuming in the administration, therefore a case for a one time annual fee can be made. This should not be equated with a salary however, Councillors are not doing a paid job, their role is to create policy and make decisions, this does not require a full time commitment from Councillors. If Councillors want a full time salary, they should be subject to employment law and all that entails. I do not accept the argument that remuneration should be increased to encourage low paid or poor people to become Councillors. Where is the evidence that there a large number of poor people who desperately want to become Councillors but just can't afford to? Increasing remuneration for this reason just looks like people lining their own pockets when the rest of society is being forced to make cuts.

### **No increase**

Under present circumstances I do not think that there should be any increase.
There is of course a commitment to a role such as Councillor. But in a time of cut backs on services, public sector pay freeze (particularly Police) there is no place for any increase in what is already a considerable payment. Can councillors justify the difference between their payments and the unpaid role of a school governor
when people are losing their jobs, and parents have to struggle to feed their children, and pensioners are forced to heat or eat, in my opinion this is not the time for paying more, in any form, people who live in an ideal world, such as councillors. personally, as a pensioner, my state income has been reduced by £2.00 per week, would these overstuffed people like to reimburse me?
There are challenges and it does require commitment however if you are going to pay increased allowances these should be linked to the increase that county council workers receive. EG if there is a pay freeze for them there should be an allowance freeze for councillors.
From interactions with trustees who are councillors it appears that this is used as a full time job and the allowances are considered salaries therefore the balancing of commitments is not a large issue as it is the same for an individual working full time and having a family at home or volunteering in their local community in addition to work. All other volunteers do not get monies paid to them for their time purely for their out of pocket expenses.
During this time of austerity where local government workers are receiving no pay increase yet again, I believe that we have only received an increase in real pay on two occasions in the last 8 years. That 'we are all in it together' and the councillors should be leading by example and not taking finance from front line staff to fund their own extra ordinary pay rise. The time needed to fulfil this role is not huge and can easily be included with the demands of another role. I have to juggle with the time demands of two roles within the County Council and at times one has to take a back seat at times, I know it is possible. The most difficult part of attending meetings at Shire Hall is parking but as they have allocated places I do not see attending meetings here as an issue.
Having served as a county councillor back in the 1980s I appreciate the time and commitment needed and how difficult the balance can be. Each councillor knew (or could find out) what the allowances were when they stood for election, even if they didn't know how much time being a councillor would involve. Even though Cambridgeshire pays county councillors less than Essex I don't believe now is the right time to be looking at raising member allowances.
If I elect a CC I expect them to work for me, however there is little evidence to support their attendance at meetings and claiming the allowances they do which are well above what the Public Sector workers receive in basic salary - I do not believe their time commitment and remuneration, to be comparable to full time public sector workers
It is a job for which they get paid
I whole heartedly agree that if a County Councillor is fulfilling their role correctly, it involves a

time and financial commitment for which they should be remunerated. If no allowance was payable, being a Councillor would become the echelon of the wealthy and privileged (or union backed!). It should be open to anyone of any class to be able to represent their electorate irrespective of income. However, in these times of cut backs with the majority of households having to tighten their belt, reduce borrowing and spending to live within their means, it is not appropriate for Councillors to accept a rise in their allowance, justified or not. This is their opportunity to say "We are all in this together and we are prepared to shoulder the burden with you." The County Council in particular faces huge challenges - don't create one of your own against the people who elect you.

## Communication

Considering Cambridgeshire, more often than not appears, to be led by officers and the Chief Exec one has to wonder what the politicians actually get up to. I'm not disinterested but they've clearly failed to communicate to me what they are actually doing with the power we've mandated them with. As with all public servants I believe the onus is on them to demonstrate their worth.

Being elected as a County Councillor is both a privilege and a duty. They are responsible for a large budget that supports many vital services around Cambridgeshire as well as responsibility for safeguarding the most vulnerable children and adults. This comes with large time commitments, reading papers and attending meetings. I would like to think it extends to also communicating effectively with citizens, engage with them through surgeries and explaining the complexities of the Council better. This doesn't happen, in my ward or in others from experience. The privilege is that they represent their communities, and it was a choice of theirs to put themselves up for election.

## Miscellaneous

I do (NOT?) believe a County Councillor can hold down a full time job plus a part time 20 hour a week commitment as a County Councillor and do both roles effectively. I suspect this is why many County Councillors tend to be the older generation who or those with flexible work commitments and therefore are not representative of the wider community. I think if local government employed professional managers and consolidated the multiple tiers of Parish (amateur), District & County local government the overall service would be delivered far more efficiently and professionally. Of course there are good County Councillors who seem to have the time to do an effective job but these appear to be the exceptions. My work (average 50 hours), commuting (20 hours+) and personal commitments make it impossible to consider a County Councillor role. For these reasons I cannot attend your meeting this evening.

Quite a lot of people who become Councillors have quite well paid jobs already and, if they are claiming allowances, the income that they already receive should be taken into account. For example, someone who is earning over £200,000 a year as a private consultant doesn't really need to claim travelling expenses to get in their car and drive up the road for a local council meeting. And if they have to travel from outside the county then he or she shouldn't really be representing that area. A lot has been said about the voluntary sector filling in for paid professionals in other, less-well rewarded jobs. I think that if you are going to stand as a councillor then you should do it for the love of your community and only ask for financial assistance if you absolutely cannot do your duties without it.

A Councillor should represent the Members of the Public who elected him/her and not simply accept office to cover up the mistakes of Officers. They should be brave in this and not be frightened by the Officers. My experience is such as to lead me to believe that this is not the case.

What a great pension you get.

<p>Having worked for the County Council, my feelings are that Councils themselves are run by political motivation rather than what people, society, environment actually need and this is reflected in the approach of the Councillors themselves who seem so pre-occupied with putting down the opposition at all costs to the taxpayer and not putting the taxpayer first. Having witnessed first hand the policies in place at the County Council towards staff discipline I was totally aghast with the unprofessionalism and mis-Management of the Councils culture bourn by the policies. So where challenges and time commitment of being a Councillor come into this, I would question what exactly Councillors do with their time and compare that to the needs of what we perceive Councils to be all about.</p>
<p>Need to focus more on face to face meeting with constituents and do more Council business electronically</p>
<p>A vital necessity to represent the views and wishes of a Councillor's local electorate. This is providing the Councillor fairly and independently promotes local issues and not a particular political party's policy.</p>
<p>Doing the job well, particularly being a cabinet member, must make a considerable drain on an individual's time. It's not clear how this is possible together with a conventional 9-5 full time job. However, by holding all of its meetings during the day it is clear that the Council is not seeking other than those who can free up time during the day - either because of the nature of their other job/role, or because they are not in conventional employment.</p>
<p>The time commitment is part of the basic requirements of the job, surely? If you cannot spare the time to act as a councillor, don't stand for the job. In terms of distance, I think it would be fair to consider any meeting within the councillors' local council area (e.g. South Cambs, East Cambs etc.) as a 'home office' location and therefore no travel expenses would be claimable. On top of this, any meetings within Cambridge itself, or wherever the County Council has its headquarters, would not be applicable for travel allowances. Certainly councillors' should not expect any special treatment like free parking spaces or permits within Cambridge itself if travelling from outside the city limits. The company I work for has this distinction between a 'home' office and any other office and it seems fair enough to me. I can only claim travel expenses if I have to travel to the London office for a meeting, for example.</p>
<p>It's a balance between serving the public and serving their own self interests and boosting their own self esteem. No one should be put off from standing and it shouldn't be a job for just the rich or retired. However, we are in a recession and councillors should not be taking increases when the majority of their constituents haven't had pay rises or are even jobless. However, the vast majority of local councillors are party candidates, yet how much funding is supplied by the local parties? Probably nil; they want the power yet aren't prepared to pay something towards it. I'd rather see one member of the county council staff keep their job than councillors get an increase in allowances.</p>
<p>Depends entirely on the individual councillor's situation e.g married, single, family, young children.</p>
<p>There are paid officials to deal with the complexity and detailed work what councillors should concentrate on political direction, overview and review which isn't that challenging or time consuming for someone who has decided they want to be a councillor and are prepared to put themselves through an election process.</p>
<p>There is a considerable amount of work involved, if the job is to be done properly. But there are 69 of them, and they are there for POLICY, not OPERATIONS - so they are required to direct council employees, not to do their work for them. There was a time when councillors were not paid, and that means perhaps that some people couldn't afford to stand and therefore we didn't get people who were "representative" of the electorate. However, we mustn't go too far and turn these posts into full-time jobs. Travelling to meetings - give them a bus pass (they will experience the public transport for which they are responsible). Personally, I think we have at least one too many layers of government. With its geography and demographics, Cambridge should be a unitary authority. Bedfordshire has gone that way, as has Peterborough. Nobody on CCC represents a Cambridge town constituency.</p>
<p>As a district councillor with a full time day job who spends a fair amount of time at Shire Hall I think I have a reasonable view of the position of county councillors.</p>
<p>It is most likely to fall on those who have time and wealth as you cannot put food on the table through sheer acts of democracy</p>

<p>councillors can find plenty of free time for really important meetings, but far too many "talking shops" have been introduced over the last few years. Neighbourhood councils being a prime example of a waste of time and yet another way of claiming expenses.</p>
<p>Too much travel. Use video conferencing. Too many Cllrs. Reduce by 45% Remove District Councils. Cllrs should be business men/women.</p>
<p>Like so many so called 'expenses' the sands of time and other relevant matters have 'skewed' the allowances paid. Having viewed the PDF files and amounts in the current economic climate and 21st Century a serious review should be undertaken. Firstly there is ongoing reference to the time Councillors give. Let us not lose sight of the fact each and every Councillor stands for election by choice. Most certainly each should be reimbursed for any travel expenses incurred if by private car at the prevailing Council rate. Certainly a sum for additional light and warmth. Broadband charges are in my opinion out-of-order. Most households in this 21st Century have some form of Internet connection paid for by the household. There are a number of other 'allowances' of questionable nature which should be cut. Certainly mobile contact devices such as I pads should not be provided.</p>
<p>until now not really given much consideration</p>
<p>Some do a very good job and put a lot of time and effort in, others appear to do it for personal gain (not financial), they don't appear to be that representative of the local population and often are returned on a very few number of votes. Appointments seem to be on who you know rather than candidates actually being selected by the community to stand in the first place.</p>
<p>I THINK THAT FOR A TOWN OR DISTRICT COUNCILLOR YOU MIGHT FIND IT A PROBLEM ATTENDING COUNCIL MEETINGS IF YOU HAVE A FULL TIME JOB DURING THE DAY. WAS IMPRESSED THOUGH BY THE LIBERAL PARTY COUNCILLORS IN PETERBOROUGH (THAT IS THOSE FROM THE LIBERAL PARTY WHO CHOOSE NOT TO JOIN WITH THE SDP TO FORM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT PARTY IN 1988) AS REGULAR SURGERIES ARE PROVIDED AT THE DOGSTHORPE COMMUNITY CENTRE ON SATURDAYS WHEN THE CITIES TWO COUNCILLORS ARE IN ATTENDANCE. LIKE TO SEE THE OTHER PARTIES DOING THIS INSTEAD YOU HAVING TO CONTACT THEM FIRST TO GET SOME ACTION.</p>
<p>I think that it is a difficult job which is often taken by the wrong people for the wrong reasons. I also feel that acting along party lines is an inappropriate way for a CC to behave.</p>
<p>It is a role that some people are drawn to. Sadly not always the best people stand for election, or are elected. It can also be a route for some people to gain a feeling of importance and power. They should be reimbursed for reasonable expenses. For example rail travel should be on standard fares not first class travel. We have learned a lot of the excesses of politicians by the parliament expenses scandal.</p>
<p>You are voted in to represent the aspirations of all the constituents in The County. It's easy to carry out Cuts that are affecting thousands in The County! Councillors need to vote against all the cuts. To save Jobs and The Communities not to devastate the County. Most County Councillors are in it for prestige and as a non-de-plume. Some even serve on outside bodies and other Councils and receive even more of our Council Tax as their Wage for carrying out The Cuts!</p>
<p>I don't have a view.</p>
<p>I don't understand the question, surely all jobs require balancing commitments.</p>
<p>Most councillors see election as a matter of self aggrandisement.</p>
<p>Having been a councillor myself in a unitary authority in a ward with 11,000 electors in the 1990s I'm decidedly unimpressed by my current county councillor. I see little time spent on community engagement apart from the occasional brief appearance at Parish Council meetings.</p>
<p>I believe that back bench County Councillors put in as much time and effort as their back bench colleagues on District Council. The fact that Parish Councils remain voluntary and that County pays 3 times as much as District.</p>

I don't understand this question
I appreciate that there are many extra responsibilities that a County Councillor does, but also believe that they choose to do this balancing act themselves. Sometimes it may benefit them to spend time with their officers, to see how services work as they may find it relieves their time more
Let us embrace technology and have videoconferencing so that people who would like to serve but can not because of work commitments do get the chance. This would also cut down on travelling and help ease congestion in the city, not to mention alleviating the issue of finding a space to park near Shire Hall. All IT equipment would have to be returned at the end of service and some posts would require more devices than others. Obviously face to face meetings are still important from the point of view of press and would-be public audiences.
The work of county councillors remains equally demanding and challenging as it does for all those working, whether for local government, for with profit organisations or not for profit organisations. Elected members are briefed and advised by council officers; they represent the constituents of the area they serve. Some county councillors have additional responsibilities. In addition they may also be engaged in activities outside their county council role, for which they may receive a salary, wage, honorarium or shares. All people engaged in work activities whether full-time, part-time or fractional time, at whatever level of decision making are required to do more for less. County councillors are no different. More time effective means of decision making should be used instead of meetings, such as video conferencing and telephone conferencing as other organisations do. Travelling allowances should be based upon public transport and venues should be public transport accessible.
There's a lot to do but it is not meant to be a job. It would help if there wasn't a culture of "working for the council" that acts as a justification for being paid the equivalent of a salary, which is wrong. Elections are strongly contested so there are clearly plenty of people willing to take the pain.
I have no view

## APPENDIX B

**Do you have any opinions on the current level of County Councillor allowances? (for example, do you feel current allowances are sufficient?)**

### No allowances

No allowances should be paid at all.
As it is a chosen role AND for the community the person should receive NO pay other than that to cover reasonable expenditure such as travel costs, stationary requirements and such like.

### Data

Should match regional average
I think that raising allowances is definitely one way of encouraging a greater number of people from more diverse backgrounds to stand for election. But at the same time, the current allowance is roughly a quarter of an average wage in Cambridgeshire, therefore allowing someone to work a quarter less on a 'normal' job, freeing up that time to be a Councillor, but at the same time still earning the same amount overall (based on averages). This seems a reasonable compromise to me. I also think that there is currently a reasonable link between hours worked and payment received, especially when you take into account that there is a voluntary aspect to the role - i.e. it shouldn't all be compensated in monetary terms.
Evidence of the amount spent by Councillors should be collected and published. As a CC employee I can only claim for what I actually spend, and even that is closely scrutinized and questioned. How can a flat amount of £7610 paid to all be acceptable when some may have high travelling costs due to living further from Cambridge, and attend more meetings than one who lives in Cambridge but attends very few meetings.
Both the basic allowance and the additional allowances should ONLY be increased in line with the pay increases given to ordinary staff. Thus cabinet members who had their HUGE additional allowance increase should be made to give it back. (Snouts in the trough job).
I am not sure - it would be interesting to know how this compares with other councils and how much time is involved. It certainly seems fair that those with extra responsibilities should get paid more
It might be helpful to set out what this sum represents in terms of hours @ rate, as this would shape expectations in terms of level of work (for comparative purposes) and number of hours.
It would be preferable that county councillors were paid on an hourly rate based on attendance, weight of duties carried out and number of residents they represent rather than a fixed annual allowance.
Councillors' allowances should not be regarded as a living wage, but are some recompense for time committed to society. An increase in Councillors' allowances should be considered in relation to the economic problems facing society both locally and nationally. Council tax is being increased in order to continue services. Also low paid local authority employees have had their pay frozen for two years, and will no doubt face a continued pay freeze, whilst having to cope with rises in living costs.
The allowance should be recompense for the impact on your career and a contribution towards the loss of leave or earnings. It should not be a direct replacement for income as that doesn't make sense - day rates for some councillors I know, in their 'day' job is well over a thousand pounds. SRAs should exist to acknowledge the extra impact of the roles and should consider the extra meetings and contacts that the roles bring.

### Expenses



<p>Being a Councillor is a choice, not a job, it is like any other person doing voluntary work for a charity etc and should not be paid for such, they should only receive mileage for travel. There should be no other allowances, and they should certainly not be increased!!!!!!</p>
<p>Councillors stand for election to serve the community I believe because they want to give to community I feel should be reimbursed for out of pocket expenses but not treat as paid employment</p>
<p>I was unaware that they received such a sum. I assume that they get this whether or not they attend meetings. If that is so then that payment MUST cease forthwith and payment be made per meeting plus expenses incurred. The same goes for cabinet members.</p>
<p>I have read the linked details and I am shocked that you even need extra travel &amp; subsistence allowances on top of the base £7,610! Either cut down the travel &amp; subsistence allowances to any official business (this should be covered by the basic allowance) or cut the basic allowance and keep the travel &amp; subsistence allowance. I would be interested if the rates that are claimable for travel and subsistence as well. E.g. the per mile allowance for car, cycle, bus(?) and subsistence per day maximum allowance.</p>
<p>For reasons given in answer to Q4, my view is that councillors should not receive a standard compensation but should be happy with a return of all legitimate and justified expenses.</p>
<p>In such difficult times when so many CCC employees are being made redundant and accepting pay freeze's no increase for councillors should be made, in fact a cut would be fairer as this is a voluntary role and not a job, only mileage should be paid!!!!</p>
<p>Feel they volunteer to undertake role should only be expenses incurred so they are not out of pocket</p>
<p>As with parish councillors, the job should be unpaid. Only legitimate expenses incurred wholly exclusively and necessarily in performing the job should be paid on receipt of proof of expenditure. Use of own car on public business at 45p/mile. They do not deserve nor should be entitled to any remuneration whatsoever. This is a position that should be done by volunteers willing to put something back into society not for personal gain.</p>
<p>I don't agree with allowances at all. I think they should claim expenses and perhaps be paid for attendance at meetings if the number of meetings is onerous. Serving as a County Councillor is not a career or a job, it's something you volunteer to do to serve society. As such the County should provide them with the tools to do the job for free.</p>
<p>As stated previously, I believe VERY strongly that financial gain should be prohibited. I am very happy for expenses to be paid, in line with outlay for travelling to meetings, to employers who release their employees during the working day to attend council meetings and to councillors who lose pay through attending council meetings. I do not see why anyone should gain financially from being a councillor, whatever their role within the council. By becoming a councillor on a voluntary basis one is offering one's expertise for the benefit of the community, not for self - which is exactly how it should be. If the potential for financial gain is the motivation for becoming a councillor then community benefits can easily be compromised.</p>
<p>It should be linked to actual reasonable costs incurred in connection with their work for the authority</p>
<p>legitimate expenses - being a councillor should not leave you out of pocket but should not be a means of making money. Council workers did not get a rise in mileage for a very long time even though the cost of fuel has increased markedly. What is good for the workers is good for the councillors</p>
<p>I think they should get expenses. Transport costs to and from meetings should be covered and a very small allowance to cover phone bills and computer printing use. I would say in addition to travel costs an additional allowance of £500 (five hundred pounds) should be sufficient. This could be raised if evidence is provided of telephone and computer consumables beyond this sum were expended with a cap of say £750.</p>

Allowances should be for expenses, not for paying basic salaries. If you want to pay basic salaries then call it a salary, not an allowance. The amount should not be increased in the current climate. It should especially not be increased by 25%. We are allegedly "all in this together" but somehow the ruling elite always manage to find excuses why they should not tighten their belts, only ordinary people should. The idea that we would suddenly get better candidates if they were paid more is bogus. Is the county council admitting that the current lot are hopeless?

## Too Low

I do not think the level of allowances are sufficiently high enough if "we" want to encourage people who are not either retired, semi-retired or wealthy to stand for election. I know it is probably unworkable, but I think a Councillor role should be voluntary, but with an allowance that is means tested. So someone who is a millionaire might get a very low allowance, but someone who has a family, mortgage, etc and would perhaps be giving up a paid job should get a higher allowance.

The current allowances have lagged behind current county council salaries due to pay awards in the interim years

I feel the current level is insufficient. I reckon all Councillors should be paid £27142 a year pro-rata at 2.5 days a week. There should be no discount for "public service". All other allowances except for Cabinet Posts would need to be ended.

Not enough. Cabinet Members should be paid more.

The allowance seems low for the responsibilities councillors have.

This is not high enough to encourage people without an additional income to become councillors

The level is not high enough. A County Councillor's work cannot be done in one's free time, and so the role should be seen as a part time or full-time job. If it is not properly remunerated then the roles will continue to be filled by retired people or those without the talent to get a decent job. I supported the principle of the proposed 25% rise.

Given what I imagine to be the time commitment to the role of a councillor who takes their role seriously, the standard allowance really isn't a huge amount of money for the time spent, and can't compensate for a "normal" salary.

This seems a very modest sum.

The amount paid is not excessive for the amount of time spent by councillors who carry out their duties properly.

## Sufficient

I do think this is sufficient for remuneration for time which perhaps the Councillor has had to reduce paid hours in their main job. Even if council duties for a councillor without special responsibilities took a day per week (which I suspect it easily does some weeks but certainly not all), then this works out as well more than average UK salary. As councillors are not in this for the money, this is sufficient. What an allowance of this level may do is discourage high earners from reducing their paid work hours to make time for council work. However I feel that this would be a rare occurrence anyway due to the nature of high earners' roles, unless they are close to retirement.

about right.

Yes, I feel they are sufficient, at least in the present economic climate when services are being closed and staff losing their jobs.

<p>As a County Council employee who has not received a pay increase since starting here 1.5 years ago I do not feel that it is appropriate for Councillors to receive an increase in allowances. All public sector workers are suffering from the pay freeze, with the cost of living, including council tax increasing all the time. Surely it is unfair to expect us all to work for no increase but to give councillors an increase? Also, where would the money for the increases come from?</p>
<p>Yes that is sufficient. Many people within the local community probably get paid about the same but for a full time job. Some councillors do not appear to go to many council meetings and I would not want their allowances increased.</p>
<p>I absolutely feel that the current level of remuneration is sufficient. This represents approximately 25% of the average public sector employee wage and given that it is a voluntary role, this should be more than adequate. Timewise, this equates to about 36 hours a month for 12 months of the year. Given that the Council employ staff to undertake the operational service delivery of the Council, Councillors should not need to spend longer than this fulfilling their duties if the duties are evenly allocated/spread across the Councillors. My experience is that some Councillors take on far more than others and they may consider they are underpaid whereas others are overpaid and are effectively freeloaders but this should be adjusted by workload, not pay. Cabinet members should get increased payment but only slight uplift, not the huge uplift as at present. Highly paid officers are paid to fulfil senior roles for which they are suitably qualified, experienced and have been through a proper recruitment process. It does not need Councillors to replicate these roles and be recompensed as well. Again, comparison needs to be made with other voluntary/community workers who get paid nothing for significant input into their organisations (often without the support of highly paid Council officers).</p>
<p>The current allowances are more than sufficient. If someone cannot afford to be a councillor, then they cannot be one. Same as I'd like to only have to work part time, but I cannot afford the drop in salary. Money (or lack of) prevents lots of people doing lots of things. It's just life.</p>
<p>In the current financial climate like most of us councillors should not receive any increase in allowances or salary.</p>
<p>I think in the current climate their allowances are appropriate. I think its important to remember that no one else is getting pay rises at this time!!</p>
<p>Current allowances are sufficient. A candidate for the position of Councillor should do so for the reward of improving local standards of living and not for any profit.</p>
<p>I feel that £7,610 (plus expenses) is a reflective income for an individual that elects to take on a Councillor role. No-one is forced to pursue this role and Councillors will take their position entirely mindful of the remuneration on offer. There are plenty of other people that volunteer their time and efforts for charitable (or similar) organisations without receiving any allowances or expenses. Public service is a choice, and in these austere times - particularly when so many Council departments are under such scrutiny I feel that £7,610 (around one quarter of the average national wage) actually represents a rather generous allowance for those that choose to work as a Councillor in their spare time.</p>
<p>I believe that the current level is more than adequate to cover the costs, and in some cases I feel that Councillors must be covering more then their reasonable costs.</p>
<p>Yes, current allowances are sufficient</p>
<p>I do feel that that is sufficient.</p>
<p>This is extremely difficult as some councillors give the distinct impression of doing very little whilst others are the exact opposite. I do not feel that an increase of the basic allowance should be considered. The additional responsibility allowances need revising into easier to interpret groups before changes to allowances are considered.</p>
<p>Seems about right. The Council cannot afford s big increase, even if the councillors deserve it.</p>
<p>sufficient</p>

The current allowance looks more than sufficient. The policy relating to travel and subsistence looks complex enough to allow it to be manipulated and no rates are identified. I trust that, in the spirit of equality, the rate for millage and the subsistence allowance (ie the guidance for what a meal costs etc) are in line with what are allowed for general County Council employees. If not then they should be.
Currently these are adequate when you look at the number of people currently working full time for this amount - when for most of our councillors this is extra income.
yes no increase
The allowances are about right, if even a little high. Many councillors also get further allowances for being on other committees such as Police - these appointments are incestuous and corrupt.
Yes sufficient under the current circumstances.
I think the current allowances are high enough and those for cabinet members are too high
Yes I believe it is sufficient.
As an employee of a local authority (living in Cambs, but not working in Cambs), I have not had a pay rise for two years. Why should Councillors expect a rise in their allowances when the rest of us are struggling in the current economic crisis?
more than enough
Adequate
I feel the current levels are sufficient but should only be paid on attendance at meetings and proof of work undertaken
The amount of allowance for County Councillors allowance is more than sufficient for the work that they do. They have voted themselves an increase way above the rate of inflation - this is against government guidelines which has frozen all public sector monies
I feel that the current level of County Councillor allowances are ample bearing in mind many also have a role as District Councillors for which further allowances are available for what is essentially a voluntary commitment.
Given the difficult financial climate we all face and the fact that we again are all being encouraged to support our communities I believe the current allowance to be sufficient.
They are sufficient, this is a bad time to increase allowances when others are losing their jobs or taking 0% pay rises
That is more than enough
I believe this allowance is sufficient, in the current economic climate
The basic allowance plus the special allowances far outweighs any expenses that other volunteers get for their time. I agree that they should not be out of pocket and travel and subsistence allowances seem fair however monies for purely attending meetings etc seem too much. I do not agree that Councillor should be seen to profit from their role or treat this as a salary. Not increasing the allowance would encourage councillors to spend more wisely, e.g. taking public transport, which in turn would lower the overall cost and enable monies to be allocated to front line services that are continually being cut. It seems bad taste to offer an increase to councillors when services, e.g. police are being scaled down and the unemployment numbers are rising.
I do see this as sufficient. When Councillors are voting through redundancies, they should not be taking an increase above what the people they are representing and who voted them in are receiving.
Yes, sufficient. As CCC employees are not currently receiving pay rises, none should be paid to Councillors, either.
This depends on how many hours they actually put in annually as a councillor, but generally I feel it is fair when combined with the supporting package of carer's allowance for dependents, mileage, etc.

I think these are sufficient. I believe that councillors should exercise the same rigorous restraint as other county council employees have to in terms of other expenditure so no catering for meetings, no unnecessary costs (meet people outside of mealtimes to avoid restaurant costs etc)
The allowances are more than adequate given that this is a voluntary role and that there is never a shortage of volunteers. In addition to this allowance, travelling expenses can be claimed, meals are provided, tax allowances can be claimed and for some reason it attracts a pension (this implies it is a salary). So not only will the immediate cost to the Council and its tax payers increase but it will also have an ongoing additional pension cost. At a time when this Council is reducing benefits to staff to save money Councillors should and must share their part of the cost saving agenda and follow the same pay regime as staff.
The current allowance is sufficient and should not be amended at a time when major changes are happening within the Council and staff are losing their jobs in order to make savings.
Yes. If Local Government Workers are not allowed salary increase then neither should their 'leaders'
In my opinion County Council allowances for members are quite adequate, I am horrified and appalled to see that there is a consideration for them to have higher allowances, especially in these times when so many families are losing their jobs and facing financial difficulties. It is the choice of the individual Councillor whether he/she wishes to continue in the role and whether they can afford to do that.
Current allowances are sufficient (other than a possible raise in line with all public sector pay rises). They may not be considered sufficient to cover political activities and time that Councillors would choose to do. That is, and should be, irrelevant.
It would be immoral to increase Councillor allowances if Council Tax increases are possible.
I think they are sufficient. They are allowances, rather than a salary, and are not meant to reflect an hourly rate for hours undertaken. If they were they would not be called 'allowances'.
At this present time I feel they are adequate.
I think that allowances are sufficient given that my pay has been frozen for at least the last 3 years effectively making me and other worse off
As with Q4, even though £7160 is lower than other councils now is not the right time to be increasing that amount.
Allowances should NOT RISE. Some are too high considering that no Cllr takes personal responsibility for decisions or actions.
We are all tightening our belts and have pay freezes. Councillors should do likewise.
Yes I do feel that the allowance is sufficient. I feel very strongly that given that Cambridgeshire County Council Employees have not received a pay rise for the last two years and that many people have lost their jobs with more job losses planned that it would be unjust for the County Councillors to be given an increase in their allowances in the current climate.
I feel the current allowances are more than adequate in the current climate of austerity, especially when public sector pay has been frozen, jobs and services are being cut to save money, workers are having to make substantially increased contributions to pensions, and the value of pensions has been reduced. If we are to believe we truly are 'all in it together', then it is vital that councillors lead by example.
The expenses are adequate, particularly given the fact that County council employees are facing pay freezes and cuts are being made in services, affecting constituents. Councillors need some recompense but they do some of the work as volunteers.
They should do it for the good of their community just like a volunteer would do. They shouldn't expect an expense increase when many others are faced with the prospect or reality of losing their jobs or having pay freeze, pay cuts and job cuts. I understand that the money for their increase has come from the council budget which means other vital services are under even more pressure.

Because this is a voluntary calling to community service, remuneration should not be thought of as salary. It should well cover the costs of doing the work.
I think the current level of allowance is sufficient for the time involved
In the present climate I feel the current allowances are more than sufficient
Current allowances are sufficient in the view of economic situation.
Yes unless the whole system were to change those that currently do it either have well paid jobs or are retired and don't need to work. Also councillors performance isn't measured, maybe some form of PR payment system could be introduced with a basic allowance paid and then members having to demonstrate what they have done to achieve a PR payment, equally if staff PR payments are frozen then so should the members be.
I feel that the current level of annual allowance for a County Councillor is the correct level. If councillor's feel that such allowances should be reviewed, perhaps they could follow along the lines of the County Council employee's pay/expenses review timescales/levels.
The allowances are adequate - I assume that this is taxable?
As above, I'm happy with the idea of an allowance. The National Minimum Wage would net someone about £11,500 if they worked full time. As councillors don't, the present allowance (plus expenses) seems sufficient, particularly when you consider that public sector workers have been subject to a pay freeze for three years. I don't see why there should be any payment for "special responsibilities"; this is simply another term for political careerism, and should not be funded by the public.
I feel that the current allowance meets the requirements to compensate Members for their time, subject to cost of living adjustments. This is moderated by the current financial state for local government, that leads me to suggest the same restraint is applied to officers employed by the authority.
Perfectly adequate and during a time when staff are losing jobs and having pay frozen despite the cost of living rising THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO AWARD A RAISE. If the current remuneration is not enough, stop volunteering.
This seems a reasonable sum
yes more than sufficient
Yes - we all have to make cut backs I haven't had a pay rise in three years!
This is enough. There should be no increase in the current economic climate. There are plenty of people who will do this work -financial considerations should not enter into it.
I believe their allowances should be frozen as long as the local government salaries are. I work for the Cambridgeshire County Council and have not had an increase in my salary for 3 years. I have been a Trustee of a local charity for 6 years and have never been paid for my time there. I do believe expenses should be paid.
I feel they are adequate especially considering they are paid additional for travel, child care, home as office etc.
This basic allowance is more than adequate bearing in mind that travel etc can be claimed in addition. At a time of austerity in our country these allowances should be frozen in the same way that the wages of workers have also been frozen. Councillors do not do a job that makes them more important than anyone else in the community
This is more than an apprentice gets or someone working full time in a Supermarket! More than the minimum wage
In the current climate the allowances are fair
Cambridgeshire may well pay lower allowances than many others but now is not the time to increase them. I reject the claim that higher allowances will attract candidates of a higher calibre. It might attract a few but that is all. Staff are being asked to do more for no more and many taxpayers are struggling to make ends meet. An alternative would be to have modest increases annually until whatever is considered to be the appropriate level but not without some restrictions to meet the matters referred to previously.
Current rates and % allowance seems more than adequate

The current level is more than sufficient to reflect their roles and responsibilities. It is incredulous that Members should be considering any increase when staff have had salaries frozen for 3 years and there is a considerable reduction staffing numbers. Compare what they do to what everyone else in the voluntary sector does.
I do feel in the current economic climate these allowances are adequate
There are cuts across the council - councillors should feel these cuts too. No increases!
In the current climate where no pay awards are being made in Local Government councillors have a duty to set an example by freezing their own pay notwithstanding any merit or otherwise to their claim for an increase.
I feel in these hard times, it is completely inappropriate for councillors to vote for an increase in their allowances, I am very strongly against it. Sheila Howard,
Not an appropriate time to increase allowances even if this is merited. Most people are having to work harder at the moment for less real pay (when inflation is factored in)
I do feel this is a fair allowance.
Would not want to see any further increases.
The current allowances are sufficient. This is a public service, not a job. If you think you can earn more money working elsewhere, then you are free to do so. The main barrier to a more representative council is not the allowances, it is the timing of meetings.
I think the allowance is reasonable at the moment
£7,610 is reasonable. It isn't a full time career.
I think the current fees are enough
It depends on the hours of work a week undertaken by the councillor. Some do much longer than others, but I feel this allowance is a fair allowance if they are working or claiming tax credits etc.
Present allowances more than sufficient
I feel that the current level of allowance of £7,610 is fair and equitable given the current economic climate and while there may be some justification for certain changes, these should not be implemented and indeed cannot be afforded at the present time. Additionally I have no objections to the additional level of allowance paid to those with special responsibilities but again, do not presently consider that an increase to those can be justified at the present time.
I do not know if current levels are sufficient, but feel that in current financial times, it is not appropriate to raise them any more than in line with current public sector pay settlements (around 1.5%). Even this will be annoying to those having budget cuts.
We have never seen our local councillor and never receive any news from them, so am currently unaware of what, if anything that they are doing.
This is not enough to live on, so being a councillor must rely on other sources of income. At the same time we demand the hours of a very full part time job. They should get adequate recompense for this work.
Any set payment for being in a public service role such as this is hard to justify. Councillors should not have to meet any expense which is required to fulfil their role, or be in any way out of pocket. A set payment for 'employment' is hard to justify.

<p>I have no idea how these figures have been arrived at. Being a County Councillor is both an honour and a duty, and it is a position that the holder has had to compete for; something that she or he has wanted and has had to work for. The only reason why she or he should then be paid to do the job should be to ensure that she or he is not so financially disadvantaged that she or he is not longer able to sustain the commitment. I was a parish councillor for some four years. I did the job because I wanted to repay the support I had received from the community for the years in which I had lived in it while I was at work, and I paid my own expenses. I resigned because it became apparent to me that no one at District, County or national level was really interested in anything I or my colleagues had to say.</p>
<p>Whilst it is possible to argue that current allowances for County Councillors are overdue for review, I feel very strongly that in the current economic climate they should not be increased. When their constituents are facing the very real prospect of pay freezes, and in many cases pay reductions, and with the cost of living increasing all the time, I think it would be morally wrong for County Councillors to award themselves any increase. I firmly believe they should lead by example and show restraint.</p>
<p>Allowances should be frozen for the foreseeable future but financial investment should be put into IT to ease the workload/ travel of councillors and to enable their time to be used more effectively. Now is the time for investment for the future rather than for remuneration in these difficult financial times.</p>
<p>In this time of austerity the current level seems adequate at both basic and cabinet level. It would be better if it was performance related so that councillors who are regular attendees and contribute frequently to ideas and debates are paid more than absentees or those who just make up the numbers. Travelling is clearly a factor in both time and costs so councillors from areas a long way from the meetings should receive more on a sliding scale.</p>
<p>I don't understand why there are such wide differences between the amount of the additional allowance payments dependent upon which party you represent. It would appear to be based on the electoral support of each party. I do not believe the allowance is sufficient for 20 hours work per week, particularly after deductions. The number of County Councillors should be reduced and the role made a professional job with appropriate salary.</p>
<p>I find this very difficult to judge as I do not know how much time the average councillor has to give to County Council work. Some I know feel they should only get expenses others accept the fact it does not cover the time they spend on Council work and would like to see a raised. Probably an outside body should judge this and maybe the allowance should be linked to a particular level of income relating County Council officials. The councillors should not be voting on their own levels of allowances or increases in that allowance otherwise it is open to criticism and maybe abuse.</p>
<p>This is roughly double what I received in 1990s as a unitary authority councillor representing 11,000 electors. Allowing for inflation on that time then this current figure for Cambridgeshire looks to be broadly at the right level and I would struggle to see the justification for any significant increase.</p>
<p>Given the cuts that have been made to services, to staff redundancies and the cuts in pay to those staff that remain, it is only fair and responsible that allowances are not increased at this point in time.</p>
<p>I think given the cuts that councillors have voted in and the expectation that council staff will have a pay freeze, last years' increase in allowance was inappropriate.</p>
<p>I feel current allowances are sufficient, as they receive mileage etc as detailed in the "Members Allowances Scheme" document.</p>
<p>I feel the current arrangements are more than adequate. I do question what constitutes a group on County Council, and what is a special responsibility.</p>
<p>I think this is sufficient, especially when I look at the additional allowances in place for those holding specific responsibilities.</p>



In my opinion, the current allowances are sufficient.
The majority of councillors either have second jobs, are retired, or hold extra responsibility posts, and so receive extra remuneration. Although the pay is not sky-high, it is not for a full time job, and thus proportionally adequate. To ask for more under the current recession is to my mind, tantamount to greed.
I think the current level of allowances is already quite generous. It would be hard to comment on those with specific responsibilities as I do not have that depth of knowledge. Basic travel and subsistence allowances are fine. In order to encourage younger woman into the role of councillors, assistance with childcare could aid in this process.
they get more than I earn
Given the current economic climate I feel any consideration of pay increases would be improper use of public finds.
Given that all County Council staff have not received a pay rise for three years, that vacant posts are not being filled and services to clients are being "shaved" wherever possible, it is an insult to everyone to even contemplate increasing allowances for councillors, who for the majority also hold down well paid jobs. If their present allowances are not enough then they should be encouraged to look to their working practices , not be holding their hands out for more.
I am happy with the current allowances which reflect the time/financial commitment of members.
It seems a fair amount, when you look at the pay freeze the lower workers at the council receive with the current economic climate
I feel current levels are sufficient along with expenses and additional allowance.
I feel that the current allowance is enough in relation to the current climate in this country
I feel that the current allowance is sufficient as they receive other monies for travel, internet etc.
I believe the current levels of allowances are sufficient, indeed, more than adequate.
Yes - In these times where salaried officers are suffering a pay freeze for a third year I feel that it is inappropriate to increase members allowances
Council monies are raised from tax payers, whether local or national, business or domestic. All people in receipt of payment for their knowledge/time/expertise/labour from the county council should be treated equally according to their role description. Those people who manage, organise and deliver the council's services for local council tax payers have had their payments/salaries/wages frozen. County councillors/elected members should be treated no differently from other people who receive their monies from the county council via tax payers.
Yes, current allowances are sufficient, anyone wishing to be elected a County Councillor should be aware of the reward.
The current level is sufficient seems grossly unfair to increase allowances when the County Council is making staff redundant and current staff have had no pay rises.
They are sufficient, if not excessive. The policy provided does not specify that positive outcomes must be evidenced for receipt of special responsibility payments, which suggests that allowances will be paid with no benefit to the electorate. Officers within the Council, as well as members of the community, will not have seen any increase on their annual salary, and will be seeing an increase in Council tax. This must be taken into account.
Current allowances are reasonable given the financial situation in which the County Council finds itself. The problem is that payment is made whether the councillor does a good job or not.

I feel that the current level of allowances as detailed is more than reasonable, and reflects the amount of time that needs to be dedicated to the role, and any increases should be reflected by increases that the employees of the authority receive. Whilst becoming a cllr is voluntary, it should not discourage those that are not financially secure from partaking, however the time commitment is also a strong consideration.
these do not seem unreasonable. The aim should be to ensure that the allowances are set at such a level that ensures those who are prepared to take on this important task are not prevented from doing so on financial grounds whilst not setting them so high as to make this a career choice
The existing levels are about right. No increases should be made during this period of austerity. Let's be honest few, if any, will give the role up willingly if no increase is made.
If it covers their expenses then yes current levels are sufficient

## Too High

These are way too high. The original ethos of local government was that it was an opportunity to serve. Allowances muddy the waters so that financial reward can be a factor in the decision whether to stand for the Council and then what to do on it. Out of pocket expenses, such as travelling and subsistence, are quite acceptable, but payment for being a Councillor, or someone with the risible and grandiose titles that Councillors in some authorities give themselves, is not.
I feel this is far too high
I think it is very generous.
More than sufficient - too much in fact.
They are not worth a penny
Its too high.
The basic allowance of £7,610 for what is a part time commitment is too high considering that this is approx 1 1/2 times the basic Old Age Pension. Councillors should not be making money for being councillors, they should get just their expenses and any lost of earnings and not one penny more.
For the quality of current councillor the allowances are too high at present.
Very high, compared to district councillors' allowances. It's not entirely clear why county councillors think they need so much more - it's not as if there isn't a full slate of people wanting to do the job at every election in my division.
The current allowance is substantially more than required. As a director of my own company, HMRC 'permit' me to charge my company £120 per year for using my home as my office (as stated in your policy section 9.4 (v)). That would leave the balance of £7,490 to cover other additional expenses for duties as a Councillor, which seems hard to justify. This figure would employ a person, at the minimum wage, 3 days a week for a year.
much too high
Most people view local councillors and county councils as poor value for money, I certainly do because I pay and do not get much back. The view expressed in the previous failed attempt to up allowances claimed that Cambridge councillors are under rewarded but my view is that they are more than adequately rewarded for the poor return they provide and the allowances paid by other councils are far too high and should be cut back. Moreover in times of financial shortage including job losses and service cuts any proposal to up allowances is wrong and sends out the clear message of 'I'm alright Jack'. The pain of lack of money should be shared by the councillors who should show some leadership (for once) and they should not be considering this at all.
If anything they are too much.
This is too high. It is equivalent to around two thirds of the minimum wage. Much of the time involvement of a County Councillor is linked to party political issues and we should not have to pay for that time.

<p>This is excessive. Given the current climate of cuts, and the council tax being received from the area, this is hard to justify. If councillors are full-time then they are adequately paid to travel and perform their duties. If they are part time, a minimal travel expense should be available, and £7610 is clearly excessive for this.</p>
<p>minimal expenses should be paid, but over £7000 is far to much..</p>
<p><b>CURRENT RATE IS MORE THAN ENOUGH</b></p>
<p>Are they sufficient???? They are more than sufficient!</p>
<p>I didn't realise it was this much. I thought Councillors did the job because they wanted to make a difference not to get paid. This is more than sufficient. In fact I would be interested in having a go and dropping all the voluntary activities I get nothing for.</p>
<p>I feel the current rate is already excessive and should be frozen for 3 years</p>
<p>Why are allowances so high???? Councillors should be given a salary and claim mileage some allowance could be made for booking rooms but beyond that why so many benefits???</p>
<p>This seems high. I believe councillors should not be out of pocket through their council commitments, but I feel the amount they receive should purely meet their expenses as these are voluntary positions.</p>
<p>I think that this is too much. We have around seventy councillors in Cambridgeshire alone and could pay three or four full time employees to do serious jobs like clearing our rubbish, caring for our old and vulnerable people and burying our dead for the money that they receive. A care worker doing around 20 hours per week would have to work all year to earn that much money.</p>
<p>too much</p>
<p>£7,610 is about half the normal salary of a full time administrative post at the current time. I do not feel that many councillors put in half the hours work that the administrators do in the offices at CCC.</p>
<p>The present amount received is excessive and is unjust against the many low paid staff working within the authority. As employers Councillors were unwilling to implement a £250 annual cost of living award for those earning less than £21,000 due to present financial pressures despite the Chancellor stating that this should be implemented as the low paid in the public sector should not be seen to be paying for the financial crisis. Whilst in the present political climate of achieving a 'voluntary society' a leaf should be taken by Councillors and a reduction only in the lines of the 25-30% in allowance in line with other cuts should be appropriate.</p>
<p>I do not support any increase in their allowance nor do I feel my Councillor deserves the current amount received. They should be paid as other public sector employees</p>
<p>The range of allowances is too broad. The amounts are currently too high.</p>
<p>It's too high. County councillors should be issued with a county bus pass, which would enable them to get to council commitments. That should be enough.</p>
<p>The allowances are excessive and should be significantly reduced and/or eliminated. Senior officers' pay should also be significantly reduced.</p>
<p>This allowance is excessively generous. Yes it doesn't reflect the equivalent time in a salaried job BUT IT IS NOT MEANT TO! Turning councillors into wage slaves will reduce their independence and turn them even more into the puppets of officers than they already are.</p>
<p>All levels of allowance seem like too much. The aim of the scheme should be to recompense Councillors for reasonable expenses incurred as part of their role (e.g. travel), while the best and most transparent way of doing this is via receipts viewable to the public, there is an argument that this is expensive and time consuming in the administration, therefore a case for a one time annual fee can be made. £7,610 seems too high, everything up to £22,000 seems ridiculous.</p>

Far too much. They are not value for money in the slightest, and I resent being charged a penny of council tax to go towards their remuneration or their spending on bloody vanity projects. \*cough\* Busway \*cough\*.

It's a lot of money to pay people for sitting in meetings and voicing their opinion.

## Mixed

Again , this too low for a hard-working community councillor; too high for many.

This will depend on the councillor. The overall budget may well be sufficient, but the share may not be sufficient if all councillors do not deliver the same level of service (ignoring any additional allowance for specific additional responsibilities). As an employer I would expect performance related pay, so allowances for councillors should be the same.

Clearly the money is not enough. However, neither should it be increased. Councillors are confusing the necessity for a review, which is embodied in the various acts, and accepting the recommendation of the review which is an entirely separate issue. Whilst staff salaries are frozen, there can be no argument that Member Allowances should not be - both are working for the good of the people of Cambridgeshire ... As with all roles/jobs - if Councillors do not like the allowances, they can stand down - there always appear to be lots of people who want the job at election time, so, in a commercial world, one might say that the allowances are too high! Why are we comparing with other Counties- that is already making the assumption that County Councillors are more important/deserve more than District Councillors. A District Councillor making a real difference in their ward is probably worth a great deal more than a County Councillor who is not on cabinet or in the ruling party and is therefore more challenged to make anything happen. Perhaps Councillors ought to be rewarded (a bonus scheme, perhaps) in terms of the difference they manage to make?

Reduce the amounts paid to the 'sheep' and some of their money to the committee leaders/cabinet members.

In the current climate where the majority of public sector workers have not seen any pay rise for 2+ years, where some people have been losing their jobs and where the Leader of the Council has called on the people in the county to pull together for the good of the county, I think it would be inappropriate in this climate for members to be seen to have any sort of overall pay increase. When financial times are more favourable I think it would be appropriate to re-assess then. However, I think there are definite financial barriers to becoming a councillor for those people who need to work full time simply to keep a roof over their head, and so for such people I think it is right to seek ways now to make it easier to become councillors by substantially increasing their allowance on a means tested basis - but only if this is funded by reductions in allowance for other councillors.

Backbench allowance too high. Special allowances ok but shouldn't be any higher.

Whether or not the current level is adequate is not relevant. This is the wrong time to be considering the question. If Councillors have not kept up with the going rate then, frankly, it is as a result of their own incompetence.

I think that although the level may be low, with all the cuts to services across the council, and freezes in salary for other council staff, it's not appropriate at this time to increase the current allowance.

The current level is sufficient for the basic allowance. There should be more clarity in the Special Allowances provision as this leaves scope for councillors to be paid extra amounts which are not clear to the residents of Cambridgeshire.

I think that Councillors should be paid a living wage - this would ensure we had full representation of those who need to earn. But a rise in allowances will not enable this to happen - it will not enable working people to stop work and become a good Councillor.

Raising allowances may enable Members to drop other areas of responsibility ( i.e. District Council ) to enable them to increase their commitment to both the officers and voting public. Increasing allowances may also provide an increase in number of persons interested in standing for election and this may broaden the experience the Council.

I do not think this is an appropriate time for an increase but will be the case when economic circumstances improve.
Not sure if councillors get a flat payment or whether this is the maximum amount they can claim. As staff we have to provide evidence of what costs we have incurred, I do not see why they shouldn't provide the evidence that shows it is genuine costs incurred.
The level is low - but no performance measures are required currently at all. Service should be the main motivation. As leaders speaking up on behalf of the community and understanding its pain would be much more difficult from a position of affluence. And as leaders, Members need to feel the economic pain first hand. Allowances should eventually rise, but only as the economy rises and when there are no more CCC redundancies, no more youth unemployment and no more overspends. In other words Cllrs should gain when the community is thriving, not when it is undergoing hard times. Members need to be leading the county forward and bringing it out into the good times - this is the meaning of leadership.
If a Councillor is active in the provision of services and in representing its electorate then the allowance is valid. Absent councillors who do it for personal gain should be subject to periodic review.
I think it can be looked at in two ways. 1) They are not paid and this figure is remuneration for time and effort put into their duties. Realistically, until they are effective conduits of thought between citizens and the Council I don't feel this is too little at all. Many people hold voluntary positions within organisations, charities, as carers and don't get paid anything at all. Their contribution, though not with the far reaching decisions a Councillor makes are crucial to society. 2) Councillors become paid (such as in Kent CC and other Counties). This changes the dynamic of the role with Officers but makes the system potentially more accountable. it would also encourage those that cannot afford the time due to other life commitments or financially to show an interest in the role. At the moment, a small increase in the annual allowance would neither improve the current role of the Councillor (don't see this increasing their ability/time to carry out duties or bring a step change in the demographic of those being elected.
Whilst I believe that the current way of recompensing councillors and their current allowance does not encourage all to participate and that, in the longer term there does need to be a more equitable way of doing so, now is not the right time to do it when Council employees have not seen an increase in their salaries for two years plus. I also think that at a time when the Council is going to raise the Council Tax, any increase in allowances will be seen by Council tax payers as being directly related to this, no matter what publicity is sent to them about the major financial issues the Council is facing.
Many are paid far in excess of their true worth.

## Miscellaneous

£7610 for doing what? What TRULY independent analysis of what a Councillor does has ever been done to say that Councillors actually spend this allowance in the most appropriate manner? Are they sitting in restaurants over a glass of wine talking politics and achieving little but using this allowance to pay for it? Councils up and down the entire country are notoriously wasteful and that waste is added to the taxpayers' bill. For example, do we want Councillors meeting to discuss putting microchips in people's bins and charging these meeting costs to their allowances??
See last answer
A 25% increase at a time of economic difficulty for most people can not be justified and should not be considered. They do the job by choice after all.
I don't believe allowances as a system are appropriate. I think councillors should have to submit expenses with receipts and the normal rates in industry. The HMRC mileage rates for example.
reading question 4 says it all.

<p>I DONT THINK TOWN COUNCILLORS GET AN ALLOWANCE AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS GET AN ALLOWANCE. I THINK THEY SHOULD BE PAID SOMETHING FOR THEIR TIME AND EFFORTS TO HELP PEOPLE IN THEIR WARD.</p>
<p>As in all walks of life when you make decisions to take on a task you are aware of the conditions. If any of the present councillors find that they are unable to perform their duties, without an increase in their allowances, perhaps they should stand aside and let others manage the budget.</p>
<p>This figure of 7610 is misleading as your report of allowances paid clearly shows they are taking home considerably more - up to £33k for the highest earning Councillor. Only 16 out of 70 took home anywhere near the basic (members allowances paid 2010-2011).</p>
<p>no real comment.</p>
<p>see previous answer Councillors should not in effect become paid employers, only genuine out of pocket expenses should be paid</p>
<p>The 'allowances' begin to add up when members have other responsibilities. I notice some even claim for having Broadband. This is not an option for full time CCC staff who are encouraged to work at home. The list of expenses gives the impression that the 'volunteer' Councillors are better looked after and valued than the CCC full time staff at the moment.</p>
<p>The majority have outside interests that bring in extra income, mileage allowance and more than adequate pensions.</p>
<p>I cannot see how a county councillor can hold down a full time job and respond to constituents demands. If we want councillors who are not retired we have to pay to make up for lost wages</p>

## APPENDIX C

What factors do you feel should be taken into account when deciding on the nature and level of payment?

### Financial Climate

The current economic circumstances of the country, the county and the finances of the Council in question. The officer job losses that are being undertaken, the reputational risk of the Council and the impact on the community's view of democracy
Affordability and effect on county council and voters' perception.
Economic climate Poor engagement of many county councillors with local community
I believe the only thing that should be taken into account this financial year is the current recession, I believe there certainly should not be an increase in any values paid to a County Councillor and if possible reductions should be made.
It should be sensitive to the current political climate and financial status of local residents
The current economic crisis.
The extent to which any increase is going to reflect salaries in the wider economy, where average salaries are falling expenses should not increase
Overall financial situation of the council, and current cuts to services.
Current economic climate and pay freeze for some CC employees over the last 2 financial years
The current financial situation, job losses. The amount of time Councillors do work which can be monitored.
The budget of the council and the amount of cuts being made in other areas
The councillors should suffer the same financial deprivation that they are inflicting on ordinary council employees
It must be taken into consideration what is happening in the country, restraint must be shown as an example. They should resign if they feel they are 'owed' a rise in allowances.
I feel in the present economic climate any allowance changes should fall into line with the rest of the community. Large numbers of which have had their wages frozen, or had to take a wage reduction, some have been made redundant or are facing redundancy, therefore I feel any increase would be obscene as these same people would be the ones who would have to fund it.
The current financial climate within which Cambridgeshire County Council is operating.
position of local govt staff
The fact that we are trying to save money. Council workers have not had a pay increase in two years and many have lost their jobs.
General cuts having to be made in the council
go up at the same level as Council Staff which at the moment is Nil!
The current economic climate.

The wider national economic circumstances which mean that everyone is having to work harder for less
the cuts being made in the county: can you justify paying councillors more when you are taking away buses?
The wider economic in the country as a whole
Any increase in allowance should be in line with increases made to other council workers.
Public sector salaried officers are suffering yet another year of pay freeze whilst being expected to carry out extra duties as staff levels fall. It is becoming evident that public services are being reduced as posts are cut through redundancies. An increase in council tax has been announced - the electorate will justifiably question this. Increasing members allowances at this time is inappropriate
County councillors/elected members should be treated no differently from other people who receive their monies from the county council via tax payers. That is they should be frozen at current levels.
Councillors should be treated the same as County Council employees - i.e. no pay rise, no increase in allowances.
Budgetary problems for the council.

## Expenses only

I believe Councillors should only receive out of pocket expenses.
The basic cost to the councillor to reimburse phone, internet & postage, plus basic travel (public transport where available). If the councillor chooses to spend more of their own money to enhance this, then that is their choice.
Councillors should not be making money for being councillors, they should get just their expenses and any lost of earnings and not one penny more.
This should not be looked on as remuneration but as to actual cost. This is a voluntary role.
Effective net deductions from council funding, minimum necessary expense to cover travel, culture of claiming for frivolous items
See above, community benefit should be the only motivation. The nature of payment should be tied explicitly to outlay and loss of earnings.
Generous allowance for expenses genuinely incurred, with no wriggle room for those who might be tempted to fiddle
I regard this post as a voluntary involvement, which should not be done for financial benefit. I am prepared to accept that the amount of time required for some may be more than that required of other types of voluntary work, but without knowledge of the amount of time someone spends, and what the time is spent on, I can't really say what they should be paid (over and above expenses). £7,610 seems like quite a lot to me - that's half many people's FT salary.
Expenses should only be paid not a wage!
genuine out of pocket expenses only
Any payments should be based on expenses incurred only.



expenses mean exactly that! only necessary and prudent amounts should be claimed for, not a blanket handout.

Costs incurred in the course of exercising their duties.

Reasonable expenses incurred as part of their role. Nothing more, it's not a job, see answer to Q3

## Financial situation of individual councillors

How wealthy the Councillor is.

Means testing determining the extent to which the councillor needs the money. Pay more allowance to those who can't afford to be a councillor without a bigger allowance due to loss of regular income, and pay less to those who can afford to receive less.

Ability of applicant to fund his or herself adequately in fulfilling duties, without assistance.

## Hours Worked

This is a voluntary, public/community sector role and so level of payment should reflect that. The average hourly public sector rate could be applied to a fixed number of hours for each meeting they are required to attend to reflect a reasonable preset duration for each meeting, including some preparation time. No payment or allowance should be made for political group meetings in advance of such meetings. The average hourly rate used should be 25-50% of the actual average rate to reflect the voluntary nature of the work

Time to prepare for policies and understand what is going on in Council.

Work involved, requirement that no other compensations are being claimed for public office

Councillors should be expected to commit to spending a minimum amount of time (between 20-30 hours a week) on council duties

The time commitment is ever increasing due to changes in leadership requirements - i.e. member consultation at all stages of decisions / works in their area. Professional training in certain areas should be improved - i.e. Health and safety - as their decisions are in certain instances overtaking professionally trained and experienced staff.

Transparency in how many hours are put in and what they actually do.

One of the reasons for becoming a councillor is for the advancement of particular political views, and therefore remuneration should be an acknowledgement of time given, and not regarded as a salary.

## Indexing

Increases should be limited to the CPI on a fixed date each year. These to be commenced from 2013 on the rate of inflation as indicated by the CPI as at say 30 November 2012 and that same date annually. They should not be allowed to pull a figure out of the hat and award themselves a pay rise.

Rate of inflation.

## None of the factors listed

none of these
None of the above
None of the above
These factors are not relevant if the expenses and capped allowance as suggested above is given to every Councillor.
None of the above. The role should not have ANY financial gain. As the Person is not employed by the council they should not receive ANY form of salary ONLY reimbursement of reasonable expenses.
None - as all of these factors apply to every county council employee currently experiencing pay freezes and redundancies.
none of these. The amount should be a balance for the loss if income and career progression. I would peg the basic around 20 days of the average 'white collar' income and then provide expenses for travel and other, similar, costs.

## Public Opinion

All of the above. Wage increases across the public sector, or rather the lack of could be considered. Ideally the perceptions of CCC staff and all Cambridgeshire residents should be considered to a degree, as I'm sure you're aware of the backlash from the previous decision on allowances. It seemed grossly inappropriate at a time of redundancies in CCC and general job uncertainty for everyone in the current climate.
The effect on public opinion. At a time of cuts, no rise in payments should be considered. It doesn't matter what happens on other counties.

## Performance

Their integrity
failure to attend a predetermined number of meetings should result in a deduction in their allowance (unless there is a valid reason).
Achievement based on objectives and review like anyone else in industry.
Performance and involvement of the individual Member - it should not be possible for it to be a free ride anymore.
Their performance, not based on decisions but based on a set of criteria/contract about what a Councillor's role is. Would help build confidence up with voters. It was proposed some time ago to have annual reviews/supervision and appraisals. Things like, has a surgery in their ward, consulted with voters etc.
However difficult, there should be some level of assessment and competency set as to the effectiveness of an elected Member and linked to the level of allowance paid.
Quality of their work.
The positions should be totally voluntary. Also performance should be taken into account. CCC's performance is dire (guided bus??) so why should councillors be rewarded for failure??
Added value to existing processes and front-line delivery.

## Zero

None. They are all volunteers
-------------------------------

If 'impact on the community' meant anything! Let's face it Greek politicians have had a huge impact on their communities, just not one that anyone actually wanted. Seeing as that being a councillor is both a privilege and a duty and nominally open to anyone who can get elected then the level of responsibility taken on by them is irrelevant. To be given more responsibility should be its own reward. If it's voluntary it doesn't need paying for. As above the reward of service to one's community is in the satisfaction of a job well done not in financial reward.
None of the above - this is simply not the time to consider the issue.
They already receive enough and should receive nothing more in times of austerity
As above no allowances should be paid
There should no increase in allowances what so ever. Nick Clarke is a millionaire why does he need more money. What is he doing the job for?

## Comparison

Comparison with district councillors.
Average wage increases in private sector. Amount by which council tax is increasing.
Parity in terms of other public roles
Instead of looking at allowances in other counties you should be comparing them to the rates in other employment sectors, i.e. outside of only local government. And preferably include non-publicly funded companies in the comparison. At least for travel and subsistence the figures are directly comparable.

## Miscellaneous

job security for those that make career sacrifices through things like Cabinet roles.
see above comments, it is a choice and an honour to be a councillor not a job!
None of the above, for certain. There has to be a system of recourse when decisions have been bad or go wrong and most importantly, when they go over budget. Why give a Councillor £7,610 in allowances when the projects they work on 'go bad' or are largely against what the taxpayer want. We see all too often Councillors trying to build their own worlds rather than what the taxpaying voting public want.
All, and yet none of the above. These could be positive or negative factors.
No Councillor should be able to treat the role as their main employment
What they actually need to do the work of a Councillor and nothing more.
Actual costs incurred. £7,610 is a lot of money for expenses which do not need to be justified and I do not believe that all Councillors are incurring the full cost.
Again, some councillors put in more time and effort than others so how can this be resolved in financial terms?
Since the budget and saving having to be made is being would it not be the case that the level of financial responsibility is reduced.
In such difficult times when so many CCC employees are being made redundant and accepting pay freeze's no increase for councillors should be made, in fact a cut would be fairer as this is a voluntary role and not a job, only mileage should be paid!!!!
Allowances should only be increased if Councillors are going to be made accountable for the performance of the Council. Members ultimately decide how the Council serves its residents and there should be some sort of performance management when they get this wrong. Furthermore to hold certain positions within the Council such as Portfolio holder and therefore qualify for the uplift in allowances, Councillors should meet behaviours and person specifications similar to employees.
My view is that allowances are already too high

solely the Governance work done.
Re: changes in roles and responsibilities - it should be considered if they are doing more than they ever should have been responsible for - or if they were starting from a point of not holding enough responsibilities, to now doing a more appropriate amount.
Levels in reductions of services. Staff reductions. Fewer responsibilities for reduced services and staffing levels. Electorate already hard pressed with food, heating, lighting and fuel costs
Flat rate allowances are a bad idea. At the very least, there should be a direct connection between effort and payment. eg paid to attend and contribute at meetings.
All questions in Q6 are 'loaded' indicating a 'positive' upward movement of expenses is a foregone conclusion.
How many workers would lose their livelihood or have their pay reduced in order to increase payments to councillors. Where would the money for any increase come from when the council must make savings.
Travelling allowances should be paid, stationery costs and other genuine costs incurred as the result of their job role. If there is a subsistence and hospitality allowance this should be used in order to get best value and only when it is essential and there are no other options.
See response to Q5
None of this seems to count in staff pay freeze, so why for voluntary posts?
miles travelled
See Q4 and Q5
As stated above I feel that the current allowances should be frozen at current levels
Given that councillors are expected to follow the party line( regardless of party ) some of the criteria referred to are not that critical
If it is to much for any member. then they can resign.
Budget of the County Council available to pay for this. Impact of additional costs on these budgets and fairness of giving a pay rise when CCC staff haven't received a pay rise at all for a few years. What services would be cut to provide any extra money?
It's important to take into account the perception of fairness, as well as other factors - if councillors award themselves increases above inflation, however well deserved they may be it will do a lot of reputational damage and damage to their relationship with both the public and council staff.
Times are hard for every one. Economies are being inflicted upon members of staff at CCC. Councillors should set an example and forfeit any increases in allowances.
The fact that they are authoritarians who want to steal my freedom and force me to pay for the privilege.

## APPENDIX D

The final question invited respondents to make any other comments. Many of the comments repeated opinions previously expressed, and are listed below under **miscellaneous**.

4 respondents commented on the **timing** of any change to allowances

2 respondents felt that councillors should not be eligible for the **pension scheme**

There were 10 comments on the makeup of the **panel**, or the process it should follow

41 respondents referred to the need to take into account the **financial climate**, staff salary changes or related issues.

1 person referred to **childcare**

Detailed comments follow under the above bold headings.

### Timing

I think that any increases should not come into force until the next round of elections. The existing Councillors took on the role knowing what the allowance level is, and so there appears little justification to increase it at this time (especially given many public sector employees have a pay freeze). If allowances had been higher at the last lot of elections, more people might have put themselves forward at the time.

This is not the right time to be looking at rises for Councillors allowances. The working population (well those of us on normal wages/salaries not Company directors or those with high powered jobs) are currently suffering cuts in pay and hours and often forced redundancies or pay freezes as imposed by central government. We are also suffering due to the rise in the cost of living with gas, electric, water and insurance costs going up. It would be insensitive to suggest that Cllrs. get increases now. I don't think increasing allowances would encourage more people to become councillors but rather alienate Councillors from the ordinary residents even more. I was outraged with the proposed 25% increase and told my local Cllr so when he voted for it. I will not vote for him again and have told him this. I am disappointed by the make up of the board - does not include one ordinary working person. Scrap the idea and think again when/if we come out of the current recession.

Increasing allowances at this point would be a very bad move, we are in a volunteer age where many people are performing difficult tasks for free and demand for this is such that now volunteer agencies/websites are demanding levels of qualifications to perform the voluntary job - this reflects a government initiative "big society". In addition salaries in the economy are decreasing and unemployment increasing a 0% rise reflects the reality of most people in employment and will do so for some years given current predictions for growth.

Whilst appreciating the fact that allowances have not been reviewed for a while. Strong consideration should be given as to when any increase should be applied. If there is to be an increase and approved - a delay to the effective date should be given - that would fall in line with any Public Sector salary increase that may be made. (Even if this delay is 12 months plus).

No, only that I think that now is a bad time for councillors to be seen to be having a 'pay rise'. I appreciate that people give up a lot of time to be a councillor, but so do lots of other volunteers who do not get any allowance at all.

I consider this an insensitive time to be considering an increase in Councillors' allowances, especially with the present economic difficulties, The County Council has been cutting jobs and frozen pay for low paid workers, while the cost of living is rising including the planned rise in council tax. Although I appreciate that councillors are giving their own time for the good of the community, I feel in the present circumstances allowances should not be increased. I would also like to point out that a majority of councillors belong to political parties, and therefore also have political reasons for becoming councillors.

## Pension Scheme

Councillors should not be eligible to join the Local Government Pension Scheme. They are NOT employees of the Council.

When public sector pensions are unaffordable, why are councillors eligible to join the scheme? Many of them have other employment!

## Panel

This new review panel consisting of Company Directors and generally people of 'high position' is a 'conflict of interests' which will inevitably lead to 'cronyism'. The UK is witnessing the largest gap that now exists between rich and poor due to Directors of Companies, Banks and Corporations voting themselves high pay, benefit and pension awards while the low to middle paid are left with inflationary rises but having to deal with rising costs. This new proposal would be like asking turkeys to vote for Christmas and would still question what the Councillors are actually spending these allowances on and why.

I think any panel considering member allowances should have members of the public and non managerial Council staff as a majority on it, not external HR and business consultants whose experience is commercial HR. This is not a commercial organisation, does not require specific qualifications, does not require Councillors to go through a recruitment process. Increases in allowances should be capped in any year to be no more than the average paid to Council staff in that year and where the average paid is negative, allowances should be adjusted down.

The appointment of David Gent Sales (First Ascent Consultancy) and Helen Valentine (Anglia Polyethylene University) makes the whole process risible

I do not believe the members allowance should be increased due to public services redundancies, pay freezes and cuts to public services provision. Should lead by example. The newly appointed independent panel set up to review the allowances is not a true representation of the community that the councillors serve.

the questions you have asked do not seem to be entirely related to or focussed on the remit you have been given.

I was outraged by the decision of the previous panel to increase Councillors allowances and hope that the current panel will give due consideration to the current financial climate, the people who have lost their jobs and the employees of Cambridgeshire County Council who have had no pay increment during two years of high inflation.

This is a complicated discussion. It is essential to get the points over to us, the public so we understand them. So, whatever the result we feel the decision has been made based on a series of criteria. A small increase will leave Councillors with more money, at a time when everything is being squeezed. This judgement would be poor on trust with our politicians when we need them to be standing up and leading by example. Until there is a change in the fundamental role of the Councillor at the Council and then a significant increase in their salaries can be mitigated against by a reduction in senior officer salaries then I would be very unhappy to see this increase accepted.

The members of the committee to oversee allowances appear to have been chosen from a specific sector, professional, establishment figures. This does not seem a fair distribution across all rate payers in Cambs. The "Ordinary Man on the Street" seems to have been overlooked. Do these decisions not affect him as well ?

Why does the make up of the review board totally fail to represent the Council tax payers of Cambridgeshire ? It is entirely compiled of people who habitually sit on committees and boards drawing just the type of allowances they are now sitting in judgement on. When they recommend a large increase in cllrs allowances, they will then be able to get their own increased as the average has just gone up !

## Financial Climate

<p>in the current financial climate and as D C says we are all in this together . When many of us are seeing our standard of living decline and not getting pay rises I do not feel it right that councillors are seen to get increase to allowances</p>
<p>I would not support a rise in their allowances. Cuts are being made within the council and many council staff are being made redundant. It would therefore be very unfair to increase Councillors' allowances while council officers are doing more work with less resources. Can councillors work more efficiently so that they can continue with their duties while getting the same allowances?</p>
<p>The cost of living for "Joe Average" has risen considerably. Cambridgeshire is an expensive place to live. Council tax is very expensive. There is no room for manoeuvre in household budgets. If that means some people give up being councillors, I'd rather that than being forced to pay for any increase in allowances.</p>
<p>I have not decided one way or another whether the advantages to increasing the allowances outweigh the disadvantages during normal circumstances. But I think the economic circumstances we are in and the budget that the Council has to try and deliver overrides any discussion as to whether an increase is appropriate or not - I don't think it is. I also think the mechanism for deciding upon the allowances is flawed; although the independent panel make the recommendations, at the end of the day the Councillors themselves still get the final vote as to whether they should award themselves a pay rise and I think this is fundamentally wrong and inevitably sends out the wrong message to the officers of the Council and the people of Cambridgeshire. However, I appreciate the process is not something that this Council has any control over.</p>
<p>Only to point out - as I suspect many, many other will - that the notion of being in these straitened times together is something that must be acknowledged and respected by everyone, even those for who it is not really the case. Symbolically, any increase in the allowance is not only morally repugnant, but is representative of a wider disparity between those who are in positions of authority (and are often financially secure via alternative means) and the general populations that is being conditioned to expect worst-case scenarios in terms of employment and incomes for the foreseeable future.</p>
<p>Given the current austerity push, why were the allowances increased recently? Should they not have been trimmed back in accordance with the other cost-savings the County Council is obliged to make?</p>
<p>It is important that the current financial climate is taken into account, but that should not be the sole factor.</p>
<p>absolute need for pay restraint for members</p>
<p>Reviewing allowance cannot be done in isolation of other Cambs residents' financial position. The panel is biased being made up of people who have very similar backgrounds and a vested interest setting high allowances for councillors. The rate of the allowance isn't a key factors in people deciding to put themselves forward. The older I get the more councillors I personally know - we are dealing the sharpest tools in the box here.</p>
<p>As a Director of a (not-for profit)company with 25 employees, we have had to award 0% for the past three years. I would love to give them more, but in order to ensure our long term survival we ask for sacrifices. If consideration is given to payment for merit, as an elector, I am aware of the total shambles of the Guided bus - I simply don't believe it will be within budget and it certainly wasn't on time. In addition Councillors that are presiding over an outrageous 2.9% increase in Council tax at this time are simply not doing their job.</p>
<p>Any increase in allowances should be in line with the public sector pay awards e.g. frozen as this would reflect the current economic climate and show solidarity with the work force they lead and the general public.</p>
<p>To increase the already considerable allowances by any amount reflects a body out of tune with those they represent who are seeing reductions.</p>
<p>Within the current economic climate I do not see any viable reason for increasing allowances at this time</p>

<p>In such difficult times when so many CCC employees are being made redundant and accepting pay freeze's no increase for councillors should be made, in fact a cut would be fairer as this is a voluntary role and not a job, only mileage should be paid!!!!</p>
<p>Members allowances should not be viewed in isolation to other financial restraints on the Council at this present time: this is what seems to have happened at the previous review/vote - allowances were taken out of context of the existing financial climate.</p>
<p>The recent award of 25% showed how out of touch the current set of Councillors are with their community. In a time where families and communities are struggling to survive, are being made redundant and face the constant fear of losing their jobs and the affect that this would have of their families and themselves. Councillors should be showing they are a caring community representative, where as this proposal sets them as uncaring.</p>
<p>If any rise is approved it will be in very poor taste this coming financial year when local government workers will have a pay freeze. It would seem more appropriate to have a freeze on allowances this coming financial year and to rise the allowances in the 2013/14 financial year in line with the rise approved for public sector workers.</p>
<p>Remember most other people are struggling financially and act in a responsible manner</p>
<p>Local Government workers have had a pay freeze for the last few years. They are facing a cap in inflationary increases for future years to come. And their pensions are under threat. This should be considered seriously when deciding if members' allowances should be increased at this point in time.</p>
<p>Allowances should rise at the same rate as that of Council employees. There should be one rule for all. Councillors risk further alienating voters and damaging the democratic process.</p>
<p>Budgets are being cut, Services are being curtailed, Council tax payers are suffering, The vulnerable elderly and child services are being reduced. The public is tightening its belt. Cllrs should NOT be an exception.</p>
<p>In a time when there is a public sector pay freeze and the Local Authorities are making a large number of their staff unemployed it is incomprehensible that Councillors are even considering this. What planet are they on? This sends out the wrong message completely, I thought we were supposed to be in this together (in the words of David Cameron) I bet most of these semi-retired councillors don't even need the money anyway. I understand that a Councillor who is not involved in much may only get £7600 but those which are involved in a number of things could earn up to £40K a year which is basically a very good salary.</p>
<p>As a public service worker, I expect my councillor to show the same restraint in pay/ allowances as I am under.</p>
<p>I feel strongly that as staff have had a pay freeze for some time now, and many staff are facing redundancy, also services are facing large cuts in their budgets, which are already impacting on service provision, it would be wrong for councillors to have an increase. I will admit to being a staff member and therefore having a personal interest, but I do think that the public will be rightly indignant if they see councillors getting a pay rise while their front line services are being reduced.</p>
<p>Please be frugal it would be massively insensitive to over boost your benefits when so many are unemployed and people are working under a great deal of stress due to a lack of capacity since the cuts. Cuts to adult social care should play on everyone's conscience.</p>
<p>An increase above the rate of inflation for the basic allowance would be quite wrong in the present financial climate. Out of pocket expenses are, I assume, the same as for Council employees - so no payment for travel to your place of work, or for meals within the County. I do not see the need for any other allowances for "special responsibilities"; the previous proposals were totally disproportionate - there's no reason why a Councillor should receive what equates to a very decent salary.</p>
<p>Have some respect for the Public who pay for services. They are facing job losses , Council Tax rises and services are being cut. How many people would place Councillors allowances as their number one priority over their own families concerns. Please volunteer for something else if you feel it would be right to raise the allowances. Homeless charities, Mental Health Charities and Hospices all spring to mind.</p>



<p>Leadership is about service and sacrifice. It is a hard role to fulfil and part of it should be about setting an example. It is an honour to represent your community and not a job. How will the public believe Cllrs are there for them, if they cushion themselves with increase. Rises should (for now) be in line with staff pay rises, once the economy improves and cuts are not the order of the day, that is the time to make modest rises. Members can hasten better times by focusing all their efforts into improving the quality of life in Cambridgeshire. Any special allowances should be based on actual performance and not paid automatically. Performance measures would consist of evidence of work done on behalf of the community. Leadership needs to be about inspiration.</p>
<p>Just that in these times where many people are losing their jobs, services to vulnerable people are being cut, and Council employees salaries are frozen, I don't believe it is right that members increase their allowances. With kind regards,</p>
<p>In line with council employees who have not had even rises in line with inflation and who have in fact taken pay cuts and many redundancies the fact this any increase is being considered is an insult</p>
<p>Reflect cuts they have made to paid staff and be seen to have no more than staff % increase ( or cuts as appropriate)</p>
<p>Cambridgeshire County Council have recently reviewed library staff pay structures, one of the changes made has been to stop weekend pay enhancement. This effectively means any member of staff working weekends will, as from April, be taking a pay cut. This change I would assume was made as a cost cutting exercise. As library staff also have not had a pay increase since 2009, I hope that if faced with the same choice that the library staff have had to make, Cambs County Councillors will act as magnanimously.</p>
<p>Any increase will send completely the wrong message to the public at a time of pressures on public expenditure.</p>
<p>As staff of the Council are not having increases in their salary and the Chief Executive accepted a 10% salary reduction I feel it would be irresponsible for councillors to award themselves an increase or they will appear to be out of touch of the people they serve.</p>
<p>Whatever the merits of an increase this consideration should wait until their employees' pay situation is reconsidered.</p>
<p>I would have greater sympathy towards the Councillors and their finances if CCC had not reduced its support of its own staff.i.e. closing the vehicle lease scheme, freezing the level of business mileage reimbursement for several years, then agreeing to increase this so long as staff agree to CCC cutting or removing things like subsistence allowance etc.</p>
<p>The vote on this should be postponed until the economic climate is more favourable.</p>
<p>I do this the economic situation in the UK must be taken into account, also the fact that employees in most sectors, public and private, are not being given pay awards.</p>
<p>I note that Council workers are under enormous pressure at this moment in time to deliver a service on behalf of Members who have slashed budgets, made staff redundant and yet they seem to want more work delivered by less people with less funding and within an environment where job security does not exist. Wages have been frozen again this year so take home pay against inflation has fallen. I cannot understand how Councillors can warrant a large increase in allowances within this period especially when many of the people laid off this last financial year are often low paid but vital workers for the residents of Cambs. It would certainly be detrimental to moral which is already very low for public sector workers at the County Council. I also note that the Chief Exec of the Council was forced by the Members to give up £10,000 of his annual wage as everyone is being persuaded to make savings. Surely this is absolutely the wrong time to be awarding rises of any sort to Members (remember they will have less money this year to spend on behalf of residents not more!!) and if a rise is considered it has to be reflective of the inflation rate, not several points above. If it was I think it would be an insult to the very hard workers at the Council.</p>
<p>I have a strongly held view as already indicated that whatever the outcome of the current review, that currently, there should be no immediate increase in the level of allowance paid. Given the current economic climate and the strain on public finances at a Local Govt. level, that it is completely inequitable to increase the level of allowance at this time. I also have a particularly strong view that while we enjoy the benefit of having some highly effective, respected and hard working elected officials at both County &amp; District level, we likewise have a significant number who do very little to serve the communities they are elected to represent. Under no circumstances should they be permitted to benefit from an increase in their allowance without some system put in place to reward effective delivery and competence in the same way as is set for local govt. employees.</p>

Any changes to the scheme need to give regard to the current economic conditions, in particular rising unemployment amongst electors, public sector pay freeze followed by just 1% annual increases and private sector pay awards at around 1.5% and cuts to council services

Increasing allowances at this time will adversely affect staff morale.

Any changes would be counter productive to the message this council has been sending. With so many targets in place to reduce costs and make savings it would be inappropriate for councillors to drain the budget to any further degree. All county council employees and Cambridgeshire residents are suffering the impact of the budget, services are being reduced or withdrawn, redundancies made, pay freezes set for 3rd year running, restructuring to reduce costs and employee benefits reducing to name a few. Cambridgeshire also pay less than it's neighbouring counties for many jobs, any consideration for councillors on this basis should therefore be reflected across the whole council not a select few.

There has to be an expectation of commitment when anyone takes on the post of Councillor, remuneration should be based on proof of the work undertaken. As a Council worker myself, I am finding life a continual struggle as my salary remains the same and my bills increase year on year. I have no career path and have been told not to expect to be able to move up through my existing pay levels. Without an annual increase my standard of living is decreasing, whilst I continue to increase my workload and pressure due to staff shortages. No increases should mean no increases, not money for some and not for others.

I am an employee of CCC and have not had any rise in the last 4 years. I feel it would be unfair if CC's were given a rise. What does that say to CCC employees?

I feel members need to think carefully and consider the lower paid members of the council staff who have not been able to have an increase in pay due to government restrictions. I feel they should lead by example and not accept any increases either.

If they increase their allowances the money will have to be taken from some other service, and as we are to have an increase in council tax to protect service levels, at a time when many people are facing job losses, I think it is unacceptable.

The current financial environment must be considered. Any rise in allowance must be paid for by efficiency savings by the County Council and NOT by a further rise in Community Charge.

How can Councillors agree an increase in allowances when they are agreeing at the same time to reduce staffing levels in the County Council to save money. Surely not increasing allowances will also save County Council money.

We live in severe economic times. The majority of Cambridgeshire County Councillors have chosen to ignore the difficult position of hard-pressed households by rejecting the offer of central Government funds and, instead, are going to impose a significant increase in council tax for 2012/13. This demonstrates that these Councillors have become out-of-touch with council tax payers. If Councillors are awarded a substantial increase in their allowances, their remoteness from constituents struggling to pay the increased council tax will be exacerbated. In the current economic climate, there should be no increase in Councillors' allowances.

## Childcare

It would be good to consider childcare allowances for members as the provision of childcare might allow more women/carers to consider becoming councillors. The new allowances should be publicised at the time people are being invited to stand for election

## Miscellaneous

The previous debacle around the setting of the councillors allowance increases should be taken into account by the committee. Setting higher allowances will impact on services, staff morale and voter motivation
I think it would be unacceptable for councillors to be awarded a rise in their allowances at present and would recommend a 20% cut.
allowances should be cut to £5000 maximum.second class postage used.no tax funded hi-tech phones,lpads.laptops.public transport must be used by all councillors (that would concentrate their minds on the problems facing the residents). most tasks should be carried out with no payment.
THE SUM PAID IS MORE THAN ENOUGH AND IT IS SHAMEFUL, PARTICULARLY IN THESE DIFFICULT FINANCIAL TIMES, THAT AN INCREASE IS BEING CONSIDERED, ESPECIALLY IN THE LIGHT OF YOU BEING ONE OF VERY FEW TORY COUNCILS PLANNING TO INFLICT A COUNCIL TAX INCREASE TO PAY FOR THE MESS MADE OF THE GUIDED BUS
I feel you need to have a radical look. County Councillors need to be paid and paid correctly. The allowance is not attractive. If it were then the number of candidates at elections would be much higher.
As stated previously, we need a greater diversity of councillors. There is a perception that the council is run by a group of retired men who have time on their hands. This needs to change and if increasing allowances will allow greater diversity, then that should happen.
There must be a method of capping councillors' allowances so that those considering multi roles are deterred. See first paragraph. The person to whom I referred to was simply not earning all his allowances. Councillors who are suspended must be penalised financially. Root and branch reform is needed.
No increase in allowances. Everyone is facing times of cutbacks and increased pressure on income.
No
There should be no rise at this time. The County Council is proposing a rise in Council tax, claiming that it is needed to cover services. If the councillors accept a rise, it looks as if they are charging extra in their own interest. I think that few local people can understand why councillors should be treated better than most of their constituents
Please look at some sort of attendance / no of committees served on element. More complex, perhaps, but fairer.
I think I have made my views clear!
Could we pay them enough to become silent partners.
Councillors need to get in the real world and stop being so greedy.
Reduce the number of councillors (by a third) and you'd have more money for allowances.
I do not know what the mileage allowance is or whether a councillor's distance from home to council offices is considered before any payment is made, but no more than 30p per mile after travelling the first 10 miles unpaid is my recommendation.
Current rates look perfectly adequate, this is clearly not the time to start pushing up the cost of administering the state. Upping the rates to people who are ostensibly volunteers when vital services are being cut and wages everywhere else are stagnating would be further indication of the general rot in politics. Politics in general is in crisis, we haven't forgotten expenses and we're all too conscious that there have been both ideological and practical failures in the administration of our polis that have allowed the banks to effect a hostile take over on our ability to self determine our own futures. Now is not the time to give yourselves a pay rise or any perks. If you're really clever you'll drop the figures a little to show that you understand what 'all in it together' actually means.
It is disgraceful that the county council are going to raise taxes to hike councillor allowances. The government is offering cash incentives to freeze council tax and that is what they should be doing not spending our money on councillor allowances and guided busways.
Nobody really knows what the allowances "should" be. Some panels try to do sums along the lines of "minimum wage for estimated hours spent" but that's likely to end up with an unaffordable amount, and the allowance isn't supposed to be a salary anyway.

<p>There is no breakdown as to how the figures are derived, as such there is no transparency as to what the figures are to recompense the Councillor for. It would be interesting to enquire how many of the councillors or candidates would still run for office should the allowances be frozen for the next 3 years or reduced by 25%. It is hard to justify any potential increase in these allowances, given the imposition of freezes throughout the public sector for pay and allowances. Doing so would clearly be unjustifiable as with the tax and NI contributions the true cost of the allowance to the local council tax payer is higher than the stated allowance with the additional contributions to be made.</p>
<p>For the work that they achieve and the amount of hours they 'give' the allowance is more than adequate</p>
<p>The recent attempts to increase the allowance has put the whole thing into disrepute and damaged councillors standing tremendously.</p>
<p>Scrap the scheme completely</p>
<p>They should not consider it as a "career", but as primarily a voluntary contribution to the community. Members who are committee chairmen are receiving more than many individuals receive as a wage.</p>
<p>If you become a councillor you know what it involves, do not moan once you are in and try to line your own pockets by upping allowances when services are being cut and jobs lost. Taxpayers want services first and foremost and not to pay for councillors to attend meetings.</p>
<p>meetings etc should happen in the most economical place for all councillors to stop the huge cost of Wisbech people having to be paid for time and mileage to and from a Cambridge-centric organisation.</p>
<p>My perception, though it may be misinformed, is that the current system is a bit of a gravy train and needs major overhaul sooner rather than later.</p>
<p>I would not vote for any Councillors who votes to give themselves an increase in the current economic environment.</p>
<p>Please please consider not only that councillors are largely acting part time, but that they choose to undertake this role, and a monetary compensation should not be the deciding factor in this, the good of the community should be.</p>
<p>I strongly feel that most councillors do a good and under-appreciated job. They should not get rich being a councillor but they should get enough of an allowance to allow them to do the job. I also think that it is important that councillors are representative of the wider community so should come from a range of backgrounds, ages, genders and ethnic minority backgrounds.</p>
<p>I appreciate the number of hours now necessary to enable Members to carry out their duties and the present system appears to be insufficient with increasing expectations of commitment especially with those members who do not have cabinet duties. It is unfortunate this issue is being raised at this present economic time especially as staff in some cases have not had pay rises for up to 5 years. There are pressures to spend budgets economically and obtain best value and if Members are able to commit increased hours then officers will be able to consult with them without long delays as can be the situation at times.</p>
<p>If they can't be reduced then they should be frozen for years as are many workers' wages and elderly people's pensions</p>
<p>Do we need so many councillors</p>
<p>scrap it all! Particularly for the chief executive whose idea was to increase the allowances by £100k. This is a job for people who are committed to their community not to making personal gain. Since you won't do that then consider reducing the number of councillors and bureaucrats in the back rooms and their salaries. Allowances should directly reflect work done, meetings attended and cost incurred, not on a flat rate.</p>
<p>There should be a root &amp; branch review with value-for-money foremost</p>
<p>I am appalled that there has been any suggestion of increasing allowances at this time. They should be frozen, and then be limited to increases no greater than the lowest public sector pay awards in future years. Lets not forget we are all in it together</p>
<p>A lot of talk has been made about using allowances to encourage more people into serving their community. I think people should serve their community out of a belief that it is the right thing to do. The facilities should be provided for them to do the job properly, but it should not be something entered into for financial reward.</p>
<p>Why do they feel they deserve this pay rise when no one else is getting one.</p>
<p>Why could they not be linked to officer expenses</p>

<p>The allowance is coming from tax payers money and they have a duty to show it is being used wisely just as we are having to analyse and justify any expenditure within the County Council role I am currently in.</p>
<p>Conscious of the debate surrounding the need for allowances being generous enough to attract the 'right' type of person, it is proper that a full, almost forensic, examination of the motivations effectiveness and calibre of existing elected members takes place before the consideration of any changes to the scheme. There may not be a problem to fix.</p>
<p>I THINK A COUNCILLOR SHOULD BE PAID AN ALLOWANCE FOR THEIR EFFORTS PERHAPS IT SHOULD REFLECT HOW MUCH EFFORT THEY PUT INTO REPRESENTING THE COMMUNITY AS SOME DO A LOT AND SOME DO NOTHING !</p>
<p>Perhaps there should be a way of paying in a way that rewards payment for doing what your electorate wants you to do?</p>
<p>Councillors should not be out of pocket in providing the essential role of representative of the community but the sum of £38k for a part time leader of the council is far in excess of a commensurate payment.</p>
<p>You should enter Politics to represent all the Constituents and not to feather your own nest. Husbands and wives as Councillors is not on and could be a conflict and serving on County and Town Two lots of allowances?</p>
<p>A modest increase in line with inflation is sufficient in current economic climate</p>
<p>When most people are feeling hard up, why should a few people be able to vote THEMSELVES a rise, wish the rest of us had an option for this! I feel the allowances are completely adequate in these times of austerity</p>
<p>Should be linked to outcomes, so attendance at meetings, level of contribution, additional responsibilities etc.</p>
<p>It's important to ensure that all increases to allowances are proportionate/responsible and properly justified. Equally, it's important to present a clear view of the responsibilities that Councillors carry, their time commitment (how many hours and when), and (perhaps most difficult) the balance between offering one's time out of a sense of public duty as against payment for carrying out a role. Whilst the operation of the Council depends on the former, getting breadth of representation may depend on ensuring a "fair rate" for Councillors' allowances.</p>
<p>More publicity on this issue</p>
<p>Look at who makes up the members and the impact their decisions have - stop wasting money on consultations like this</p>
<p>I am appalled that the councillors should be considering an increase at a time of recession, and bearing in mind this particular Council's record of gross financial incompetence</p>
<p>In typical employment, we are paid a fixed salary (or hourly paid) and in return are expected to work a certain number of hours + expenses incurred if necessary. Not knowing what the average councillor attendance to their duties are make it difficult to draw comparison</p>
<p>Councillors are in a difficult position as they are required to make the budget that is also responsible for their level of reward. The point is not to make a profit, but to reward them for hard work on behalf of the community. They should be assessed by standards of integrity, public trust, and activity on behalf of ward members and the council as a whole. An hourly rate of pay should be considered.</p>
<p>The council can't vote to cut rural bus services, emergency fire cover, funding for Citizens Advice etc etc and then approve increases in allowances.</p>
<p>I think that as the role is, to all intents and purpose, voluntary the financial package should ONLY be the reimbursement of reasonable expenses. I would also call into question the number of Councillors as in Chatteris alone, there are 12 and if the current allowance is over £7000 each I would ask WHY the Government and Councils are not cutting back on this expense.</p>
<p>I feel it is unreasonable to consider increasing allowances at this time. If public sector pay must be frozen, then all public sector pay should be frozen. Councillors are the first to say we are a low taxation authority, so we must also be a low allowance authority.</p>
<p>There should be a system to reimburse certain expenses only - not a system of universal allowances.</p>

They need to be fully transparent and open to view. Allowances should not be made where attendance is poor. Allowances for travel should not be paid where the councillor has elected to live outside the area which they represent.

I have little time for professional politicians, politicians who have never had to deliver anything of substance to a customer in either a commercial or a public service environment. They have little understanding of the 'real world' they are responsible for supporting. They are good at talking about those things they should be doing, but they have little or no idea how to make things happen. County Councillors should be people who understand what needs to be done to deliver the services and the environment to those who live in their County and who do the job because they see it as their duty, not because it is a source of income. Personally, I would not pay County Councillors an income, I would pay them for those expenses they necessarily incur in doing the job for which they can provide receipts.

Many other public bodies have seen their allowances capped. Pay rises, even in relation to inflation have either voluntarily been turned down or pressure has been placed on individuals not to accept them for the 'greater good of all'. I personally think that councillors are well paid for what they do. A good basic salary, with basic travel and ad/hoc expenses is fine - I do not like the idea that allowances are almost being seen to be part of a basic salary. Councillors are voted in via the democratic process, which in my opinion is often flawed - which doesn't always lead to the best person for the job actually being appointed. I believe that if the council was run more as a business, with politics not getting in the way then Cambridgeshire residents would get a far better deal.

It should not be increased by any more than staff wages are increased

I have always felt that a Councillors role should be voluntary with payment ONLY being made to cover "expenses" i.e. travel.

Should be self funding ... higher allowances.. less councillors....

Please do not make this an exercise where you start from the present and work out what escalation should be applied and/or what you can get away with. Start with a blank sheet of paper and try to come up with one justification as to why councillors should be paid anything.

Travelling allowances should reflect the need to meet the council's own policies of promoting public transport, cycling, cutting carbon emissions and reducing road congestion. All travelling allowances should be based on a public transport rate and reimbursements for using cars only allowed where public transport is proven to be unavailable. Allowances for subsistence should be revised so as to work on the premise that people at work provide for their own meals/food and not paid for by tax payers. If necessary meetings should be re-timed so as not to incur the need to claim subsistence.

County Councillors should be doing the role for the good of the community, not for financial reward.

It is entirely wrong to consider allowances as the equivalent of salary. They should be much closer to the city council allowance level - a smaller, almost nominal amount but a welcome contribution to the costs of undertaking the role. It should not be a hefty reward for winning an election and it should not be an alternative to getting paid work - people should not be worrying about not getting re-elected for financial reasons.

The Leader of the Council commented that the intention of the original proposal for an allowance increase was to encourage more Councillors from lower-income households, and particularly to support women to become Councillors. What he was unable to respond on when asked was why the allowance increase was proposed for all Councillors regardless of income. If there was any truth in his stated aim, surely the most sensible proposal would be for allowances to be means-tested, based on household income. It was also not clear to me why the proposal was that this would be implemented immediately, when the next elections are years away. Further, I find it extremely concerning that Members voted to give themselves such a significant allowance increase at a time when officers of the Council, including front line workers, were not only facing successive years of frozen pay and changes to their pension scheme, but significant redundancies, justified by argument that there was a significant need for budget reductions across the Council. I would not argue that redundancies were not necessary in some cases, but to take further money from the overall budget for their own benefit is insulting and hypocritical. The same applies to the decision to increase Council tax - how can Members feel it is appropriate to do that at the same time as taking more money themselves. It shows them to be significantly out of touch with the communities they represent.

Lower the current levels of remuneration, or prove (through a transparent release of data) that it is a reasonable level of recompense for expenses incurred through the carrying out of their duties.

Steal from the poor to give to the 'elected'. And do note the inverted commas. A person elected by 30% of people on a 15% turnout deserves nothing.

Please consider merging wards and reducing the number of Councillors. There really is no need for 69 County Councillors in addition to a large number of District Councillors. It would also be extremely useful to develop a way by which it became clear what the Councillors have achieved whilst in post. A kind of performance tool or appraisal system. Otherwise, how will we know that they are adding value to the activities that the council carries out as part of the organisation's day-to-day business?

The previous attempt to review allowances attempted to bring in some sort of attendance allowance. This is exactly what the last change in the scheme got rid of. Attending formal meetings is the least important part of being a councillor, especially in a 'leader and cabinet' set up. Working for the residents is what a councillor is and there is no efficient or effective way of measuring that and, after all, the public will be able to measure that in other ways and reward at the ballot box. Being a councillor is not about financial reward but it should be rewarding and should be open to all people from all walks of life. When reviewing the scheme, all aspects of allowances and expenses should be considered. The anomaly of the 'broadband' scheme should be considered and the type and list of meetings that qualify for expenses should be reviewed. The unlimited 'gift' of the ad-hoc meetings should be brought into better governance; at the moment a cabinet member can reward loyalists by convening meetings in interesting places and, as long as the cost per month is less than £500 no-one will know. Indeed the 'ad-hoc' meetings are described as policy developing solely to fit them in to the current scheme. Down in the detail, no mileage should be given for travel along the Guided Busway corridor and, instead, passes should be provided. Meetings that don't involve presentation material or whiteboarding-type activity should be done by phone.