Part 2 –

Investigation
Report and
Schedule of
Unused Evidence



PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Case reference: MC/08/1017

Report of an investigation by Wilkin Chapman LLP, appointed by the Deputy Monitoring Officer for Fenland District Council, into allegations concerning Councillor Simon King of Fenland District Council.

20th September 2018

VOLUME 1 REPORT

wilkin chapman lip

Cartergate House, 26 Chantry Lane, Grimsby DN31 2LJ

a limited liability partnership registered in England number OC343261 authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

This page is intentionally blank

Conte	nts	Page
1.	Executive Summary	4
2.	Councillor King's official details	6
3.	Relevant legislation and protocols	7
4.	The evidence gathered	8
5.	Summary of the material facts	19
6.	Carol Pilson's and Councillor King's additional submissions	21
7.	Reasoning as to whether there have been failures to comply with the Code of Conduct	29
8.	Finding	35

Appendix A Schedule of evidence taken into account and list of unused material

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Councillor Simon King is a member of Fenland District Council having been first elected in May 1999.
- 1.2 A complaint was made by Carol Pilson, the Council's Monitoring officer about the conduct of Councillor King. The complaint alleged that Councillor King might have submitted overinflated mileage claims and attempted to claim for journeys outside the scope of the Members' Allowance Scheme.
- 1.3 The Council adopted a Code of Conduct on 26 July 2012 in which the following paragraphs are included:-

"you must not:-

conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute

You must, when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of your authority-

- Act in accordance with your authority's reasonable requirements;
- Ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes);
 and

have regard to any Local Authority Code of Publicity made under the Local Government Act 1986.

- 1.4 We have considered the wording of the Council's Allowances Scheme and are of the view that a member may only make a claim for mileage (a) incurred to attend meetings in respect of one or more of eight types of official duties set out in the Scheme and (b) which is for a journey wholly and necessarily incurred in pursuance of those eight duties. The Scheme permits claims from a councillor's normal place of residence. The Scheme does not require the shortest route to be used but an excessively indirect route would in our view call into question whether the journey was wholly and exclusively in pursuance of one or more of the eight duties.
- 1.5 We have inspected copies of a number of claim forms submitted by Councillor King between 2011 and 2017. These have highlighted a significant difference in the actual mileage between his place of residence and the Council offices and the mileage claimed. There were claims for travel expenses for journeys which are not covered by the Members' Allowance Scheme adopted by the Council.
- 1.6 We have concluded that in some cases there is insufficient evidence to show that claims for mileage between Councillor King's normal place of residence and the Council offices were not wholly and exclusively in pursuance of one or more of the eight duties.
- 1.7 However, we have also considered claims made for journeys which were clearly not covered by the Members' Allowance Scheme. We have concluded that there is evidence that Councillor King should have been aware that some of these claims were not justified.

1.8	Our conclusion is that there has been a breach of the code of conduct of the
	Authority by Councillor King.

- 2. Councillor King's official details
- 2.1 Councillor King was first elected to Fenland District Council on 6 May 1999.
- 2.2 He is a Conservative Councillor representing the Hill-Wisbech Ward.
- 2.3 He was a Member of the Fenland Strategic Partnership.
- 2.4 We are not aware whether Councillor King has attended any Code of Conduct Training.

3. Relevant legislation and protocols

- 3.1 Section 27 of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act) provides that a relevant authority (of which Fenland District Council is one) must promote and maintain high standards of conduct by members and co-opted members of the authority. In discharging this duty, the Council must adopt a code dealing with the conduct that is expected of members when they are acting in that capacity.
- 3.2 Section 28 (1) of the Act provides that the Council must secure that its code of conduct is, when viewed as a whole, consistent with the following principles:-
 - (a) Selflessness;
 - (b) Integrity;
 - (c) Objectivity;
 - (d) Accountability;
 - (e) Openness;
 - (f) Honesty;
 - (g) Leadership.
- 3.3 The Council adopted a Code of Conduct on 26 July 2012 (attached at WC 1) in which the following paragraphs are included:-
 - 3.2 "you must not:-
 - (e) conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute
 - 6.1 You must, when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of your authority-
 - (a) Act in accordance with your authority's reasonable requirements;
 - (b) Ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes); and

have regard to any Local Authority Code of Publicity made under the Local Government Act 1986."

4. Evidence and facts

Our appointment

- 4.1 Fenland District Council's (the Council) arrangements for dealing with standards complaints state that the complaint should be considered through the pre-screening process conducted by the Conduct Committee Chairman, Independent Person and Deputy Independent Person. In this case those persons considered that a breach of the code of conduct might have occurred and therefore referred the complaint to the Conduct Committee, with a recommendation to proceed to an investigation.
- 4.2 Fiona McMillan, the Deputy Monitoring Officer (MO) of the Council, instructed Wilkin Chapman LLP on 2 May 2018 to carry out an investigation, on her behalf, of a complaint dated 24 November 2017 submitted by the Council's Monitoring Officer, Carol Pilson.
- 4.3 Wilkin Chapman LLP is a solicitors firm based in Lincolnshire and East Yorkshire with a national local government legal practice. Work in relation to this investigation was undertaken by Jonathan Goolden, Dave Hayward, Peter Scarbro, Peter Bray and Alan Tasker.

The investigation

- 4.4 During the investigation a signed statement was obtained from Carol Pilson.
- 4.5 Councillor King provided responses to the complaint on 30 November 2017 and 7 February 2018. On 11 July 2018 a number of questions were sent to Councillor King by the investigators. A response was received to these questions on 31 July 2018.
- 4.6 Copies of all relevant documents are annexed to this report and listed in a schedule of evidence at Appendix A.

Background

- 4.7 Carol Pilson submitted a complaint about the conduct of Councillor King on 24 November 2017. The complaint related to Councillor King's mileage claims.
- 4.8 The information submitted with the complaint suggested that Councillor King might have submitted overinflated mileage claims and attempted to claim for journeys outside the Member's Allowance Scheme equating to £1,511.10 (3,358 miles) paid to Councillor King and £736.65 (1,637 miles) claimed but not paid.
- 4.9 Councillor King submitted a complaint to the Council on 19 February 2018 in relation to the Council and the Monitoring Officer's handling of the conduct matter. Due to the nature of the complaint an independent investigation was commissioned.
- 4.10 Richard Penn, an independent external investigator was appointed via the Local Government Association and subsequently undertook an investigation into the allegations contained within Councillor King's complaint (attached at WC 2). The investigation was completed in March 2018. It concluded:-

- (a) there was no evidence that the Council's current mileage policy had not been followed;
- (b) the Monitoring Officer acted correctly in initially referring the matter to the police;
- (c) it was reasonable for the Monitoring Officer to consult the Council's Independent Person before the assessment stage:
- (d) the Monitoring Officer had acted correctly in respect of her role as the line manager of the Member Services team dealing with allowance claims;
- the Monitoring Officer was correct in her action in progressing the matter as a code of conduct issue having first clarified the potential for police action;
- (f) it was appropriate for the Monitoring Officer to appoint a Deputy monitoring officer who was not an employee of Fenland District Council.
- 4.11 We consider it a matter of some surprise and regret that Councillor King pursued allegations concerning the Monitoring Officer and her actions as a complaint against her. Though all the allegations were dismissed, there was a risk that such a process had the appearance of a collateral attack on the complaint against him and the officer making them. Such actions risked being a breach in themselves of paragraph 3.2(c) of the Council's code (you must not intimidate or attempt to intimidate any person who is likely to be a complainant ... in relation to an allegation that a member (including yourself) has failed to comply with his or her authority's code of conduct).
- 4.12 Such issues might better have been raised in Councillor King's response to the allegation or during the investigation.

Members Allowance Scheme

- 4.13 The claiming of mileage by Councillors is governed by the Council's Members Allowance Scheme (attached at WC 3). Travelling and subsistence allowances are dealt with in paragraph 6.1 and 6.2. The scheme states:-
 - "6.1 Subject to the provisions set out in the attached schedule, travelling and subsistence allowances shall be paid to those councillors attending meetings in respect of the following duties:
 - A meeting of the cabinet or any committee of the Cabinet
 - A meeting of the Council or a committee, sub committee or other body of the Council (for which proper notice is given)
 - A meeting held under joint arrangements with another authority (for which proper notice is given)
 - Training and induction courses, seminars and conferences
 - Site inspection meetings (for which proper notice is given)
 - Formal meetings of outside bodies as a representative of the Council
 - Undertaking civic duties as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council
 - Any other duty which has been approved by the Chief Executive

- 6.2 All claims for travel expenses and subsistence should be made on the appropriate claim form backed by receipts as applicable. Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1."
- 4.14 We consider that the requirements of the Scheme are such that a member may only make a mileage claim for mileage incurred:-
 - (a) to attend meetings in respect of any one or more of the eight duties set out in paragraph 6.1, and
 - (b) which is a journey undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of those eight duties.
- 4.15 The wording "mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment of Council business" is permissive. It indicates that such claims for such journeys are possible.
- 4.16 The scheme does not require the shortest route to be used but in our view an excessively indirect route would call into question whether the journey was wholly and exclusively in pursuance of one or more of the eight duties.

The Complaint

4.17 Carol Pilson submitted a complaint (attached at WC 4) on 24 November 2017 together with a number of appendices. In this complaint she stated:-

"The information suggests that Councillor King may have submitted overinflated mileage claims and attempted to claim for journeys outside of the Members Allowance Scheme."

The Complainant - Carol Pilson

- 4.18 Carol Pilson provided a signed statement on 1 June 2018 (attached at WC 5) She stated that:-
 - (a) she was the Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer for Fenland District Council and had been so since February 2015;
 - (b) on 24 November 2017 she raised a complaint concerning the conduct of Councillor Simon King in relation to the submission of mileage claims which appeared to have been overinflated as well as attempting to claim for journeys outside the Members' Allowance Scheme equating to £1,511.10 (3358 miles) paid to Councillor King and £736.65 (1,637 miles) claimed but not paid between April 2011 and October 2017:
 - (c) the Members' Allowances scheme had been agreed by the Council following the receipt of recommendations from the Independent Remuneration Panel. It was last agreed on 5 November 2015. The scheme included a range of provisions but those particularly relevant to the complaint were Section 6 Travelling and Subsistence Allowances;
 - (d) section 6.1 set out the meetings for which a claim could be made under the Members' Allowances Scheme. Section 6.2 made it clear that "Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1";
 - (e) discrepancies in Councillor King's mileage claims were brought to her attention by the Member Services team who processed claims for all Councillors. She was concerned by the fact that despite Councillor King being advised, on numerous occasions, of what was acceptable in terms of appropriate mileage claims, incorrect claims continued to be submitted:
 - (f) to her knowledge, she had not been informed of any occasions when Councillor King had sought advice on his mileage claim before submitting it for processing. No other Councillors had been brought to her attention as having a high number of discrepancies within their claim forms:
 - (g) to establish the seriousness of the issue she asked for an analysis of Councillor King's mileage claims from April 2011 up to the present (October 2017). This analysis showed a significant level of misclaiming since 2011/12 as per the table below:

Year	% of journeys misclaimed
2011/12	96%
2012/13	100%
2013/14	82%
2014/15	100%
2015/16	91%
2016/17	94%

- (h) this analysis showed that Councillor King had claimed for journeys that appeared inflated over and above what would be expected by comparison with Google Maps and journeys were claimed for that were outside of the scheme; mainly not travelling from home but another start point or travelling to another place which was not claimable on the way to Council business. The information outlined that there were consistent claims for differing amounts of mileage from home in Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March. This generally consisted of 26 miles or more for a journey Google Maps stated could be achieved within 22 miles;
- (i) a summary of the analysis of mileage claims by financial year showed the following:

Financial Year	No of miles claimed	No of miles paid	Difference between miles claimed & miles paid	Miles on further analysis that could have been challenged or not paid as outside of the scheme
2011/12	808	678	130	204
	(£363.60)	(£305.10)	(£58.50)	(£91.80)
2012/13	1026	756	270	219
	_(£461.70)	(£340.20)	(£121.50)	(£98.55)
2013/14	2067	2042	25	586
	(£930.15)	(£918.90)	(£11.25)	(£263.70)
2014/15	1086	1086	0	606
	(488.70)	(£488.70)		(£272.70)
2015/16	2180	1856	204 (£91.80)	851
	(£981.00)	(£835.20)		(£382.95)
2016/17	4060	3232	828	597
	(£1827)	(£1454.40)	(372.60)	(268.65)
2017	2542	2362	180	295
	(£1143.90)	(£1062.90)	(£81)	(£132.75)
			_	
Total	13,769	12,012	1637	3358
	(£6196.05)	(£5405.40)	(£736.65)	(£1511.10)

- journeys of note were outlined in the conduct complaint. Examples of very high mileage claims for the journey from Wisbech to Fenland Hall,
 March where a claim of 22 miles would be expected included:
 - a. 56 miles claimed February 2011

- b. 54 miles claimed February 2013
- c. 66 miles claimed November 2014
- d. 43 miles claimed November 2014
- e. 35 miles claimed November 2016
- f. 34 miles claimed December 2016
- g. 52 miles claimed January 2017
- h. 38 miles claimed June 2017 Cllr King confirmed he returned via Peterborough.
- (k) the use of Google Maps in this analysis was to provide an objective tool by which the mileage claimed could be assessed;
- (I) other examples from the analysis that were of particular concern were:
 - a. April 2017 claiming 57 miles instead of 30 miles for a journey returning via Peterborough on personal business.
 - b. November 2016 claiming 20 miles instead of 4 miles.
 - c. November 2016 & July 2016 claiming 10 miles for meetings in Wisbech.
 - d. December 2015/January 2016 this claim consisted of a train ticket from Huntingdon to London return, pay and display ticket for Huntingdon station and 70 miles claimed from Huntingdon to March. Cllr King confirmed he was travelling from personal business and this was not paid. This same claim was submitted again in January 2016 but the journey altered to read Wisbech to March to Wisbech (which would comply with the scheme) instead of Huntingdon to March to London. This claim was also refused.
 - e. January 2016 claimed 71 miles instead of 32 miles and it is understood to have attended a dentist appointment in Peterborough.
 - f. Numerous journeys claimed not from place of residence but from another place e.g. Rugby, Swaffham, Cambridge, Leicester.
- (m) no detailed explanation had been provided by Councillor King in regards to many of these journeys;
- (n) based on the analysis found, she sought external legal advice and advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer, Stephen Gerrard as to how this matter should be dealt with. After careful thought and considering the financial nature of the issue and the quantity of potential misclaiming, it was considered appropriate that a conduct complaint should be raised;
- (o) due to this issue potentially being a criminal matter, she requested advice from the Police as to whether they wished to pursue the matter so that any conduct process would not fetter a police investigation. The police stated they wished to assess the information therefore the conduct process was paused whilst this occurred and resumed once the Police had completed their enquiries;
- (p) as Monitoring Officer, she had no formal decision making power in relation to resolving complaints; this was reserved for Councillors once the formal stage was reached therefore it was her role to collate the information found and put to the relevant part of the Council for assessment and determination:

- (q) due to the potentially seriousness of the complaint, it could not be resolved informally, therefore at that point she removed herself from the process and the Deputy Monitoring Officer, Fiona McMillan led on the process;
- (r) when the conduct complaint was raised with Councillor King in November, as well as being provided with the details of the complaint, Councillor King was also given a list of journeys and the mileage that would be acceptable for those journeys in future. Councillor King had not complied with those mileage limits;
- (s) in January 2018, Councillor King submitted a further incorrect mileage claim. Councillor King claimed for a total of 360 miles which on further analysis only equated to 290 miles, an over claim of 70 miles or £31.50.

Councillor Simon King

- 4.19 On 30 November 2017 Councillor King provided an initial response to the complaint (attached at WC 6). In this he stated:-
 - (a) he agreed that he had submitted the claim forms referred to and that he had received the payments stated;
 - (b) he accepted that some of the claims might have been outside the officer's interpretation of the terms of the Members Allowance Scheme Policy. Where claims had been disallowed he accepted this;
 - (c) he accepted that some of the claims might have been for greater mileages than the shortest distance between the start and end points of the journeys claimed as shown on Google maps;
 - (d) he did not accept that mileage claims were properly limited to the shortest route in every case, for the following reasons:-
 - neither the Policy or the claim form stated that the route must be the shortest route. If this principle is applied it should be stated clearly in the policy;
 - it was not always possible or desirable to travel by the shortest possible route. This could be due to traffic considerations, road closures, weather, safety considerations and innumerable other factors.
 - (e) he did not accept that mileages shown within the complaint were correct;
 - (f) he did not accept that there had been any intent on his part to deceive Fenland District Council or to claim more than the mileage to which he was entitled under the policy:
 - (g) he had accurately stated his start and end points of mileage. He had done this in each case so that officers could correctly apply the Policy and rates to his journeys;

- (h) whilst the policy states what could be claimed, it did not state that this was exhaustive, nor did it state what could not be claimed:
- it was not clear from the policy whether the effect of a detour taken before or after a Council meeting to consult with or inform a constituent in relation to that meeting would wholly disallow a claim for that journey;
- (j) he agreed that with future claims he would comply with the instructions from Officers;
- (k) he did not accept that he had over claimed and been overpaid any travel expenses;
- (I) without accepting any liability or obligation on his part he had paid Fenland District Council the sum of £1,511.10;
- 4.20 On 7 February 2018 (letter is dated 2017) Councillor King provided a further response to the complaint (attached at WC 7). His response questioned the Officers interpretation of the Members' Allowance Scheme. In its conclusion Councillor King stated:-
 - (a) a serious complaint had been made against him by the Monitoring Officer of Fenland District Council:
 - (b) the complaint was based on a flawed interpretation of Council Policy and the application of policies which were not the approved policy of Fenland District Council:
 - (c) he had not breached the Members' Code of Conduct and the complaint against him was wholly without foundation and vexatious.
- 4.21 On 31 July 2018 Councillor King responded to a number of questions sent to him (attached at WC 8). He stated:-
 - he used his phone to record Council meetings and Council business and any non-standard mileage, which he would measure using his car trip odometer;
 - (b) he would not record the mileage on every standard trip as he was familiar with them and had measured them and claimed them without any issue since 1999, when he became a Councillor;
 - he attempted to record matters in a timely fashion, however that was not always possible, and he would, at the end of an expenses period, usually consult the record in his phone in order to complete the expenses form for the balance of the period;
 - (d) for familiar trips he knew the mileages, having travelled them on innumerable occasions since 1999. He would have originally measured these mileages on the car odometer but ceased to do so having established the mileages;
 - (e) in order to travel from his home to the Council Offices in March, he would usually take a route out of Wisbech via Wisbech St Mary and Guyhirn to join the March Road at Ring's End. This route was the

most convenient, as it avoided Wisbech Town centre. This was a reasonable route to take:

- (f) his route into and out of March would vary according to the time of day and year and the traffic conditions. There had never been any issue raised as to these mileages and they were accepted in claims and by emails as late as July 2017;
- (g) the challenging of expenses back to 2011 provided him with some considerable difficulties in dealing with the precise route used for any particular journey. There were often when travelling, traffic problems, accidents and road works that made it expedient to take an alternative route, which was not necessarily the shortest, but may well have been the quickest, or even obligatory if directed by police;
- (h) he had never used Google Maps to establish the mileage for trips, using the trip odometer on his car, when required. He had no knowledge of the accuracy of Google Maps or of the odometer on any of his cars, although he now understood having looked into the matter, that odometers may provide as much as a 10% over-reading of mileages (consistent with a 10% over-reading of speed on the speedometer, to which it was connected);
- (i) It appeared to him that the factors of alternative routes, odometer over-reading and inaccuracy in Google Maps would account for the vast majority of the differences in mileages;
- (j) the policy did not state that the geographically shortest route must be used or would be paid. Neither did the policy state that Google Maps had any status in relation to the implementation of the policy, including the route to be used;
- (k) he did not accept that the mileages that he recorded were inaccurate or misleading or were submitted dishonestly. Further there was no attempt on his part to gain any advantage for himself, simply to claim for expenses incurred;
- (I) the expenses form required that actual departure and destination locations and times were recorded. He had always recorded truthfully and accurately to the best of his ability the actual journeys completed;
- (m) his understanding of the scheme was that expenses could be claimed for journeys completed on Council business as set out in section 6.2. He understood that he could claim from home or another location from which he departed to a destination to conduct Council business;
- (n) as he understood it, the amendment in 2011 to add Clause 6.2 was a permissive amendment to make it clear that mileage could be claimed from home (as well as from other locations) on Council business, in contrast to the position for employees;
- (o) the claim form provided spaces for actual distances from actual departure points to actual destinations which he completed;
- (p) he had been making journeys from his home in Wisbech to the Council Offices in March since 1999, when he was elected a Councillor;

- (q) at the outset of making those journeys he measured them using the car odometer. He had no knowledge of the accuracy of the odometer in the car he used to establish these mileages, although he now understood that odometers might provide as much as a 10% overreading;
- (r) he had no knowledge of the accuracy of mileage readings provided by Google Maps. This in itself may provide an explanation for much of the difference alleged in the report. Indeed, considering route 4 on document 4, which used the start of the route he would usually use, the mileage was stated as 24.6 miles using Google Maps. Leaving aside the issue of accuracy of Google Maps, a 10% over-read on his car odometer would provide a distance of 27.06 miles, entirely consistent with the mileage he had recorded and claimed;
- (s) his usual route out of Wisbech was to take the Barton Road out of Wisbech, towards Guyhirn, joining the March Road at Rings End. This route, whilst not the shortest route he could take, was usually the most convenient as it avoided the centre of Wisbech, traffic lights and congestion. It was a reasonable route to take. There was no requirement in the policy that Councillors must travel by the shortest route available;
- (t) his route into March depended upon the time of day and year. Some routes were to be avoided, for example the route back from March along the Twenty Foot Road, turning right onto the A141 by Hobbs Lot Bridge as there was often a long delay waiting to make the turn onto the A141:
- depending on the routes he took into March the mileages he recorded were 26, 27 and 28 miles. He had used those mileages since he commenced as a Councillor. They had always been accepted;
- (v) he did not accept the suggestion that the amounts claimed were overstated. The route he took in relation to home together with errors in reading from his car odometer and Google Maps would provide an explanation for the vast majority of the alleged over-stating;
- in respect of mileages which were disallowed due to departure location, he claimed them believing that he was entitled to claim them.
 He entered the actual departure locations in order that the claim could be processed;
- (x) it was for the Council to determine the policy not officers. To his knowledge no additional clarification or guide to interpretation of the policy had been agreed by Councillors and issued;
- (y) with regards the 5 November 2015 train fare, he was acting as a consultant and had arranged a number of meetings in London on that day. He had been recently appointed to the Cabinet. He was specifically asked to attend the Council meeting. As a result of that request, he cancelled two of his later meetings in London and attended Council Meeting. As a result of this, he had to travel again to London a few days later to attend the meetings that he had cancelled;
- (z) as the policy and claim form were not clear as to whether he could have claimed for all or part or none of his journey on the day of the

Council meeting, he decided that it was best to show the full journey so that member services could decide whether to pay all or part or none of the journey;

- (aa) with regards 7 December 2015 West Norfolk Planning Meeting, this was a planning application in West Norfolk affecting an area of land which bordered his constituency. Several of his constituents raised concerns in relation to the planning application and he attended the meeting to represent their interests, which he believed was official business:
- (bb) his car was not available as his wife had inadvertently taken his car keys which he only discovered as he was preparing to leave. The only way he could attend the meeting in time to make the representations he had promised was by taxi. He got a bus back after the meeting as the cheapest way of making the journey home. He made the claim in accordance with his understanding of the policy as set out above;
- (cc) with regards the 6 June 2017 Huntingdon Mileage, he believed that due to traffic conditions he travelled back from Huntingdon via the A14, A1 and A47. This was a reasonable route in the circumstances. He made the claim in accordance with his understanding of the policy as set out above;
- (dd) with regards the 5 January 2016 tour of assets, he had to travel from Wisbech to March to begin the tour. He could not recall all the stops on the tour to confirm the accuracy of the mileages. He believed that the tour went to March, Manea, Elm, Leverington and Wisbech St Mary. He had to leave the tour early because of a personal commitment. As far as he could recall, there was an informal Cabinet meeting that day and he subsequently visited the locations that he had not been able to see. He made the claim in accordance with his understanding of the policy as set out above;
- (ee) as he indicated when challenged about the matter he took the view that the officer's interpretation of the policy was wrong. There had never been any clarification, interpretation or guidance issued in relation to the making of claims that was agreed by Councillors. He always made it clear what his interpretation of the policy was and made the claims openly.

5. Summary of the material facts

- 5.1 Councillor King is a member of the Council representing the Hill-Wisbech Ward.
- 5.2 Councillor King lives in Wisbech. The Council offices are located in March. Using various mapping systems the mileage between Councillor King's home and the Council offices is 9.5 or 10.5 miles depending on the route chosen. The Council has identified five possible routes between the two destinations, these vary in distance from 10.1 miles to 12.3 miles.
- 5.3 The Council has adopted a scheme for Members' Allowances. Included in this scheme is Section 6 which deals with Travelling and Subsistence Allowances. Paragraph 6 states:-
 - "6.1 Subject to the provisions set out in the attached schedule, traveling and subsistence allowances shall be paid to those councillors attending meetings in respect of the following duties:
 - A meeting of the Cabinet or any committee of the Cabinet
 - A meeting of the Council or a committee, sub-committee or other body of the Council (for which proper notice is given)
 - A meeting held under joint arrangements with another authority (for which proper notice is given)
 - Training and induction courses, seminars and conferences
 - Site inspection meetings (for which proper notice is given)
 - Formal meetings of outside bodies as a representative of the Council
 - Undertaking civic duties as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council
 - Any other duty which has been approved by the Chief Executive.
 - 6.2 All claims for travel and subsistence should be made on the appropriate claim form and backed by receipts as applicable. Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of council duties as set out in 6.1."
- 5.4 The schedule referred to in Paragraph 6.1 sets out the amounts that can be claimed in respect of each of the allowances covered by the scheme.
- 5.5 On 24 November 2017 a Code of Conduct complaint was submitted to the Council by he Council's Monitoring Officer regarding the overinflation of mileage claims and attempts to claim for journeys outside the Members' Allowances Scheme. A counter complaint was made by Councillor King in relation to the Council's handling of the matter. This was investigated by an

- independent investigator who found no fault in the Council's handling of the Code of Conduct complaint.
- 5.6 The complaint referred to a number of instances where Councillor King had claimed for travel between his normal place of residence and the Council's offices which was in excess of the actual mileage between the two locations. These regularly included claims for between 25 miles and over 50 miles for the return journey. Analysis carried out by the Council identified that the majority of Councillor King's claims between 2011 and 2017 had been over stated.
- 5.7 Analysis of Councillor King's claims also identified a number of occasions where claims had been submitted for journeys which included an element of private business or Council business which was outside the Members' Allowance Scheme. These included detours from journeys between his home and the Council offices to visit constituents and journeys which started at other locations with no explanation of any Council business undertaken. A number of items were identified where claims were submitted for attendance at meetings which Councillor King did not attend.
- 5.8 Councillor King had been advised on a number of occasions regarding his mileage claims. Records show that a significant number of claims submitted by Councillor King were questioned by the Council's officers processing the claims. In many cases this was due to the information on the claim form being inadequate to enable the claim to be authorised.
- 5.9 The complaint identified claims which had been over stated in the sum of £1511.10. Councillor King did not accept any liability or obligation on his part but repaid to the District Council the sum of £1511.10.

6. Councillor additional submissions

6.1 The following comments were received from Carol Pilson on the draft version of this report:-

"Volume 1 - Report

Page 1 – Under case reference, first line – Wilkin Chapman were appointed by the Deputy Monitoring Officer, not the Monitoring Officer.

Page 5; 2.3 – Cllr King is no longer a Member of the Fenland Strategic Partnership.

Page 8; 4.10 (a) – Might be worth clarifying that there was no evidence that the Council's current mileage policy had not been followed – by officers.

Page 22; 7.15 – The mileage provided as stated by Google Maps was used as an objective measurement of what the likely mileage would be from a journey from Clir King's home address to Fenland Hall, March to act as a barometer for the other amounts of mileage claimed.

At 7.15 and at Councillor King's statement at 4.16 (i) and (r), it is concluded that mileage may have been inclusive of inaccurate odometer readings, alternative routes etc and this was the cause of the over inflation. The report at 7.15 states "Whilst the significant variation in the actual distance and the distance claimed for these journeys is cause for concern." I would comment that it would appear these journeys are too numerous and there are a number of journeys that are grossly overstated over and above 22 miles, and over and above the 27 mile limit Cllr King states would be acceptable that give rise to a breach in this area of the code of conduct. I would provide the following examples of journeys Wisbech-March return which exceed this limit:

22/6/17 - 38 miles 3/7/17 - 31 miles 16/1/17 - 36 miles 24/1/17 - 52 miles 27/2/17 - 31 miles 24/11/16 - 35 miles 8/12/16 - 34 miles 11/1/16 - 55 miles 3/12/15 - 42 miles 10/12/15 - 36 miles 7/1/16 - 35 miles 6/11/14 - 66 miles 24/11/14 - 43 miles 6/2/13 - 54 miles

Page 23; 7.21; 2nd to last line 'w' to be 'were'

Page 23; 7.22; For 70 miles and also a train ticket from Huntingdon to London return and a car parking ticket equating to £25.75.

Volume 2 - Schedule of Evidence

Below case reference, Sandwell Metropolitan Council is referenced – change to Fenland District Council."

Response to Carol Pilson's comments

- 6.2 The typographical errors identified have been corrected in the final report. The comments on the content of the report have been noted, these do not have any material effect on our conclusions.
- 6.3 The following comments were received from Councillor King on the draft version of this report:-
 - "1. In Paragraph 7.16, it is stated:

"What is clearly not covered are ... journeys to meetings from locations where private business has been carried out"

In making this statement, the Report accepts without examination the interpretation of the Scheme proffered in the complaint.

1.1 Despite having been directed to the question of interpretation of clause 6.2 of the Members

Allowance Scheme, the Report fails:

to examine or consider, even in the most cursory way, the words of clause 6.2 so as to establish their effect.

to ascertain from the Chair of the Independent Review Panel of 2011 the intent in the drafting of clause 6.2.

to review or consider the actual operation of the scheme from 1999 to 2011 to confirm the permissive nature of the 2011 amendment

to review or consider the actual operation of the Scheme from 2011 to ascertain the actual interpretation of the Scheme by FDC.

to take account of the three differing interpretations of the scheme operated by FDC over the period of the complaint.1

to examine whether FDC intends in the operation of the scheme to discriminate against Councillors who may be obliged to travel to meetings from starting points other than their homes, for example due to being employed.²

to consider the operation of travel expenses policy in Cambridgeshire County Council, which does not restrict the location from which it pays expenses and pays travel to any meeting clearly related to their role as a Councillor.

¹ The interpretations are: (1) to pay all claims irrespective of start point (2) to treat claims as if starting in Wisbech (3) to reject claims not starting from Wisbech. If the policy is clear to the authors of the report, it was self-evidently not clear to FDC

² The authors of the Report should review the note from HMRC "Tax exemption for travel expenses of members of local authorities" and particularly the stated Policy objective.

to consider whether there was a change of interpretation in 2015.

1.2 Councillor King's position on the

interpretation of Clause 6.2: Clause 6.2

states:

"Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business".

The word "can" is permissive. It does not say "can only" as is used later in Clause 6.2, nor does it say "must" or "must only". It is therefore a valid interpretation that the wording is indicative of some of the range of locations from which mileage can be claimed.

Paragraph 6.2 makes it clear that a claim can be made from "a subsequent appointment on council business". This is explicitly not a reference to 6.1. It would appear to open up a much wider category of places from which travel may be claimed. Certainly visits to constituents or any other meetings in relation to his role as a Councillor en route to a meeting specified in 6.1 would seem to clearly fall within this definition.

2. Paragraph 7.17 of the Report states:

"The evidence provided shows numerous claims for travel expenses for journeys **not covered by the scheme**"

- 2.1 Again the Report makes an assumption about the correct interpretation of the scheme, and accepts, without analysis, the interpretation proffered in the complaint.
- 2.2 No consideration is given to the fact that prior to the e-mail of 10/12/15, claims for travel from locations other than home were routinely paid, which is clearly a precedent, both before and after the permissive change to the policy in 2011.
- 2.3 The Report does not acknowledge that from 2011 to December 2015, the policy was interpreted and implemented in accordance with Councillor King's interpretation of it.
- 2.4 The Report does not examine the fact that no guidance or interpretation documentation was issued to Councillors by the Council (either in relation to the 2011 or 2015 schemes) to clarify the manner in which the scheme was intended to operate, leaving Councillors to reach their own view as to what was permissible on the basis of the wording.
- 2.5 The Report does not acknowledge that there was a period of some 5 months, during which Councillor King makes it apparent that he disagreed with the new interpretation of the policy imposed in 2015,

³ SJEKing's emphasis

where he continued to make claims for travel from non-home locations.

- 2.6 There is no acknowledgement that Councillor King made no further claims for travel after 16 June 2016 where the starting point is other than Councillor King's home.
- 2.7 The Report does not further quantify or analyse the number and nature of the claims, having removed those allegations involving allegations of excess mileage.
- 2.8 The Report does not consider how the interpretation of the policy could legitimately change in 2015, notwithstanding that there was no change made to the relevant part of the Members' Allowance Scheme.
- 3. In Paragraph 7.21, the report states:

"Due to the volume of inaccurate claims and the repeated advice to Councillor King that some of his claims were not covered by the scheme we have concluded that on a number of occasions these w[ere] deliberate attempts by Councillor King to claim allowances that he was not entitled to."

This conclusion relies wholly on the correct interpretation of the scheme. In the absence of any analysis of the interpretation of the scheme, this demonstrates an unquestioning acceptance of the interpretation proposed by the complaint.

3.1 This conclusion fails to recognise:

the nature of the precedent provided by FDC to Councillor King in the payment of non-home claims from 2011.

the genuine view of Councillor Kings that the effect of the policy is that it permits non-home claims, demonstrated by his email of 10th December 2015 at 16.38 to Jane Bailey where he states:

"This has never happened before, Jane, and is patently unfair so you're misinterpreting the policy"

the clear change of policy which occurred in 2015, at the time when Carol Pilson became responsible for members' claims. The significant reduction in "the volume of inaccurate claims" due to the conclusion at 7.15 that car odometer inaccuracy and alternative routes provide an explanation for the variation in mileages.

3.2 After 10th December 2011, Councillor King submitted claims for 16 journeys where the starting point was not Councillor King's home, out of a total of 78 journeys in the same period. All these occurred during the period after the change of policy, whilst Councillor King was questioning the new interpretation of the policy made by officers.

⁴ SJEKing's emphasis

- 3.3 The reality is that Councillor King has made each of those 16 journeys to attend meetings of FDC entirely at his own expense, simply because he was obliged to start from a point which was not his home.
- 4 Paragraph 7.23 states:

"We therefore conclude that by submitting inaccurate claims for travel expenses Councillor King was not acting in accordance with the Authority's reasonable requirements when using the resources of the Authority. This was a breach of Paragraph 6.1 of the Council's Code of Conduct"

4.1 This paragraph is in direct contradiction to Paragraph 7.12, which states:

"Only improper use of resources for party political purposes will be a breach of the Code of Conduct"

- 4.2 The Report has assumed, but has failed to show, that the Scheme did not permit claims for travel to Council meetings other than from the member's home. Given that this interpretation of the policy was first notified to Councillor King in in December 2015, and that prior to that date FDC had paid such claims without demur, it could not have become a "reasonable requirement" of FDC in December 2015 that a member should henceforth omit such claims on pain of being in breach of paragraph 6.1 of the Code of Conduct, for submitting an inaccurate claim, without any notification to members of that new requirement.
- 5 Paragraph 7.30 states:
 - "It is reasonable to conclude that that the public would expect Councils and Councillors to be open and transparent when using public funds. Therefore the misuse of public funds would, in our opinion, be likely to reduce public confidence."
- 5.1 Councillor King has only made claims using the expense forms provided by FDC. These claims are publicly available documents. Therefore these claims meet the expectation of openness and transparency.
- 5.2 The Report acknowledges in Paragraph 7.15 that the Scheme does not state that the shortest route should be used. The sums paid to Councillor King for these claims are not therefore misused public funds.
- 5.3 Payments made to Councillor King prior to December 2015 for travel from a starting point other than his home were made under the policy as it was then interpreted. These payments were not therefore misused public funds.

- 5.4 Between December 2015 and March 2016 (whilst the new interpretation of the scheme was being debated between Councillor King and the council officers) Councillor King received payments for 4 (out of 16) claims for travel from a starting point other than his home. These claims were all reviewed and changed by officers prior to payment. These were not therefore misused public funds.
- 5.5 Since March 2016, Councillor King has not made any claims for travel where the starting point was not his home. Therefore no misuse of public funds has arisen in that period.
- 5.6 The conclusion set out in Paragraph 7.31 is glib, and wholly without proper foundation. There is no analysis of the factors which have to be considered in assessing the seriousness of any breach, including but not limited to:

The interpretation and implementation of the travel expenses policy, consistent With his understanding of it between 2011 and December 2015

His open stating of his understanding of the scheme

His understanding of the operation of the scheme (whether mistaken or not)

That the travel expenses all related to Councillor King discharging his functions as a Councillor

Any ambiguity in the drafting of the travel expenses policy.

The limited number of Claims between December 2015 and May 2016, whilst he was disputing the change in interpretation of the policy

That considering Cambridgeshire County Council's travel policy (attached):

- o There is no restriction on the start point of a journey to the home address
- o Expenses are claimable for attendance at meetings clearly related to their role as Councillor
- 6. The Report has a number of general failings, as follows:
- 6.1 The Report adopts the contentious language of the complaint as its own. For example, it repeats the illogical words "over-inflated claims". Together with the assumptions made in the report about the interpretation of the travel policy, this demonstrates a lack of independent and critical consideration in formulating the report.
- 6.2 The Report does not make enquiry of the Monitoring Officer about the change of policy in 2015, and the reasons for it. It is possible that the changes in tax legislation relating to member's travel expenses at the time lead to a misinterpretation of the policy by the Monitoring Officer.

- 6.3 The Report does not examine whether the interpretation of the policy can legitimately be changed by an officer, without a resolution of the Council.
- 6.4 The wording of the Executive Summary is highly contentious, in particular:

Paragraph 1.4, second sentence: the word "actual" should read "shortest". There are numerous possible routes.

Paragraph 1.4, third sentence: the word "numerous" exaggerates the reality. Also "clearly not covered" is an unsupported statement.

Paragraph 1.5, first sentence: This sentence should read:

"We have concluded that since the policy doe not require a member to travel by the shortest route, the complaint relating to the mileage claimed from his place of residence to his home is unfounded"

Paragraph 1.5, second and third sentences and paragraph 1.6: These should be reviewed when the Report has considered the interpretation of the policy.

- 6.5 The Report does not consider whether it is proper for the complaint to be retrospective to 2011, or of the prejudice to Councillor King of raising 7 years later mundane matters of which he would no longer have records or recollection.
- 6.6 The Report does not consider whether the re-analysis of past claims in October 2017 was operated so as to artificially strengthen the complaint against Councillor King.⁵
- 7. Paragraphs 4.9 to 4.11 refer to the complaint made by Councillor King.
- 7.1 These paragraphs should be deleted, since they are outside the remit of the investigation into the conduct of Councillor King as set out in the complaint made by FDC. They have no relevance to the investigation, and their inclusion is improperly prejudicial to Councillor King.
- 7.2 Paragraph 4.10 of the Report sets out a summary of the findings of Richard Penn, but does not recognise that the Report reaches a different conclusion to the conclusion of Mr Penn at point (a).
- 7.3 The final two paragraphs of Paragraph 4.10 of the Report are significantly outside the remit of the investigation. Furthermore the Report fails to recognise:

⁵ E.g. 26 January 2016. Journey Horncastle to Norwich to Wisbech. 158 miles claimed, adjusted by officers to 110 miles as if Wisbech to Norwich to Wisbech. In October 2017, reviewed to 55 miles, and 55 miles treated as overclaimed.

that Councillor King was obliged to make any complaint within a limited time. Councillor King was concerned that if he failed to make the complaint promptly, he would not be able to do so later;

Response to Councillor King's comments.

- 6.4 Most of the comments received from Councillor King relate to our interpretation of the Council's Members' Allowance Scheme. Our conclusions on this point are based on a factual evaluation of what is in the wording of the Scheme rather than interpretation. For example paragraph 6.1 of the Scheme sets out the range of duties which qualify for the payment of allowances. This is a list of 8 such duties, from this we conclude that anything outside that list does not qualify. This is not an interpretation but an objective conclusion of the scope of the allowance Scheme. We have, however, modified our comments to reflect that the scheme does not require the shortest journey to be taken nor does it necessarily restrict claims to those from a place of residence.
- 6.5 We note that Councillor King refers to the Allowance Scheme adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council which appears to be more permissive than the Fenland District Council Scheme. However, this is irrelevant as the County scheme has not been adopted by Fenland District Council. Similarly we note the HM Revenues and Customs information provided on tax exemption for travel expenses for members of local authorities. Again this has little relevance to the issues dealt with in the report.
- 6.6 Councillor King contends that our comments in paragraph 4.11 of this report regarding his complaint against the Monitoring Officer are inappropriate. Our view is that Councillor King submitted his complaint which specifically referred to the actions of the Monitoring Officer after the Monitoring Officer had submitted a complaint about Councillor King's conduct. The details of this and Mr Penn's findings are relevant background information.
- 6.7 Our investigation has been proportionate in view of the volume of claims referred to in the complaint. We acknowledged that there were some claims which were open to interpretation therefore we focused our determination on claims where there was no doubt that these were outside of the scope of the Allowance Scheme.
- 6.8 Having considered and noted the information and comments provided by Councillor King we are content that these have no material impact on our conclusions.

7. Reasoning as to whether there have been failures

Official Capacity

- 7.1 Section 27(2) of the Localism Act 2011 requires the Council to adopt a code of conduct "dealing with the conduct that is expected of members ... when they are acting in that capacity". The Council's code is expressed to apply whenever a member is acting in the capacity as a member or claiming to act or giving the impression of acting as a Member of the authority.
- 7.2 Though relating to the former 2007 model code of conduct, the Upper Tribunal decision in MC v Standards Committee of the London Borough of Richmond [2011] UKUT 232 (AAC) is a helpful distillation of the previous High Court cases on capacity Livingstone v Adjudication Panel for England [2006] EWHC 2533 and R(Mullaney) v Adjudication Panel for England [2009] EWHC 72. The principles stated in MC are:-
 - (a) was the councillor, as a matter of ordinary English, actually conducting the business of their authority, including the business of the office of councillor?
 - (b) a fact sensitive approach is required to the above:
 - (c) just because the councillor used routes of communication open to members but not to others does not in itself provide a definitive answer to the question;
 - (d) the question is one for the tribunal to determine, not a reasonable observer.
- 7.3 It is without doubt that Councillor King was claiming travelling expenses for duties carried out in his capacity as a Councillor. The claiming of travel expenses under the Council's Members' Allowance Scheme is a function of a Councillor, therefore for the purposes of this investigation we have concluded that Councillor King was acting in his official capacity when completing and submitting these claims.

Use of Resources

7.4 The complaint refers to the misuse of the authority's resources. This appears to be a reference to paragraph 6 of the Council's Code of Conduct which states:-

"You must

- 6.1 when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of your authority-
 - (a) Act in accordance with your authority's reasonable requirements:
 - (b) Ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes); and
- 6.2 have regard to any Local Authority Code of Publicity made under the Local Government Act 1986".

- 7.5 We do not consider these are cumulative requirements. There is a separate obligation under 6.1(a) to act in accordance with the authority's reasonable requirements which is independent of the obligation at 6.1(b) to ensure resources are not used improperly for political purposes.
- 7.6 Question 49, page 76 of the Case Review 2010 (2011 Edition) issued by the former Standards Board for England (SfE) defines the term 'resources of your authority':-

"They include services and facilities as well as the financial resources of the authority. Resources could include any land or premises, equipment, computers, and materials. The time, skills and assistance of anybody employed by the authority, or working on its behalf, are also resources, as is information held by the authority which it has not published."

- 7.7 Mileage and subsistence claims concern a financial resource of the authority.
- 7.8 Q50, page 76 of the Case Review 2010 sets out how members will know what the authority's reasonable requirements for the use of resources are.
- 7.9 SfE strongly recommended that local authorities had protocols dealing with the use of authority resources. The key principle underlying all such protocols should be that public office and public resources should not be used to further purely private or party political purpose. In this case the Council adopted a Members Allowance Scheme, Chapter 6 of which concerns Travelling and Subsistence Allowances.
- 7.10 The term "reasonable" is a generic and relative one and applies to that which is appropriate for a particular situation. In the tort of negligence, the reasonable person standard is the standard of care that a reasonably prudent person would take under a given set of circumstances. An individual who subscribes to such standards will avoid liability for negligence. Similarly a reasonable act is that which might fairly and properly be required of an individual.
- Question 51 Page 77 of the Case Review 2010 sets out what constitutes using resources "improperly for political purposes" Paragraph 6(b)(ii) acknowledges that party politics has a proper role to play, both in the conduct of authority business and in the way that members carry out their duties.
- 7.12 It also acknowledges that there will be times when it is acceptable for political groups to use the resources of the authority, for example, to hold meetings in authority premises. Often it is impractical to separate a member's political campaigning from carrying out their duties as an elected ward member, such as when they hold surgeries or deal with correspondence from constituents.
- 7.13 However it goes on to state that members and monitoring officers will need to exercise considerable vigilance to ensure that this provision is not abused. They must ensure that there is a sufficient connection between the use of resources and the business of the authority. Only improper use of resources for party political purposes will be a breach of the Code of Conduct.

Mileage Claims - Wisbech to Fenland Hall.

7.14 Most of the journeys from Councillor King's home address to Fenland Hall were on Council Business. The exceptions to this being claims for attendance

at meetings that Councillor King did not attend. We have taken the view that these may have been errors by Councillor King as it appears his practice was to complete a claim form periodically using his diary rather than keeping an up to date record of his mileage.

- 7.15 However, the analysis indicates that a number of the claims were for differing amounts of mileage. This generally consisted of 26 miles or more for a journey which could be achieved within 22 miles. We note that Councillor King argues that this discrepancy could be explained by the inaccuracy of a vehicles odometer and/or the alternative routes he used between his residence and the Council's offices. We have not had the opportunity to inspect Councillor King's diaries for the period in question but can only presume that he recorded his route for future inclusion on his claim form.
- 7.16 Whilst the significant variation in the actual distance and the distance claimed for these journeys is cause for concern we are mindful that the Scheme does not state that the shortest route should be used. For this reason and the argument put forward by Councillor King regarding inaccuracy of odometers and routes used we have concluded there is insufficient evidence to establish a breach of the Code of Conduct of misuse of Council resources.

Claims outside the Members' Allowance Scheme

- 7.17 A number of claims were identified which were for journeys outside the Members' Allowance Scheme. The Scheme is quite clear in that claims may be submitted for journeys carried out in the exercise of specific Council duties. These predominantly cover attendance at formal Council meetings which include committees sub-committees etc. What is clearly not covered are visits to constituents, attendance at meetings of other Local Authorities (unless these fall into one or more of the eight duties), and journeys to meetings from locations where private business has been carried out.
- 7.18 We note that Councillor King contends that insufficient advice or information was provided to him regarding the journeys which were authorised. We are also mindful of the number of times Councillor King was asked to clarify his journeys claimed for and the number he was informed would not be paid. Notwithstanding this, we consider that it is clear in the Scheme that mileage claims can only be made "for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1."
- 7.19 After considering the Scheme, we do regard mileage claimed from a Councillors normal place of residence as "journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1." However, the evidence provided shows numerous claims for travel expenses for journeys that are not covered by the Scheme as they were not "undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1."

7.20 Examples of these are:

(a) a claim on 5 November 2015 for travel to a Council meeting. Councillor King states that he was in London on personal business and travelled back to attend the meeting. Councillor King further states that he was acting as a consultant and had arranged a number of meetings in London on business on that day. It is clear that this journey was not "undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1" as the journey to the Council meeting was from London, a location where private business had been carried out by Councillor King; and

- (b) a claim for attendance at West Norfolk District Council Planning Committee Meeting in December 2015. Councillor King states that he attended the meeting to represent some of his constituents interests and he believed this was official business. This claim is clearly outside the scope of the Scheme as this was not a formal meeting of "the Council", that is Fenland District Council and Councillor King was not representing the Council at that meeting. The meeting therefore did not comply with any of the duties set out in paragraph 6.1 of the Scheme and the journey was not "undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1"
- 7.21 Councillor King argues that his practice was to include journeys on his claim form, with details, and expected the Members' Services officers to decide whether to pay the claim. Councillor King also states that he had accurately stated his start and end points of the mileage in each case so that officers could correct apply the Policy and rates to his journeys. Our inspection of copies of Councillor King's claim forms show that, notwithstanding the limitations of the form, the information provided is extremely brief and in many cases almost illegible.
- 7.22 Again, the example being the claim for 5 November 2015. The details on the claim form show departure from Huntingdon at 3.30 for a start time in March at 4.00. The meeting is described as 'Council'. The return location appears to be London, although this is not entirely clear as it is written over a different entry, with a time of 8.30. Travel was by car and the claim was for 70 miles. There is no explanation on the form that would enable the Members' Services officer to clarify the circumstances. We note that the claim form indicates that the claim was not paid. However it appears that a similar claim was included on a further form submitted in January 2016. For the same Council meeting this shows departure from Wisbech at 11.00 for a start time of 4.00 in March. The meeting is described as 'Council'. The return is to Wisbech at 8.30. The claim is for 70 miles. There is no explanation on the form to justify a claim for 70 miles for a return journey between Wisbech and March.
- 7.23 The complaint details numerous other instances where claims have been over stated or submitted for journeys outside the scope of the Scheme. From our inspection of the claim forms it is consistent that none of these have adequate information to enable the claim to be easily verified. Due to the volume of inaccurate claims and the repeated advice to Councillor King that some of his claims were not covered by the scheme we have concluded that on a number of occasions these were attempts by Councillor King to claim allowances that he was not entitled to, which were at best made without due regard to the scheme.
- 7.24 We have considered the arguments put forward by Councillor King some of which in isolation may be plausible. However in particular we have concluded that the repeated attempt to claim for 70 miles for the Council meeting on 5 November 2015 was a deliberate and false claim.
- 7.25 We therefore conclude that by submitting inaccurate claims for travel expenses and claims which were clearly outside of the allowances scheme, Councillor King was not acting in accordance with the Authority's reasonable requirements when using the resources of the authority. This was a breach of Paragraph 6.1 of the Council's Code of Conduct.

Disrepute

7.26 Paragraph 3.2 (e) of the Council's Code of Conduct states:-

"You must not

conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute."

- 7.27 This is in the spirit of the relevant provision of the previous 2007 model code of conduct which dealt with 'disrepute' and perceptions of both the Authority as a body and the office of member.
- 7.28 As such it is relevant to consider guidance issued by the then Standards Board for England (SfE). Question 43 on page 66 of the Case Review 2010 (2011 Edition) published by SfE advises that disrepute is:-
 - "....a lack of good reputation or respectability.

In the context of the Code of Conduct, a member's behaviour in office will bring that member's office into disrepute if the conduct could reasonably be regarded as either:

- 1) Reducing the public's confidence in that member being able to fulfil their role: or
- 2) Adversely affecting the reputation of members generally, in being able to fulfil their role."
- 7.29 Q44 on the next page of the Case Review 2010 advises that:-

"An officer carrying out an investigation...does not need to prove that a member's actions have actually diminished public confidence, or harmed the reputation of the authority...the test is whether or not a members' conduct "could reasonably be regarded" as having these effects.

The test is objective and does not rely on any one individual's perception. There will be a range of opinions that a reasonable person could have towards the conduct in question."

7.30 Q42 on page 66 of the Case Review indicates that:-

"A case tribunal or standards committee will need to be persuaded that the misconduct is sufficient to damage the reputation of the member's office or authority, as opposed simply to damaging the reputation of the individual concerned."

7.31 In applying the Code to the circumstances of an alleged breach of code it is established that it is not necessary for the member's actions to have actually diminished public confidence, or harmed the reputation of the authority. The test is whether or not the conduct could 'reasonably be regarded' as having these effects. However, the conduct must be sufficient to damage the reputation of the member's office or the Authority, not just the reputation of Councillor King as an individual.

- 7.32 From the above it is clear that it is whether Councillor King's conduct would diminish the public's confidence in the Council or harmed its reputation. It is reasonable to conclude that the public would expect Councils and Councillors to be open and transparent when using public funds. Therefore the misuse of such funds would, in our opinion, be likely to reduce public confidence.
- 7.33 We consider this to be a serious breach of the Code of Conduct which could reasonably be regarded as diminishing the public's confidence in Councillor King, and thus a breach of Paragraph 3.2 (e) of the Code.

8. Finding

8.1 Our finding is that there has been a breach of the code of conduct of the authority concerned.

Wilkin Chapman LLP **Investigating Solicitors**

20th September 2018

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT



PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Case reference: MC/08/1017

Report of an investigation by Wilkin Chapman LLP, appointed by the Monitoring Officer for Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council, into allegations made by <u>Ms Carol Pilson</u> concerning Councillor Simon King of Fenland District Council.

Dated: 20th September 2018

VOLUME 2 SCHEDULE OF EVIDENCE

wilkin chapman lip

Cartergate House, 26 Chantry Lane, Grimsby DN31 2LJ

a limited liability partnership registered in England number OC343261 authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

Appendix A

Schedule of evidence taken into account and list of unused material

Page	Number	Description
3	WC1	Code of Conduct
11	WC2	Penn Report
26	WC3	Members Allowance Scheme
38	WC4	Complaint of Carol Pilson
111	WC5	Statement of Carol Pilson
117	WC6	Initial response of Councillor King 30.11.17
119	WC7	Further response of Councillor King 07.02.18
121	WC 8	Questions to and responses from Councillor King

Appendix B

List of unused material

Investigator's notes, file correspondence and drafts.

CODE 1 CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS¹

The Members' Code of Conduct is intended to promote high standards of behaviour amongst the elected and co-opted members of the council.

The Code is underpinned by the following principles of public life which should borne in mind when interpreting the meaning of the Code:-

- Selfleseness Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family or their friends.
- Integrity Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties.
- Objectivity in carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.
- Accountability Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.
- v Openness Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.
- Honesty Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.
- **Leadership** Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

PART 1 GENERAL PROVISIONS

- 1. Introduction and interpretation
- 1.1. This Code applies to you as a member of Fenland District Council (Fenland).
- 1.2. The term "the Authority" used in this Code refers to Fenland.
- 1.3. "Member" means any person being an elected or co-opted member of the Authority.
- 1.4. It is your responsibility to comply with the provisions of this Code.

Block J Version 1 Page 3 of 125 Page: CP1.1

¹ New code adopted 26th July 2012

1.5. In this Code -

"Meeting" means any meeting of:-

- a) The Authority;
- b) Any meetings with the Council's officers;
- c) Any of the Authority's Committees, sub-committees, joint committees, joint sub-committees, or area committees;
- d) Any site visits to do the business of the Authority;
- e) Any of the Authority's advisory groups and, working parties and panels.
 - 1.6. In this Code "relevant authority" has the meaning given to it by section 27(6) of the Localism Act 2011.

2. Scope

- 2.1. You must comply with this Code whenever you act, claim to act or give the impression you are acting in your official capacity as a Member of the Authority.
- 2.2. Where you act as a representative of the Authority:-
 - (a) on another relevant authority, you must, when acting for that other authority, comply with that other authority's code of conduct; or
 - (b) on any other body, you must, when acting for that other body, comply with your authority's code of conduct, except and insofar as it conflicts with any other lawful obligations to which that other body may be subject.

3. General obligations

- 3.1. You must treat others with respect.
- 3.2. You must not:-
 - (a) do anything, which may cause the Authority to breach UK equalities legislation.
 - (b) buily any person.
 - (c) intimidate or attempt to intimidate any person who is or is likely to be:-
 - (i) a complainant,
 - (ii) a witness, or
 - (iii) involved in the administration of any investigation or proceedings,
 - in relation to an allegation that a Member (including yourself) has failed to comply with his or her authority's code of conduct.
 - (d) do anything, which compromises or is likely to compromise the impartiality of those who work for, or on behalf of, the Authority.

Page: CP1.2

(e) conduct yourself in a manner, which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute.

4. You must not:-

- 4.1. disclose information given to you in confidence by anyone, or information acquired by you which you believe, or ought reasonably to be aware, is of a confidential nature, except where:-
- (a) you have the consent of a person authorised to give it;
- (b) you are required by law to do so;
- (c) the disclosure is made to a third party for the purpose of obtaining professional advice provided that the third party agrees not to disclose the information to any other person; or
- (d) the disclosure is:-
 - (i) reasonable and in the public interest; and
 - (ii) made in good faith and in compliance with the reasonable requirements of the authority.
- 4.2. prevent another person from gaining access to information to which that person is entitled by law.
- 5. You must not:-
 - 5.1. use or attempt to use your position as a member improperly to confer on, or secure for yourself or any other person, an advantage or disadvantage.
- 6. You must:-
 - 6.1. when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of the Authority:-
 - (a) act in accordance with your Authority's reasonable requirements;
 - (b) ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes); and
 - 6.2. have regard to any Local Authority Code of Publicity made under the Local Government Act 1986.

PART 2 INTERESTS

7. Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

- 7.1. Breaches of the rules relating to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests may lead to criminal sanctions.
- 7.2. You have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest if it is of a description specified in Regulations made by the Secretary of State (Appendix A) and either:
- (a) it is an interest of yours, or
- (b) it is an interest of:
 - (i) your spouse or civil partner,
 - (ii) a person with whom you are living as husband and wife, or
 - (iii) a person with whom you are living as if you were civil partners,

and you are aware that that other person has the interest.

8. Registration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

- 8.1. Subject to paragraph 12 (sensitive interests), you must, within 28 days of:
- (a) this Code being adopted or applied by the Authority; or
- (b) your election or appointment (where that is later), notify the Authority's Monitoring Officer in writing of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests you have at that time.
- 8.2. Subject to paragraph 12 (sensitive interests), you must, within 28 days of becoming aware of any new Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or any change to any such interest, notify the Authority's Monitoring Officer in writing of that new Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or change.

9. Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in matters considered at meetings

- 9.1. If you attend a meeting and have and are aware that you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered, or being considered, at that meeting, —
- (a) you must disclose to the meeting the fact that you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that matter. If you have not already done so, you must notify the Authority's Monitoring Officer of the interest before the end of 28 days beginning with the date of the disclosure, and
- (b) whether the interest is registered or not you must not unless you have obtained a dispensation from the Authority's Monitoring Officer -
 - (i) participate, or participate further, in any discussion of the matter or vote at the meeting; or
 - remain in the meeting room whilst the matter is being debated or participate in any vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

Note: Council Procedure Rule 13 requires you to leave the room where the meeting is held while any discussion or voting takes place.

10. Other interests

10.1. In addition to the requirements of Paragraph 3, if you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and

Page: CP1,4 Block J Version 1Page 6 of 125

you are aware that you have a "non-disclosable pecuniary interest or non-pecuniary interest" in that item, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent

- 10.2. You have a "non-disclosable pecuniary interest or non-pecuniary interest" in an item of business of your authority where -
- (a) a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing of you or a member of your family or a person with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the authority's administrative area, or
- (b) it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests listed in the Table in the Appendix to this Code, but in respect of a member of your family (other than a "relevant person") or a person with whom you have a close association and that interest is not a disclosable pecuniary interest.

12. Sensitive interests

12.1 Where you consider (and the Authority's Monitoring Officer agrees) that the nature of a Disclosable Pecuniary or Personal Interest is such that disclosure of the details of the interest could lead to you or a person connected with you being subject to intimidation or violence, it is a "sensitive interest" for the purposes of the Code, and the details of the sensitive interest do not need to be disclosed to a meeting, although the fact that you have a sensitive interest must be disclosed, in accordance with paragraphs 8 9 and 10.

Note: Register of Interests

Interests under paragraph 8 will be notified to the Monitoring Officer on a form approved for the purpose by the Monitoring Officer and for this purpose will be deemed the "register of interests". A copy of the register will be available for public inspection and will be published on the authority's website.

13 Gifts and Hospitality

13.1 You must, within 28 days of receipt, notify the Monitoring Officer in writing of any oift, benefit or hospitality with a value in excess of £100 which you have accepted as a member from any person or body other than the authority.

Appendix A

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

This note explains the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 (Ss 29-34) in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests. These provisions are enforced by criminal sanction. They come into force on 1 July 2012.

1 Notification of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

Disclosable Pecuniary Interest	description
Employment, office, trade, profession or vocation	Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
Sponsorship	Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the relevant authority) made or provided within the relevant period in respect of any expenses incurred by M in carrying out duties as a member, or towards the election expenses of M. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.
Contracts	Any contract which is made between the relevant person (or a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest) and the relevant authority— (a) under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and (b) which has not been fully discharged.
Land	Any beneficial interest in land, which is within the area of the relevant authority.
Licences	Any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer
Corporate tenancies	Any tenancy where (to M's knowledge)— (a) the landlord is the relevant authority; and (b) the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
Securities	Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where— (a) that body (to M's knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of the relevant authority; and (b) either— (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or

Page: CP1.6

(ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person has a beneficial

interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

These descriptions on interests are subject to the following definitions: "the Act" means the Localism Act 2011:

"body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest" means a firm in which the relevant person is a partner or a body corporate of which the relevant person is a director, or in the securities of which the relevant person has a beneficial interest:

"director" includes a member of the committee of management of an industrial and provident society;

"land" excludes an easement, servitude, interest or right in or over land, which does not carry with it a right for the relevant person (alone or jointly with another) to occupy the land or to receive income:

"M" means a member of a relevant authority;

"Member" includes a co-opted member;

"relevant authority" means the authority of which M is a member;

"relevant period" means the period of 12 months ending with the day on which M gives a notification for the purposes of section 30(1) or section 31(7), as the case may be, of the Act:

"relevant person" means M or any other person referred to In section 30(3)(b) of the Act:

"securities" means shares, debentures, debenture stock, loan stock, bonds, units of a collective investment scheme within the meaning of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 and other securities of any description, other than money deposited with a bulkling society.

Offences

It is a criminal offence to

- Fail to notify the Monitoring Officer of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest within 28 days of election
- Fail to disclose a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest at a meeting if it is not on the register
- Fail to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest that is not on the register that you have disclosed to a meeting
- Participate in any discussion or vote on a matter in which you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (without a dispensation)
- Knowingly or recklessly providing information that is false or misleading in notifying the Monitoring Officer of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or in disclosing such interest to a meeting

The criminal penalties available to a court are to impose a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale and disquelification from being a Councillor for up to 5 years.



Fenland District Council

Review of the circumstances leading to a complaint by Councillor Simon King against Fenland District Council

Report for the Chief Executive

Richard Penn

Independent External Investigator

March 2018

Contents		Page
1	Introduction and methodology	3
2	The background to Councillor King's complaint	4
3	Councillor King's complaint	6
4	My findings in respect of the allegations by Councillor King about the actions of the Monitoring Officer	12
	Appendix	
	Letter of complaint by Councillor King	15

1 Introduction and methodology

- I was commissioned though the Local Government Association (of which I am a Senior Associate) by the Chief Executive of Fenland District Council in March 2018 to undertake an independent review of the circumstances that had led to a formal complaint against the Council generally and the actions of a Corporate Director and the Council's statutory Monitoring Officer from Councillor Simon King, a long-serving member of the Council.
- 1.2 The complaint was set out in a letter (Appendix 1) from Councillor King to the Chief Executive dated 19 February 2018.
- 1.3 The complaint was a complaint against the District Council but made a number of allegations about the actions of the Monitoring Officer and I was required to review the circumstances that led to the complaint and to interview relevant witnesses to establish the truth or otherwise of the allegations on the balance of probability.
- 1.4 Following the completion of my review I was required to produce a report setting out:
 - my findings about the allegations in the complaint
 - my advice as to whether there was a potential case to answer which would then need to be formally investigated in line with the Model Disciplinary Procedure for local authority statutory officers.
- 1.5 I met with Councillor King on March 2018 to hear further details of his concerns, and I met with the Monitoring Officer the same day to obtain her response to the allegations set out in Councillor King's letter to the Chief Executive of February 2018. I also interviewed the Monitoring Officer at Peterborough Council who has been appointed as the Deputy Monitoring Officer at Fenland District Council and who is now managing the complaints procedure in this case as the complainant is the Monitoring Officer. The purpose of these interviews was to establish the facts as far as possible, and to provide the interviewees with the opportunity to comment on and provide any relevant evidence in respect of the specific allegations.
- I was provided with a copy of Councillor King's letter of 8 February 2108, the agenda pack for the Conduct Committee on 27 February 2018 (that included copies of his letters of 17 November 2017 to the Monitoring Officer and 7 February 2018 to the Deputy Monitoring Officer and copies of the Members Allowance Scheme and the Code of Conduct for members. I was also provided at a later stage with a copy of the Conduct Committee Procedure.

2 The background to Councillor King's complaint

- As part of her role as Corporate Director the Monitoring Officer line manages the Members Services team at Fenland District Council, and she became aware of concerns by her team about Councillor King's mileage claims. It appeared that Councillor King may have submitted overinflated mileage claims and attempted to claim for journeys outside the Council's approved Members' Allowance Scheme between April 2011 and October 2017 equating to £1,511.10 (3358 miles) paid to Councillor King and £736.65 (1637 miles) claimed but not paid. Journeys were claimed for that period appeared inflated over and above what would be expected by comparison with Google Maps and journeys were claimed for that were outside the Allowance Scheme; mainly not travelling from home but from another start point or travelling to another place which is not claimable on the way to Council business. There were consistent claims for differing amounts of mileage from home in Wisbech to the Council offices at Fenland Hall, March. The claims are generally for 26 miles return journey or more, whereas Google Maps indicates that this return journey would be 22 miles.
- 2.2 It is the responsibility of the individual Councillor to submit Members' Allowances claims. The Member Services team processes claims and consults with the individual member if there are any obvious errors. Mileage claims are checked for attendance at FDC meetings but otherwise are accepted on face value as Members sign a declaration that they are correct.
- 2.3 Councillor King had been advised by Members Services staff on a number of occasions over the last six years about issues with his mileage claims and he met with the Acting Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer in May 2016 regarding the accuracy of his mileage claims, However the submission of inappropriate claims has continued.
- 2.4 The Monitoring Officer told me that it had become clear to her that the scale of Councillor King's over-claiming required action and that she had taken legal advice both from Peterborough Council and from external solicitors to ensure that her actions were fair and proportionate. She had made the complaint against Councillor King with a heavy heart but had concluded that it was the right thing to do in the circumstances.
- 2.5 The Monitoring Officer submitted a complaint about the conduct of Councillor King on the 24 November 2017. Councillor King was offered the opportunity to respond to this complaint and responded by letter to the Monitoring Officer on 30 November 2017. Due to the potential seriousness of this complaint it was not possible to resolve it informally and therefore the complaint progressed to the next stage of the process.
- 2.6 In line with 'Rule 9 Conduct Committee Procedures' in the Constitution of Fenland District Council and under Paragraph 5.3.2 'Initial Consideration of Complaints' a pre-screening meeting was held on 8th February 2018 to consider the complaint made by the Council's Monitoring Officer against Council King about the allegedly inaccurate mileage claims. The Conduct Committee Procedures rules (5.3.4) state that:

'Any complaint where it is considered that a breach of the Code of Conduct may have occurred, unless it is deemed vexatious, trivial or tit-for-tat will be referred on to the Committee for further consideration'.

2.7 The complaint was considered through the pre-screening process involving the Chair of the Conduct Committee, the Independent Person and the Deputy Independent Person on 8 February 2018. Councillor King had written a further letter to the Deputy Monitoring Officer on 7 February 2018 which was read out at the pre-screening meeting. In his conclusion to that letter Councillor King said:

'A serious complaint has been made against me by the Monitoring Officer of Fenland District Council. That complaint is based on a flawed Interpretation of the Council's policy, and the application of policies which are not the approved policy of FDC. The Monitoring Officer has furthermore confirmed by email that these policies have not been applied to the travel expense claims of any other Members.

The Monitoring Officer, acting outside her remit under s5 Local Government end Housing Act 1989 (and if within her remit - which I dispute- then not acting in accordance with the provisions of s5 (2) and (3), and acting in breach of s28(4) of the Localism Act 2011) has reported this complaint to the police.

Since I have not breached any Council policy in relation to my travel expanse claim. I have not breached the Member's Code of Conduct, and the complaint against me Is wholly without foundation, and indeed Is vexatious and should not go any further.'

- 2.8 Following an extensive discussion about the issues raised in the complaint it was agreed that the complaint could not be described as 'vexatious, trivial or tit-for-tat'. It was unanimously agreed that the following sections of the Code of Conduct might have been breached:
 - The first Nolan Principle "Selflessness Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family or their friends."
 - 3.2. You must not:-
 - (e) conduct yourself in a manner, which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute
 - 6. You must: 6.1, when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of
- 2.9 The Panel noted the submissions made by Councillor King in his response to the complaint but considered that the issues raised needed to be properly investigated by an external investigator independent of the Council due to the serious nature of the allegations and as the complaint had been made by the Council's Monitoring Officer.
- 2.10 Councillor King told me that he had sent his letter of complaint dated 19 February 2018 to the Council's Chief Executive with a heavy heart following the extensive media coverage of the complaint against him and its reference to the police. He had tried to resolve the matter in November 2017 by making a payment to the Council equivalent to the amount alleged to have been overpaid but the complaint continued to be progressed.
- 2.11 In view of the allegations in Councillor King's letter of 19 February 2018 it was decided to commission this review and to suspend the complaints process in respect of the complaint against Councillor King pending the receipt of the report on my review. Following the decision to progress the complaint against him Councillor King took extensive legal advice from a local solicitor and his letter of complaint reflects that advice in respect of a number of

the allegations. I have been provided with an email setting out in more detail the advice he has given Councillor King in respect of points 5, 6 7, 8 and 9 in the letter of complaint.

3 Councillor King's complaint

- 3.1 When I interviewed Councillor King he confirmed that his complaint was against Fenland District Council for what he described as its failure to act in a proper and lawful manner in the formulation, investigation and pursuance of a complaint made against him in relation to his mileage claims.
- 3.2 However, in his letter of complaint Councillor King sets out a number of specific allegations (allegations 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9) about the actions of the Monitoring Officer. As a result of my review and the interviews I held with Councillor King, the Monitoring Officer and the Deputy Monitoring Officer I have been able gather the following information about Councillor King's complaint and the allegations he has made:

Allegation 1

'the Members' Mileage policy was not followed by disallowing claims I made for travelling to and from council meetings from elsewhere than my home'

This issue is being addressed as part of the Code of Conduct complaint and it would not be appropriate to prejudge the outcome. However, Councillor King clearly considers that the policy is unclear. He pointed in his letter of 7 February 2018 out that Clause 6.2 of the policy states that:

'All claims for travel expenses and subsistence should be made on the appropriate claim form and backed by receipts as applicable. Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place and residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys taken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1'.

and that the Monitoring Officer in her complaint has interpreted the second sentence of this Clause to mean that a Councillor is only entitled to claim travel expenses for journeys starting either at home or at meeting on Council business to which the Councillor travelled from home. His contention is that Clause 6.2 should make it clear that mileage can only be claimed from the Councillor's normal place of residence. In that letter Councillor King also claims that the Chair of the IRP told his solicitor that the reason for the inclusion of the second sentence was to clarify that, in contrast to employees, Councillors are entitled to claim travel expenses from their home to the Council offices, and that her interpretation of the policy is that Councillors should be able to claim travel expenses to meetings o Council business from any starting point, whether that be their home, their place of work or elsewhere.

The Monitoring Office disagrees with Councillor King's contention, and considers that Clause 6.2 is clear. The issue has never been raised with the IRP and it has not proved to be an issue for other members.

Allegation 2

1

'the Members' Mileage policy was not followed by disallowing claims for more than the shortest google maps distance'

This issue is also being addressed as part of the Code of Conduct complaint and it would not be appropriate to prejudge the outcome. Councillor King contends that the policy should include a provision that mileage distances should be based on Google Maps or Routeplanner. As it is currently written it simply states that the mileage rate is 45p per mile for the first 10,000 miles of travel and thereafter in accordance with HMRC rates.

The Monitoring Officer clarified that the claims had not been disallowed and that Councillor King had voluntarily repaid over £1,500 of previous claims. The analysis of Councillor King's mileage claims had been based on Google Maps mileages to provide objectivity. The Monitoring Officer said that she does not consider that the policy should be amended to specify the basis on which distances should be recorded as members should honestly claim the actual mileage involved, and if this is not the shortest distance should be prepared to explain the reason for this if required. Councillor King had not provided reasonable explanation for those occasions when he had claimed more than the shortest distance according to Google Maps.

Allegation 3

'the Code of Conduct policy and the legislation was not followed by the Monitoring Office. in referring this to the police as this was not a non-disclosure of a pecuniary interest'

Councillor King claims that the reference to the police by the Monitoring Officer was not in line with the Code of Conduct policy as the complaint was not in respect of a non disclosure of a pecuniary interest. He is also concerned that the matter was leaked to the press sometime after 5 December 2017 and he denied that he had been the source of the leak.

The Monitoring Officer was very clear that if any Council officer considers that something potentially of a criminal nature had taken place it has to be referred to the police — and not only if it concerns a non disclosure of a pecuniary interest. The reference to DPI in the policy is there because of the change in legislation as a result of the Localism Act. The Monitoring Officer told me that she had been concerned that there had been fraud, she had taken legal advice from Peterborough Council and externally, and the consensus was that the matter had to be referred to the police. She had not wanted to prejudice potential police action by progressing the complaint through the Conduct Committee so the police were consulted but the matter had not reached the appropriate threshold. For the police to take action The matter had been leaked to the media but there was no evidence about the source of the leak.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that any Council officer can refer possible illegality to the police at any time, and this does not have to be with reference to a potential breach of the Localism Act provisions on non disclosure of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. In this case the matter had the potential to be fraudulent action which is a criminal offence. The recent case of Hussain v Sandwell MBC confirmed the scope of the powers of local authorities generally to investigate alleged member impropriety in a 'pre-formal investigation' before moving on to deal with it in accordance with the formal arrangements under the Localism Act. The High Court held that:

'Such pre-formal enquiries may be necessary to see whether a complaint brought to its attention is frivolous or vexatious or whether it even has substance it should be dealt with by some other procedure or avenue such as civil proceedings in a Court or a complaint to the police'

Allegation 4

'the Code of Conduct policy was not followed by the Monitoring Officer by involving the Independent Person before the pre-sift stage'

Councillor King pointed out that the Conduct Committee Procedure makes no provision for the Independent Person to be involved before the 'pre-sift' stage. Paragraph 5.3.3 of the Procedure provides for all written complaints to be the subject of a pre-screening process by the Independent Person, the Deputy Independent person and the Chair of the Committee with advice from the Monitoring Officer, but Councillor King claims that the Monitoring Officer inappropriately consulted with the Independent Person in November prior to the prescreening meeting on 8 February 2018.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that she did consult with the Independent Person earlier than the pre-screening meeting having taken advice about whether this would be appropriate given the nature and scale of the complaint. She told me that she had spoken to the Independent Person on three occasions – firstly to provide the Independent Person with an overview of the situation, second when it was proposed to consult with the police and third to advise her that the police would not be involved. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that at no point had any details of the complaint been provided to the Independent Person. She conceded that the Procedure did not provide specifically for this kind of informal contact about potential claims but pointed out that all members of the Council had been informed of the appointment of the Independent Person through an agenda item at the Council meeting on 23 July 2015, and that the advice note that had been circulated for that meeting included a statement that the Independent Person would be available to be consulted before the Conduct Committee makes a decision and that the Independent Person may also be consulted on other matters.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that it is up to each Council to decide what role it aske that Independent Person to perform in any given complaint and that many councils involve them from the outset of the process. The Monitoring Officer was the complainant in this case and was therefore entitled to consult the Independent Person if she saw that as appropriate.

Allegation 5

'Fenland District Council failed to comply with Section 28 (4) of the Localism Act 2011, in that a complaint of a breach of the code of conduct should be dealt with under the conduct procedure and not otherwise'

This is essentially a repetition of allegation 3 – that the Code of Conduct policy and the legislation was not followed by the Monitoring Officer in referring this to the police as this was not a non-disclosure of a pecuniary interest. Councillor King contends that the complaint against him clearly states that he may have breached the Code of Conduct, and that by reporting the matter to the police before dealing with the matter under the Conduct Committee procedure, Fenland District Council has acted in a manner which is contrary to the explicit requirement of the legislation.

The Monitoring Officer was very clear in her view, endorsed by the Deputy Monitoring Officer, that if any Council officer considers that something potentially of a criminal nature had taken place it has to be referred to the police — and not only if it concerns a non disclosure of a pecuniary interest. In this case the matter had the potential to be fraudulent action which is a criminal offence and it was entirely appropriate for the matter to be referred

to the police for consideration prior to progressing it as a potential breach of the Code of Conduct.

Allegation 6

'The Monitoring Officer failed to differentiate her roles as Head of Member Services and the Monitoring Officer'

The Monitoring Officer stated in an email of 22 January 2018 addressed to the Deputy Monitoring Officer that she was acting as the Monitoring Officer of Fenland District Council in raising the complaint. Councillor King contends that the complainant would be able to raise a complaint about any member's expenses at any time in her capacity as the Head of Member Services and that complaint should have been made in her capacity as Head of Member Services and not as Monitoring Officer.

The Monitoring Officer told me that Councillor King is mistaken in his contention that she is Head of Members Services. She does line-manage the Members Services team and became aware of concerns about Councillor King's mileage claims as a result of this, but this was not the reason why she raised the complaint. As Monitoring Officer she is obliged to deal with about any potential breach of the Code of Conduct or potential illegality wherever it occurred in the organisation if she was made aware of it. She denied that there had been any failure on her part to differentiate her roles, and that she had stood aside from the process at the appropriate time as she was the complainant. Her view is that as Monitoring Officer if she becomes aware from any source that a potential conduct issue or illegality has occurred she is obliged to deal with it—a view endorsed by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

Allegation 7

'The Monitoring Officer misunderstood the application of Section 5 (2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, and she purported to deal with a complaint arising under the Code of Conduct in her capacity as Monitoring Officer'

Advised by his solicitor, Councillor King contends that the Monitoring Officer has failed to understand the extent and limits of her role as Monitoring Officer under Section 5(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, where there is or may be 'a contravention...... of any enactment or rule of law'. He contends that Fenland District Council's Code of Conduct cannot be considered to be 'an enactment or rule of law' and accordingly the duties of the Monitoring Officer do not arise under that Section. This is entirely consistent with the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 Section 28(4).

The Monitoring Officer considers that the reference by Councillor King and his advisor to the provisions of the 1989 Act and the use of a Section 5 report is misguided. The Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that the core legal propriety of monitoring officers as set out in the 1989 Act is to issue a report (known as a S5 report) in the event of any breach of law, a statutory code of practice or ascertained maladministration. This is a 'nuclear option' and happens very rarely. The 1989 Act which introduced the role of Monitoring Officers preceded the Local Government Act 2000 which introduced a Code of Conduct for members and an enhanced role for Monitoring Officers in overseeing this. This was subsequently amended by the Localism Act where the role of monitoring officer was further enhanced s

the complaints system moved from a national Standards Board for England to a locally based system for dealing with complaints and upholding high standards of conduct across the authority. In summary, the Monitoring Officer was correct in her actions by progressing the matter as a Code of Conduct issue having first clarified the potential for police action.

Allegation 8

'The Monitoring Officer in acting (albeit improperly) under Section 5 Local Government and Housing Act 1989, compounded her error by failing to act in accordance with the requirements of that Section'.

This allegation is essentially a mixture of allegations 3, 5 and 8 above which have been dealt with separately.

Allegation 9

'The Monitoring Officer has nominated a person who is not employed by Fenland District Council to act as Deputy Monitoring Officer contrary to Sub-section (7) of Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.'

Based on advice to him from his legal advisor it is the contention of Councillor King that in line with Section 5(7) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the Monitoring Officer may only nominate a member of her staff to act as her deputy, and furthermore that deputy may only act in her absence or illness (neither of which is the case here). This section of the Act was revised to include a new sub-section 7A, which referred to Section 82A of the Local Government Act 2000. This latter section explicitly allowed the delegation by the Monitoring Officer of her functions:

- a) in any circumstances where the Monitoring Officer considered that she should not act; and
- b) to any person nominated by the Monitoring Officer (whether an officer of the same Authority or not).

However, as a result of various repeals, the powers under that Section 82A now only apply to Wales and have no application in England. The original insertion of sub-section 7A gives rise to some interesting conclusions as follows:

- a) If Section 5(7) were sufficient to permit the Monitoring Officer to appoint a person who is not an officer of the relevant authority; and
- b) if the Monitoring Officer could appoint a deputy to act under Section 5(7) otherwise than in the Monitoring Officer's absence or illness

From this Councillor King contends that the powers of the Monitoring Officer are once again limited to the appointment of a deputy only when the Monitoring Officer is absent or ill, and that the deputy must be an officer of the relevant Authority. This latter conclusion is supported by the language used in Section 82A which is different to the language used in s5, in relation to the appointee as Deputy Monitoring Officer. Section 82A refers to 'a person

nominated for the purpose by the Monitoring Office" whereas Section 5(7) refers to "such member of his staff as he has for the time being nominated as his deputy".

Councillor King's legal advisor raised this point with the Deputy Monitoring Officer, who referred him to the case of <u>Pinfold North Limited -v- Humberside Fire Authority</u>, decided by the High Court in 2010, as support for the argument that an officer of an authority need not be an employee, and that consequently the Monitoring Officer of FDC may appoint Fiona McMillan as DMO. That case related to a Chief Finance Officer who was not employed by the relevant authority. However, in the specific case, the Judge found that because the individual was an officer of the authority by virtue of being its Treasurer, he was therefore an officer who could be appointed its Chief Finance Officer. This therefore implies that in order to be appointed to a statutory function the individual must be, independently of that statutory function, an officer of the relevant authority. The advice of Councillor King's legal advisor to Councillor King was that unless the Deputy Monitoring Officer is an officer of Fenland District Council her appointment was ultra vires.

Fenland District Council has a shared legal service arrangement with Peterborough Council and Fiona McMillan (an employee of Peterborough Council) is very involved in providing legal advice to the Council as part of that shared service arrangement so the Monitoring Officer told me that it was entirely appropriate for her to be appointed as Deputy Monitoring Officer, an appointment confirmed by the Council. The Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that her appointment was not contrary to S5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 as confirmed by the High Court decision in 2010 which held that a local authority 'officer' does not have to be an employee. The Judge had confirmed that the term 'officer' was not defined in the relevant legislation and that although a council's employees are necessarily officers, he found that its officers are not necessarily employees and there was no statutory requirement that that should be so. The Judge held that:

'the 1972 Act refers to the duties and obligations of officers who are employees, there is nothing in the Act which excludes the appointment of an officer who is not an employee'.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer contends that this case has the same application to monitoring officers and their deputies as the LGHA 1989 monitoring officer provisions are also analogous to those concerning chief finance officers in ss. 114 to 116 of the LGFA 1988.

- 4 My findings in respect of the allegations by Councillor King about the actions of the Monitoring Officer
- 4.1 I have carried out an independent review of the circumstances that have led to a formal complaint against Fenland District Council by Councillor Simon King.
- 4.2 The complaint concerned a number of actions taken by the Monitoring Officer which Councillor King claimed to be inappropriate, outside the Council's policies or *ultra vires*. Councillor King has taken extensive legal advice about these actions and his legal advisor has made a number of contentions on his behalf.
- As a result of my review I have reached the following conclusions in respect of each of the nine allegations made by Councillor King:

Allegation 1

'the Members' Mileage policy was not followed by disallowing claims I made for travelling to and from council meetings from elsewhere than my home'

No mileage claims have been disallowed without first consulting Councillor King so there is no evidence to suggest the current policy has not been followed. The Council's Members Allowances Scheme could be further improved by stating that mileage can only be claimed from the councillor's normal place of residence or at a meeting on Council business to which the Councillor travelled from home. I understand that this matter will be addressed by the Council with the objective of providing clarity to councillors when making mileage claims.

Allegation 2

'the Members' Mileage policy was not followed by disallowing claims for more than the shortest google maps distance'

No mileage claims have been disallowed without first consulting Councillor King so there is no evidence to suggest the current policy has not been followed. Again, this is not an allegation about the actions of the Monitoring Officer specifically as it is a complaint about the absence of clear guidance in the Members Allowance Scheme. My conclusion is that specifying in the Scheme that mileage claims should be based on distances calculated through Google Maps or Routeplanner would further improve the guidance given to councillors when they make mileage claims. There should still be an acceptance that on some occasions councillors have to take a different and potentially longer route but councillors should explain the reason for this if requested. I recommend that this matter should be addressed by the Council in order to provide further clarity to councillors when they make mileage claims.

Allegation 3

'the Code of Conduct policy and the legislation was not followed by the Monitoring Officer in referring this to the police as this was not a non-disclosure of a pecuniary interest'

Council officers must refer potential illegality on the part of elected members to the police at any time they become aware of it, and this is not restricted to a potential breach of the Localism Act provisions on non-disclosure of a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. In this case the matter had the potential to be fraudulent action which is a criminal offence, and my conclusion is that the Monitoring Officer acted entirely correctly in referring the matter to the police for consideration prior to progressing the matter through the Code of Conduct process.

Allegation 4

'the Code of Conduct policy was not followed by the Monitoring Officer by involving the Independent Person before the pre-sift stage'

The Monitoring Officer did consult with the Independent Person on three occasions before the pre-screening meeting on 8 February 2018. The Conduct Committee Procedure does not provide for this kind of informal contact about potential claims but my conclusion is that it was entirely reasonable that she ensured that the Independent Person was briefed generally about developments with the complaint. In order to avoid any misunderstanding in the future paragraph 5.3.3 of the Procedure should be suitably amended to provide for such contact in the management of code of conduct cases.

Allegation 5

'Fenland District Council failed to comply with Section 28 (4) of the Localism Act 2011, in that a complaint of a breach of the code of conduct should be dealt with under the conduct procedure and not otherwise'

This is essentially a repetition of allegation 3 — that the Code of Conduct policy and the legislation was not followed by the Monitoring Officer in referring this matter to the police as it did not concern a non-disclosure of a pecuniary interest. However, if any Council officer considers that something potentially of a criminal nature had taken place it has to be referred to the police — and not only if it concerns a non disclosure of a pecuniary interest. In this case the matter had the potential to be fraudulent action which is a criminal offence and it was entirely appropriate for the matter to be referred to the police for consideration prior to progressing it as a potential breach of the Code of Conduct.

Allegation 6

'The Monitoring Officer failed to differentiate her roles as Head of Member Services and the Monitoring Officer'

The Monitoring Officer acted as the Monitoring Officer of Fenland District Council in raising the complaint. Councillor King is mistaken that the Monitoring Officer is also Head of Members Services although she does line-manage the Members Services team and became aware of concerns about Councillor King's mileage claims as a result of this, but she did not raise the complaint as a result of her line management responsibilities. As Monitoring Officer she is obliged to deal with any potential breach of the Code of Conduct or potential illegality wherever it occurred in the organisation once she was made aware of it. My conclusion is that there was no failure on the part of Monitoring Officer to differentiate her roles, and that

she quite correctly stood aside from the process at the appropriate time as she was the complainant.

Allegation 7

'The Monitoring Officer misunderstood the application of Section 5 (2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, and she purported to deal with a complaint arising under the Code of Conduct in her capacity as Monitoring Officer'

The Monitoring Officer considers that the reference by Councillor King and his advisor to the provisions of the 1989 Act and the use of a Section 5 report is misguided. The issuing of a report (known as a S5 report) happens very rarely and would have been inappropriate in this case. My conclusion is that the Monitoring Officer was correct in her action in progressing the matter as a Code of Conduct issue having first clarified the potential for police action.

Allegation 8

'The Monitoring Officer in acting (albeit improperly) under Section 5 Local Government and Housing Act 1989, compounded her error by failing to act in accordance with the requirements of that Section'.

This allegation is primarily a mixture of allegations 3, 5 and 8 above which have been dealt with.

Allegation 9

'The Monitoring Officer has nominated a person who is not employed by Fenland District Council to act as Deputy Monitoring Officer contrary to Sub-section (7) of Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.'

Even though the Deputy Monitoring Officer is not an employee of Fenland District Council, there is a shared legal service arrangement with Peterborough Council and Fiona McMillan (an employee of Peterborough Council) is very involved in providing legal advice to the Council as part of that shared service arrangement. My conclusion is that it was entirely appropriate and pragmatic for the Monitoring Officer to appoint her as Deputy Monitoring Officer, an appointment confirmed by the Council.

I was asked to advise whether my review of the circumstances that led to the complaint against the Monitoring Officer indicated that there was a potential case to answer that would then need to be formally investigated in line with the Model Disciplinary Procedure for local authority statutory officers. Given my conclusions that none of the specific allegations against the Monitoring Officer by Councillor King amount to potential misconduct or poor performance by her in her role as the Council's Monitoring Officer, my advice is that there is no potential case to answer which needs to be further investigated.

Richard Penn

Independent Investigator

March 2018

Appendix 1

Letter of Complaint by Councillor King on 19 February 2018

'I wish to make a formal complaint against Fenland District Council for failure to act in a proper and lawful manner in the formulation, investigation and pursuance of a complaint made against me in relation to my expense claims. The specific matters giving rise to this complaint are the following:

- 1. The Members' Mileage policy was not followed, by disallowing claims I made for travelling to and from council meetings from elsewhere than my home
- 2. The Members' Mileage policy was not followed by disallowing claims for more than the shortest google maps distance
- 3. The Code of Conduct policy and the legislation was not followed by the Monitoring Officer in referring this to the police as this was not a non-disclosure of a pecuniary interest
- 4. The Code of Conduct policy was not followed by the Monitoring Officer by involving the Independent Person before the pre-sift stage
- 5. Fenland District Council failed to comply with Section 28 (4) of the Localism Act 2011, in that a complaint of a breach of the code of conduct should be dealt with under the conduct procedure and not otherwise
- 6. The Monitoring Officer failed to differentiate her roles as Head of Member Services and the Monitoring Officer
- 7. The Monitoring Officer misunderstood the application of Section 5 (2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, and she purported to deal with a complaint arising under the Code of Conduct in her capacity as Monitoring Officer
- 8. The Monitoring Officer in acting (albeit improperly) under Section 5 Local Government and Housing Act 1989, compounded her error by failing to act in accordance with the requirements of that Section
- 9. The Monitoring Officer has nominated a person who is not employed by Fenland District Counc to act as Deputy Monitoring Officer contrary to Sub-section (7) of Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

As this flawed process and baseless allegations have seriously damaged my reputation, the redress I expect from Fenland District Council is to purchase the front page of both local papers to print an apology and retraction. I also require reimbursement of all the expenses I have necessarily incurred both now and until this matter is concluded, to be reimbursed.'

PART 6

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME¹

- 1. Introduction
- **Basic Allowance** 2.
- 3. Special Responsibility Allowance
- 4. (Deleted) 1(1)
- Dependents' Carers' Allowance 5.
- 6. Travelling and Subsistence Allowances
- 7. Co-optees' Allowance
- Foregoing Allowances 8.
- 9. Withholding Allowances
- Part Year Entitlements 10...
- 11. Claims and Payments
- **Equipment and Consumables** 12.
- 13. Updating
- 14. Independent Remuneration Panel
- 15. Publicity

Schedule of allowances

- 1. Members' Allowances
- 2. **Subsistence Allowances**
- 3. **Travelling Allowances**
- Overnight Subsistence 4.

¹ Scheme initially approved 8th November 2007 – significant amendments to scheme approved 3 November 2011 and 5th November 2015. 1(i) Deletion approved 5th November 2015

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Scheme

- (a) will be known as the Fenland District Council Scheme and shall have effect from 1st April 2016 2(i). At its meeting on 5 November 2015 2(i), the Council adopted a scheme based upon the recommendations of an Independent Remuneration Panel.
- (b) has been prepared in exercise of the powers conferred by the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003.

1.2 In this Scheme

- (a) "Councillor" means an elected member of Fenland District Council.
- (b) "Leader of the Council" means the councillor appointed by the Council to fill that office.
- (c) [Deleted]²
- (d) "Opposition Group Leader" means the councillor notified to the Chief Executive as the councillor elected as leader of the political groups established under the provisions of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and subsequent regulations.
- (e) "Main Opposition Group Leader" means the Opposition Group Leader of the largest opposition group. For the purposes of this scheme no Main Opposition Group Leader Allowance will be paid to a group of less than 5 members
- (f) "Cabinet Member" or 2(ii) "Portfolio Holder" means a councillor appointed by the Leader as a member of the Cabinet in accordance with the Council's Constitution 2(ii)
- (g) Deleted 2(iii)
- (h) Deleted 2(iii)

Block L Version 7 Page: M.2

² Approved 24th July 2014

²⁽i) Approved 5th November 2015

²⁽ii) Amendment and subsequent deletion approved 5th November 2015

²⁽iii) Deletion approved 5th November 2015

"Year" means the twelve months ending with 31 March. (i)

2 BASIC ALLOWANCE

- 2.1 For each year a basic, flat rate allowance shall be paid to each councillor, the level of the allowance being specified in the schedule to this scheme.
- 2.2 The basic allowance is designed to contribute towards expenses occurred as a result of undertaking Council business - such as the use of a home telephone and internet access and other semi-official activities carried out by councillors. This allowance is not intended to recompense councillors for all the time that they devote to Council business. It is assumed that some elements of the work of councillors are undertaken on a voluntary basis.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCE 3.

- 3.1 For each year a special responsibility allowance shall be paid to those councillors who hold special responsibilities outlined within the Schedule of Allowances.
- 3.2 The amount of each such allowance shall be that specified in the schedule to this scheme. 2(1v)
- 3.3 A councillor may receive no more than two special responsibility allowances at any one time.
- 3.4 In considering the Allowances for Opposition Group Leaders, the Main Opposition Group Leader Allowance will be given to the Leader of the largest group, of 5 members or more. Any other opposition group leaders will receive the Other Opposition Allowance regardless of the size of the group. In the event there are two or more equal sized opposition groups each having 5 or more members then they will all receive 2000 the Main Opposition Group Leader Allowance. In the event there are two or more Other Opposition Group Leaders then they will receive an equal share of the Other Opposition Group Leader Allowance 2(v).
- 4. Deleted 2(vi)

²⁽iv) Deletion approved 5th November 2015

²⁽v) Amendment approved 5th November 2015 2(vi) Deletion approved 5th November 2015

5. **DEPENDENTS' CARERS' ALLOWANCE**

5.1 Child Care

The scheme provides for reimbursement of expenditure incurred by councillors in providing child care arrangements to facilitate their attendance at approved duties of the Council in accordance with the requirements that

- payment is made to someone other than a close relation (eg parent, guardian, brother, sister)
- payments for the care of under 8's are restricted to payments to registered child-minders and other statutory approved child care providers
- payments be restricted to the care of children up to their
 14th birthday who normally reside with the member
- no payments be made in respect of the care of children of compulsory school age during school hours.

5.2 Care of Dependants

The reimbursement of expenditure on professional care for an elderly, sick or disabled dependent relative normally residing with the councillor and requiring constant care, subject to payments being restricted to agencies or persons qualified to provide the care other than close relations.

5.3 General Conditions

The following conditions will apply to both types of allowance:

- payments are made on the basis of reimbursement of actual hourly rate expenditure incurred for each hour of a councillor's absence from home and are subject to the production by the councilor of satisfactory receipts
- councillors to self-certify claims confirming that they have incurred expenditure in accordance with the scheme
- that qualifying meetings be restricted to those regarded as approved duties in the Council's scheme (see 6 below).
- Individual arrangements can be made with the Council via the Leader of the Council and Monitoring Officer for flexible financial arrangements for Dependents' Carers' Allowance which would not exceed the payments made

Block L Version 7 Page: M.4

under the current criteria, reflecting the individualizing of social care packages nationally.3

6. TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

- 6.1 Subject to the provisions set out in the attached schedule, travelling and subsistence allowances shall be paid to those councillors attending meetings in respect of the following duties:
 - A meeting of the Cabinet or any committee of the Cabinet
 - A meeting of the Council or a committee, sub-committee or other body of the Council (for which proper notice is aiven)
 - A meeting held under joint arrangements with another authority (for which proper notice is given)
 - Training and induction courses, seminars and conferences
 - Site inspection meetings (for which proper notice is given)
 - Formal meetings of outside bodies as a representative of the Council
 - Undertaking civic duties as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council
 - Any other duty which has been approved by the Chief Executive.
- 6.2 All claims for travel expenses and subsistence should be made on the appropriate claim form and backed by receipts as applicable. Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1.

7. **CO-OPTEES' ALLOWANCE**

- 7.1 The Town and Parish Council representatives 4 of the Council's Conduct 5 Committee shall each be paid an annual co-optees' allowance, at the rate specified in the schedule to this scheme.
- 7.2 Those persons in receipt of a co-optees' allowance from this Council shall be entitled to claim travelling and subsistence allowances where appropriate.

³ Amendment approved 5th November 2015 4 Amendment approved 5th November 2015 5 Amendment approved 5th November 2015

8. FOREGOING ALLOWANCES

8.1 A councillor may, by notice given in writing to the Chief Executive, elect to forgo all or any part of his/her entitlement to an allowance under this scheme.

9. WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES

9.1 Where a councillor is suspended or partially suspended from his/her duties and responsibilities as a member of the Council, the relevant allowances (eg basic; special responsibility; travelling and subsistence) normally payable to him/her will be withheld by the authority for the duration of the suspension period.

10. PART YEAR ENTITLEMENTS

10.1 If the term of office or duty undertaken by a councillor begins or ends part way through a municipal year or amendment of the scheme during a municipal year or changes to the councillor's responsibilities during the year results in changes in the amount to which a councillor is entitled, calculation of the allowance payable shall be on a pro-rata basis having regard to the proportion that the term of office, period of duty or relevant periods of the scheme bear to the municipal year in which they occur.

11. CLAIMS AND PAYMENTS

- 11.1 Payment of the basic and special responsibility allowances and the co-optees' allowance and Independent Person/Deputy Independent Person allowance s shall be made in twelve equal monthly instalments on or around 26th day of each month, subject to the arrangements for part year payment provisions set out above.
- 11.2 Claims for dependents' carers' and travelling and subsistence allowances under this scheme will need to be submitted in writing (using the prescribed claim form) to Member Services within one month at the end of each financial quarter (June, September, December, March) to which the claim relates.
- 11.3 Where a member of Fenland District Council is also a member of another local authority, (s)he shall not receive allowances from more than one authority in respect of the same duties.

6 Amendment approved 5th November 2015

Block L Version 7 Page: M.6

12. MEMBERS' ICT 7

12.1 Where requested, the Council to provide loans to Members which could be repaid over the remaining term in office by deduction from Members allowance to enable them to purchase suitable devices (to a maximum of £500, upon submission of a receipt).8

13. UPDATING

- 13.1 The basic allowances rates will be increased by 1% per year from 1st April 2017 1st April 2019, however not exceeding employee pay awards. In any event employee pay awards are less than 1% from 1st April 2017, Members' Allowances increases will match those of employees. Special Responsibility Allowances will not be reviewed or uplifted each year.9
- 13.2 The allowances specified in respect of mileage claims will be linked to changes in the approved rates issued by HM Revenue and Customs from time to time.

14. INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

- 14.1 An Independent Remuneration Panel has been established in accordance with the 2003 Regulations to produce reports making recommendations in respect of this allowances scheme and the Council must have regard to the recommendations of the panel in respect of allowances to be paid to counciliors.
- 14.2 The scheme will be reviewed by the Independent Remuneration Panel on a periodic basis, but not longer than two years shall pass between IRP reviews, thereby the next review taking place no later than November 2013.

14.3 Deleted 10

7 Amendment approved 5th November 2015

8 Amendment approved 5th November 2015

9 Amendment approved 5th November 2015

10 Deletion approved 5th November 2015

15. PUBLICITY

- 15.1 The Council, as soon as reasonably practicable after determining a scheme of allowances, will ensure that copies of the scheme are available for inspection and publicised in accordance with the 2003 Regulations.
- 15.2 As soon as reasonably practicable, in each year, the Council will publish in its area the total sum paid to each councillor in respect of basic, special responsibility, travelling and subsistence and dependents' carers' allowances together with the amounts of cooptees' and travelling and subsistence allowances paid to each 11 Member.

11 Deletion approved 5th November 2015

Block L Version 7 Page: M.8

SCHEDULE OF ALLOWANCES

The following allowances are applicable with effect from 1 April 2016*:

1. **MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES**

Basic Allowance

Payable to all members £4,771 p.a*.

Special Responsibility Allowance (ii)

Payable to the following post holders:

Leader of the Council	£16,509*p.a.
3	
Cabinet Member	£8,500*p.a.
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Panel	£8,000* p.a.
Vice-Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Panel	£0* p.a.
Chairman of Planning Committee	£8,000* p.a.
Vice-Chairman of Planning Committee	£0* p.a.
Chairman of Licensing Committee	£3,274* p.a.
Chairman of Conduct Committee ³	£1,637* p.a.
Chairman of Staff Committee	£1,637* p.a.
Chairman of Corporate Governance Committee	£1,637* p.a.
Chairman of Council **	£4,116* p.a.
Leader of the Main Opposition Group	£5,706* p.a.
Leader of other Opposition Groups	£2,000* p.a.

payable in addition to the "Civic Dignitaries" allowance paid under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 (see (v) overleaf)

DELETION .4

Block L Version 7 Page: M.9

[&]quot;Changes to allowances approved 5th November 2015

3 Amendment approved 26th July 2012

4 Deletion approved 5th November 2015

(iii) Dependents' Carers' Allowance

Payable at actual cost per hour for care of dependents whether children, elderly or people with disabilities, while a member is on Council business.

Individual arrangements can be made with the Council via the Leader of the Council and Monitoring Officer for flexible financial arrangements for Dependents" Carers' Allowance which would not exceed the payments under the current criteria, reflecting the individualising of social care packages nationally.4(i)

(iv) Independent Persons Allowance⁵

Payable to Independent Person advising the Conduct Committee - £1032* p.a. and for the Deputy Independent Person £516 *p.a. 6

Other Allowances - for information (v)

The following are paid pursuant to the Local Government Act 1972 (approved by the Council at each annual meeting):

*	Chairman of the Council	£3,900 p.a.
		(for 2018/19)*
*	Vice-Chairman of the Council	£1,000 p.a.
		(for 2018/19*). ⁷

2. **SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES**

Breakfast allowance

For approved duties both inside and outside the District the following rates apply:

(1)	(where away from normal place of residence between 6:30am and 10am)	£6.06
(ii)	Lunch allowance (more than 4 hours away from normal place of residence including the lunchtime between 12 noon and 2.00 pm)	£8.43
(iii)	Evening meal allowance (more than 4 hours away from normal place of residence ending after 7.30 pm)	£12.50

^{*}Changes to allowances approved 5th November 2015

Page: M.10

(i)

⁴⁽i) Amendment approved 5th November 2015
⁵ Amendment approved 26th July 2012
⁶ Amendment approved 26th July 2012
⁷ Amendment approved 5th November 2015

Any claim for subsistence allowance must be backed by a receipt for food or drinks consumed during the relevant meal period. No claim may be made in relation to any meal period for which the council or any other body hosting a meeting has provided refreshments.

In exceptional circumstances the Leader will consider and determine any variation from the subsistence allowances for Members. For members of opposition groups this will be in consultation with the relevant group leader. Where the Leader is concerned, the Chief Executive or Chief Finance Officer will consider any variation from the subsistence allowances.

3. TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES

(i) Motor Mileage Allowance

The rate for motor cars is 45p per mile for the first 10,000 miles of travel and thereafter in accordance with HMRC rates.⁸

Passenger Supplement - for passengers, not exceeding 4, a supplement of 5.0 pence per mile for each passenger carried.

(ii) Motorcycle Allowance

The rate for motorcycles is 24p per mile.

(iii) Bicycle Allowance

The rate for bicycles is 20p per mile.

(iv) Public Transport

For most forms of public transport and the use of taxicabs, the actual cost will be reimbursed on production of a receipt. In the case of train journeys, a "rail warrant" will normally be provided by the Council for standard (or second class) fare travel only.

First Class travel is only permitted when the price of the ticket is less than or equal to a Standard Class fare. If a Member wishes to travel First Class, the difference between a First Class and Standard Class fare can be paid by the Member at their own personal expense.

In exceptional circumstances the Leader will consider and determine any requests for first class travel expenses for Members. For members of opposition groups this will be in consultation with the relevant group leader. Where the Leader is

⁸ Such rate to be implemented from and including the 18th May 2011.

concerned, the Chief Executive or Chief Finance Officer will consider any appropriate first class travel expenses.

in the event that a councillor hires a motor vehicle (other than a taxicab) they shall only be entitled to claim the standard mileage rate for the distance travelled irrespective of the cost of hire; unless such hire has been approved in advance by the Corporate Director/Chief Finance Officer in which case the actual cost of hire and fuel may be claimed.

The rate for travel by air shall not exceed the rate applicable to travel by appropriate alternative means of transport together with an allowance equivalent to the amount of any saving in subsistence allowance consequent on travel by air:

provided that where the body resolves, either generally or specifically, that the saving in time is so substantial as to justify payment of the fare for travel by air, there may be paid an amount not exceeding:

- (a) the ordinary fare or any available cheap fare for travel by regular air service, or
- (b) where no such service is available or in case of urgency, the fare actually paid by the member.

This rate applies if travel results in a substantial saving of the member's time or is in the interests of the body or is otherwise reasonable.

4. OVERNIGHT SUBSISTENCE

Members will be expected to book all overnight accommodation in advance through member services, however if this is not possible then the actual cost of accommodation up to the following values will be recoverable on production of receipts.

Allowance for absence overnight from the usual place of residence

£92.14

Allowance for such absence in London (within specified London Boroughs) or for attendance at the annual conference £105.09 of the Local Government Association

Block L Version 7 Page: M.12

Complaint against Councillor Simon King

Section 1: Summary of complaint against Clir Simon King

Introduction

The file attached contains information in relation to the Member mileage claims of Councillor Simon King. The information suggests that Councillor King may have submitted overinflated mileage claims and attempted to claim for journeys outside of the Members' Allowance Scheme (*Document 1*). The Information outlines that journeys were claimed for that appear inflated over and above what would be expected by comparison with Google Maps and journeys were claimed for that are outside of the scheme; mainly not travelling from home but another start point or travelling to another place which is not claimable on the way to Council business. The information outlines that there are consistent claims for differing amounts of mileage from home in Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March. This generally consists of 26 miles or more. Google Maps states this journey would equate to 22 miles.

Financial analysis of Councillor King's Member mileage claims is included in the documentation with an estimated £1511.10 (3358 miles) being inappropriately claimed and paid to Councillor King and a further £736.65 (1637 miles) claimed but not paid between April 2011 and October 2017.

Councillor King Is an experienced Councillor and was first elected to Fenland District Council in 1999. Councillor King has held various senior positions including Chairman of Overview and Scrutlny Committee and is currently a Cabinet Member with responsibility for Equalities and Transport.

Member Code of Conduct

Councillor King may have breached the Code of Conduct (*Document 2*) under the following provisions:

3; 3.2 (e) conduct yourself in a manner, which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute.

5; 5.1 you must not use or attempt to use your position as a member improperly to confer on or secure for yourself or any other person, an advantage or disadvantage.

Members' Allowances Scheme

The Members' Allowance Scheme is agreed by Council following receiving recommendations from an Independent Remuneration Panel. The current scheme was agreed by Council in November 2015 and Councillor King was present at that meeting.

Section 6 of the Members' Allowances Scheme sets out the rules in regards to claiming mileage and what constitutes an appropriate journey. Section 6.2 states "...Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out at 6.1."

When submitting mileage claims to Fenland District Council, all Members sign a declaration which states:

I declare that:

- (a) I have necessarily incurred expenditure on travelling and subsistence for the purpose of enabling me to perform approved duties as a member of Fenland District Council.
- (b) I have actually paid the fares and made the other payments referred to in column 12.
- (c) The amounts claimed are strictly in accordance with the rates determined by Fenland District Council and currently in force.
- (d) Statement in this claim are correct and that I have not made and I will not make any other claim in respect of the matters to which this claim relates.

In submitting inaccurate mileage claims or claiming for mileage outside of the scheme, it contravenes statements a, c and d of the declaration. Submitting Members' Allowances claims is the responsibility of the individual Councillor. The Member Services team process claims and would consult with the individual member if there were any obvious errors. Mileage claims are checked for attendance at FDC meetings but otherwise are accepted on face value as Members sign a declaration that they are correct.

Councillor King has been advised what is within the remit of the Members' Allowances Scheme previously (*Document 3*) and had a meeting with the Acting Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer in May 2016 regarding the accuracy of his mileage claims. The submission of inappropriate claims has continued.

Section 2 - Summary of mileage claims and financial impact

The table below illustrates the information gathered from the individual mileage claims forms submitted by Councillor King:

Mileage Claims from April 2011 - Current

Key: Date of payroll run	Number of miles claimed for that period	Number of miles paid by FDC for that period	Difference between number of miles claimed & number of miles paid by FDC	Miles that on further analysis could have been challenged or not paid as outside of the scheme for that period
Date of Submission to Payroll	Number of Miles claimed (£)	Number of miles paid (£)	Difference (£)	Unchallenged Journeys (£)
2011 2012	,			
APRIL 2011	179 (80.55)	179 (80.55)	0	73 (32.85)
NOVEMBER 2011	190 (85.50)	190 (85.50)	0	59 (26.55)
JANUARY 2012	138 (62.10)	138 (62.10)	0	51 (22.95)
MARCH 2012	301 (135.45)	171 (76.95)	130 (58.50)	21 (9.45)
TOTAL 2011 - 2012	201 (£353.60)	678 (£305.30)	130 ((58.90)	204 (£91.80)
2012, 2013				
MAY 2012	134 (60.30) (+52 Passenger miles)	107 (48.15)(+52 Passenger miles)	27 (12.15)	19 (8.55)(8 Passenger miles)
JULY 2012	225 (101.25)(+122 Passenger miles)	225 (101.25)(+122 Passenger miles)	0	94 (42.30)(20 Passenger miles)
NOVEMBER 2012	159 (71.55) (+52 Passenger miles)	56 (25.20) (+26 Passenger miles)	103 (26 Passenger miles)	12 (5.40)(4 Passenger miles)
JANUARY 2013	343 (154.35)	259 (116.55)	84 (37.80)	51 (22.95)
MARCH 2013	165 (74.25)	109 (49.05)	56 (25.20)	43 (19.35)
TOTAL 2012 - 2013	1026 (f/461.70) (* 226 Parsenger)	756 (£340,20) (= 200 Passenger)	270 (£121.50) (26 Passenger)	219 (£98.55)[32.0
2013 - 2024				
JULY 2013	611 (274.95)	586 (263.70)	25 (11.25)	251 (112.95)
SEPTEMBER 2013	366 (164.70)	366 (164.70)	0	57 (25.65)
NOVEMBER 2013	650 (292.50)	650 (292.50)	0	117 (52.65)
JANUARY 2014	440 (198.00)	440 (198.00)	0	161(72.45)
TOTAL 2013 - 2014	2067 (6530.15)	2042 (£914.90)	25 (011.25)	585 (6263,70)
7014-7015				
PRIL 2014	255 (114.75)	255 (114.75)	0	138 (62.10)
WLY 2014	80 (36)	80 (36.00)	0	14 (6.30)
SEPTEMBER 2014	53 (23.85)	53 (23.85)	0	9 (4.05)

NOVEMBER 2014	288 (129.60)	288 (129.60)	0	90 (40.50)
JANUARY 2015	410 (184.50)	410 (184.50)	0	355 (159.75)
TOTAL 2014 - 2015	1085 (£488.70)	1088 (£488.70)	0	506 (£272.70)
Date of Submission to Payroll	Number of Miles claimed (£)	Number of miles paid (£)	Difference (£)	Unchallenged Journeys (£)
2015 - 2016 APRIL 2015	207 (93.15)	207 (93.15)		07/47.68)
JULY 2015	716 (322.20)	716 (322.20)	0	97 (43.65)
SEPTEMBER 2015	393 (176.85)	The state of the s		519 (233.55)
DECEMBER 2015	559 (251.55)	393 (176.85)	0	124 (55.80)
JANUARY 2016	305 (137.25)	489 (220.05)	70 (31.50)	116 (52.20)
TOTAL 2015 - 2016	2150 (4981.00)	51 (22.95) *	134 (60.30)	7 (3.15)
		3000	204 (£91.80)	851 (£382.95)
2016 - 2017				
MAY 2016	1187 (534.15)	847 (381.15)	340 (153.00)	144 (64.80)
11 11 V 2016	1038 (467.10)	550 (247.50)	488 (219.60)	87 (39.15)
				
OCTOBER 2016	823 (370.35)	823 (370.35)	0	148 (66.60)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017			0	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10)
JULY 2016 OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017	823 (370.35)	823 (370.35)	0	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017 TOTAL 2016 - 2017	823 (370.35) 1012 (455.40)	823 (370.35) 1012 (445.40)	0	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017 TOTAL 2016 - 2017	823 (370.35) 1012 (455.40)	823 (370.35) 1012 (445.40)	0 0 828 (£372.60)	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017 TOTAL 2016 - 2017 APRIL 2017	823 (370.35) 1012 (455.40) 4000 (E48.4.00) 862 (387.90)	823 (370.35) 1012 (445.40) 3134 (145.40) (recouped 41) 821 (369.45)	0 0 828 (£372.60) 11 41 (18.45)	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10) 331 (268.83) 103 (46.35)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017 TOTAL 2016 - 2017 APRIL 2017 JULY 2017	823 (370.35) 1012 (455.40) 862 (387.90) 1051 (472.95)	823 (370.35) 1012 (445.40) (recouped 41) 821 (369.45) 973 (437.85)	0 0 828 (£372.60) 41 (18.45) 78 (35.10)	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10) 103 (46.35) 122 (54.90)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017 TOTAL 2016 - 2017 APRIL 2017 JULY 2017 OCTOBER 2017	823 (370.35) 1012 (455.40) 4060 (£184.10) 862 (387.90) 1051 (472.95) 629 (283.05)	823 (370.35) 1012 (445.40) (recouped 41) 821 (369.45) 973 (437.85) 568 (255.60)	0 0 41 (18.45) 78 (35.10) 61 (27.45)	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10) 103 (46.35) 122 (54.90) 70 (31.50)
OCTOBER 2016 JANUARY 2017 TOTAL 2016 - 2017	823 (370.35) 1012 (455.40) 862 (387.90) 1051 (472.95)	823 (370.35) 1012 (445.40) (recouped 41) 821 (369.45) 973 (437.85)	0 0 828 (£372.60) 41 (18.45) 78 (35.10)	148 (66.60) 218 (98.10) 103 (46.35) 122 (54.90)

^{*} A further 120 miles were not paid as no clarification was given.

9e
43
of
125

Section 3- Analysis of mileage claims by month - October 2017 back to April 2011

The attached information suggests Councillor King has submitted Member mileage claims that are inflated over and above what would be expected by comparison with Google Maps and journeys have been claimed for that are outside of the scheme; mainly not travelling from home but from another start point or travelling to another place which is not claimable on the way to Council business e.g. visiting a constituent.

The information outlines there are claims for differing amounts of mileage from home in Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March. This generally consists of 26 miles or more. Google Maps states this journey would equate to 22 miles. There are other routes between Wisbech and March however no journeys could be found that would result in this amount of additional mileage (*Document 4*). Although the scheme does not specify you have to travel by the most direct route, as this is public money, it would be the expectation that, wherever possible, you would limit the cost to the public purse when executing your official duties.

Financial Year 2017/18 to date

2017/18 Summary – 2542 miles claimed for; only 2067 claimable = over claim of 475 miles, not paid 180 miles, received £132.75 not claimable

October 2017 - 58% of journeys miscialmed

- Summary 629 miles claimed for, only 498 miles claimable = over claim of 131 miles, 61 miles not paid, received £31.50 not claimable
- 12 journeys claimed for; 10 x inflated mileage.
- Note. 24/7/2017 Wisbech to Cambridge return claimed 112 miles; Google Maps states 84 miles claimable.

July 2017 - 53% of Journeys misclaimed

- Summary 1051 miles claimed for, only 851 claimable = over claim of 200 miles, 78 miles not paid, received £54.90 not claimable
- 34 journeys claimed for; 18 x inflated mileage
- Note. 25/4/17 Wisbech to Doddington return claimed 57 miles; Google Maps states 30 miles claimable Cllr King confirmed he returned via Peterborough. He was advised this was outside of the scheme.
- Note. 6/6/17 Wisbech to London return via Huntingdon station claimed 85 miles; Google Maps states 64 miles claimable. Clir King stated there are a number of different routes and as traffic was bad he used a different one.
- Note. 22/6/17 Wisbech to March return claimed 38 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable. Cllr King confirmed he returned via Peterborough. He was advised this was outside of the scheme.
- Note. 3/7/17 Wisbech to March return claimed 31 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles
 claimable. Cllr King stated there are many different routes, roadworks hampered his journey and
 he sometimes visits a constituent on route. Cllr King was advised visiting constituents is outside
 of the scheme.

April 2017 - 75% of Journeys misclaimed

- Summary 862 miles claimed for, only 718 claimable = over claim of 144 miles, 41 miles recouped, received £46.35 not claimable
- 24 journeys claimed for; 15 x inflated mileage
- Note. 16/1/17 Wisbech March return claimed 36 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable. Cllr King stated he had to see a constituent on the way. This is outside of the scheme.
- Note. 24/1/17 Wisbech March return claimed 52 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable. Clir King stated he picked up a non FDC passenger for the meeting. This is outside of the scheme and not reflected on the claim form.
- Note. 27/2/17 Wisbech March return claimed 31 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable. Cllr King stated he had to see a constituent on the way. This is outside of the scheme.
- Note. 3/3/17 Wisbech Great Yarmouth return claimed 174 miles; Google Maps states 160 miles claimable.

- Note. 16/3/17 Wisbech Wisbech St Mary return claimed 30 miles; Google Maps states 8
 miles claimable. Cllr King stated he had a subsequent meeting to attend in March. It is not clear
 if this was on Council business.
- Note. 16/3/17 Wisbech Tydd St Giles return claimed 24 miles; Google Maps states 14 miles claimable.

Financial Year 2016/17

2016/17 Summary – 4060 miles claimed for; only 2635 claimable = over claim of 1425 miles, 828 miles not paid, received £268.65 not claimable

January 2017 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 1012 miles claimed for, only 794 claimable = over claim of 218 miles, received £98.10 not claimable
- 29 journeys; 29 x Inflated mileage; 22 of which for March Wisbech mileage.
- Note. 24/11/16 Wisbech-March return claimed 35 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable.
- Note. 29/11/16 Wisbech-Leverington return claimed 20 miles; Google Maps states 4 miles claimable – Note. 4 miles claimed on 10/01/17.
- Note.06/12/16 Wisbech-Norwich return claimed 147 miles; Google Maps states 114 miles claimable.
- Note. 08/12/16 Wisbech-March return claimed 34 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable.
- Note.03/11/16 10 miles claimed for meeting in Wisbech where Cllr King resides maximum of 2 miles would be claimable.
- Note. 04/01/17 Wisbech-Whittlesey return, claimed 45 miles; Google Maps states 33 miles claimable.

October 2016 – 83% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 823 miles claimed for, only 675 miles claimable = over claim of 148 miles, received £66.60 not claimable.
- 29 journeys; 24 x inflated mileage; 19 of which for March –Wisbech mileage.
- Note. 21/7/16 Wisbech-Tydd St Giles return; 26 miles claimed; Google Maps states 14 miles claimable.
- Note. 22/7/16 2020 & Civic Reception; 10 miles claimed for meeting in Wisbech where Cllr King resides maximum of 2 miles would be claimable.

July 2016 - 96% of Journeys misclaimed

- Summary 1038 miles claimed for, only 463 miles claimable = over claim of 575 miles, 488 miles not paid, received £39.15 not claimable
- 28 journeys; 10 x not travelling to/from place of residence and 16 x inflated mileage; 15 journeys March to Wisbech mileage.

May 2016 - 96% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 1187 miles claimed for, only 703 claimable = over claim of 484 miles, 340 miles not paid, received £64.80 not claimable
- 27 journeys claimed for; 20 x inflated mileage.
- Note. 11/1/16 Wisbech March return claimed 55 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable.
- Note. 29/2/16 Claimed for meeting where apologies were given.
- Note. 30/3/16—Rugby to Wisbech claimed 85 miles, instead of 0 as outside of scheme. This was not paid.

Financial Year 2015/16

2015/16 Summary – 2180 miles claimed for; only 1125 claimable ≈ over claim of 1055 miles, 204 miles not paid, received £382.95 not claimable

January 2016 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 305 miles claimed for; only 164 claimable = over claim of 141 miles, only 51 miles
 paid as no clarification provided, a further 120 miles could have been paid- received £3.15 not
 claimable
- 8 journeys claimed for; 6 x inflated mileage home to March return; 1 journey outside of the scheme, 1 journey a repeat from a previous claims form.
- Note. 5/11/15 is the same claim refused on the December 2015 claim form. The claim has been changed so it reads that the journey was from Wisbech to March to Wisbech (which would comply with the scheme) instead of Huntingdon to March to London. This claim was refused as it had been in December 2015.
- Note. 3/12/15 Wisbech –March return claimed 42 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable. Cllr King stated he had travelled via Downham Market. Cllr King was asked to clarify what FDC business caused him to take this diversion otherwise the claim would not be paid. No clarification was provided therefore it was not paid.
- Note. 7/12/15 Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Planning Committee, claimed for a £30 taxi and a £4.20 bus fare. Cllr King confirmed he had attended on behalf of a constituent. Cllr King was informed this was outside the remit of the Scheme and was not paid.
- Note. 10/12/15, Wisbech March return claimed 36 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable. Clir King stated he took a different route. Clir King was asked what FDC business had required the change in route. No clarification was provided and the journey was not paid.
- Note. 5/1/16, Tour of Assets, claimed 71 miles. FDC provided a bus for Cabinet to undertake this tour. On a comfort stop at Fenland Hall Cilr King got in his car and followed the coach for the remainder of the tour which covered villages to the north of March e.g. Fridaybridge/Parson Drove. It was understood Cilr King had a dentist appointment and would be late if he had to return to Fenland Hall after the tour to collect his car. Covering these additional stops by car would generate approximately another 10 miles above the 22 miles that could be claimed from Wisbech to Fenland Hall. Cilr King was asked re. the excess mileage and Cilr King responded to say this was because he had further Council business to attend. Member Services clarified what FDC business generated these additional miles. No clarification was forthcoming therefore this was not paid.
- Note. 7/1/16 Wisbech to March return claimed 35 miles; Google Maps states (22 miles claimable. Cllr King stated he took a different route. Cllr King was asked what FDC business had required the change in route. No clarification was provided and the journey was not paid.

December 2015 - 100% of journeys misclalmed

 Summary – 559 miles claimed for; only 373 miles claimable = over claim of 186 miles, 70 miles not paid, received £52.20 not claimable

- 15 journeys claimed for; 12 journeys x inflated mileage; 10 journeys home to March return; 1 journey outside of the scheme not travelling from home but travelling from another start point.
- Note. 5/11/2015 This claim consisted of a train ticket from Huntingdon to London return, pay
 and display ticket for Huntingdon station, and 70 miles claimed from Huntingdon to March.
 Further clarification was sought and it was confirmed travel to the Council meeting was from
 personal business. Clir King subsequently requested a copy of the Member Allowances Scheme
 which was sent electronically with an offer of a telephone call for further discussion. This claim
 was outside of the scheme and therefore not paid.

September 2015 - 72% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 393 miles claimed for; only 269 miles claimable = over claim of 124 miles received £55.80 not claimable
- 14 journeys claimed for; 9 x inflated mileage ~ 8 journeys home to March return; 1 journey outside of the scheme; not travelling from home but travelling from another start point.
- Note.29/9/15 Wisbech to Cambridge return; claimed 116 miles; Google Maps states 86 miles claimable.

July 2015 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 716 miles claimed for; only 197 miles claimable = over claim of 519 miles –
 received £233.55 not claimable
- 16 journeys claimed for; 7 x inflated mileage 6 x home to March return; 9 journeys outside of the scheme; not travelling from home but travelling from another start point.

April 2015 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary Claimed 207 miles; only 110 miles claimable = over claim of 97 miles received
 £43.65 not claimable
- 6 journeys claimed for; 5 journeys x mileage inflated home to March return; 1 journey outside of the scheme; not travelling from home but travelling from another start point.
- Note. 19/3/15 Peterborough to Wisbech return 69 miles claimed. This would be outside of the scheme unless travelling on subsequent Council business and going back to Council business otherwise 0 miles would be claimable.

Financial Year 2014/15

2014/15 Summary – 1086 miles claimed for; only 480 claimable = over claim of 606 miles, received £272.70 not claimable

January 2015 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 410 miles claimed for; only 55 miles claimable = over claim of 355 miles received £159.75 not claimable
- 7 journeys claimed for; all for claiming for journeys outside of the scheme; not travelling from home but travelling from another start point.

November 2014 - 100% of journeys miscialmed

- Summary Claimed 288 miles; only 198 miles claimable = over claim of 90 miles received £40.50 not claimable
- 9 journeys claimed for; 9 x mileage inflated home to March return.
- Note. 6/11/14 Wisbech to March return 66 miles claimed; Google Maps states22 miles claimable
- Note. 24/11/14 Wisbech to March return43 miles claimed; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable.

September 2014 – 100% of Journeys misclaimed

- Summary Claimed for 53 mlles; only 44 miles claimable = over claim of 9 miles received £4.05 not claimable
- 2 journeys claimed for; 2 x mlleage inflated home to March return

July 2014 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary Claimed for 80 miles; only 66 miles claimable = over claim of 14 miles reseived £6.30 not claimable
- 3 journeys claimed for; 3 x mileage inflated home to March return.

April 2014 - 100% of Journeys misclaimed

- Summary Claimed 255 miles; only 117 miles claimable = over claim of 138 miles received £62.10 not claimable
- 6 Journeys claimed for; 2 x journeys mileage inflated home to March return mileage; 4 x journeys start point from a place other than home. Note. the difference between 2 same journeys; 24/4/14 Sutton to March 52 miles; 28/4/14 Sutton to March 28 miles

Financial Year 2013/2014

2013/14 Summary – 2067 miles claimed for; only 1456 claimable = over claim of 611 miles, 25 miles not paid, received £263.70 not claimable

January 2014 - 67% of journeys misclalmed

- Summary 440 miles claimed for, only 279 claimable = over claim of 161 miles, received £72.45 not claimable
- 12 journeys claimed for 5 x inflated mileage, 3 x start/finish point from a place other than home.

November 2013 ~ 85% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary -- 650 miles claimed for, only 533 claimable -- over claim of 117 miles, received £52.65 not claimable
- 20 journeys claimed for; 16 x inflated mileage.

September 2013 – 67% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 366 miles claimed for, only 309 claimable over claim of 57 miles, received £25.65
 not claimable
- 12 journeys claimed for; 7 x inflated mileage.

July 2013 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 611 miles claimed for, only 335 claimable over claim of 276 miles, 25 miles not paid, received £112.95 not claimable
- 18 journeys claimed for; 13 x inflated mileage, 4 x start/finish point from a place other than home.
- Note. 16/4/2013 claimed for meeting when gave apologies.

Financial Year 2012/2013

2012/13 Summary – 1026 miles claimed for; only 537 claimable = over claim of 489 miles, 270 miles not paid, received £98.55 not claimable (excl passenger miles)

March 2013 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 165 mlles claimed for, only 66 miles claimable = over claim of 99 mlles, 56 miles not paid, received £19.35 not claimable
- 3 journeys claimed for; 3 x Inflated mileage.
- Note. 06/2/2013 Wisbech to March return claimed 54 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable.

January 2013 - 100% of journeys misclalmed

- Summary 343 miles claimed for, only 208 miles claimable = over claim of 135 miles, 84 miles not paid, received £22.95 not claimable
- 12 journeys claimed for; 8 x inflated mileage, 2 x journeys already submitted in previous mileage claim, 1 x journey not present.

November 2012 - 100% of Journeys misclalmed

- Summary 159 miles claimed for; only 44 miles claimable = over claim of 115 miles, 103 miles not paid, received £5,40 not claimable
- 6 journeys claimed for; 2 x inflated mileage, 3 x not paid as out of time.
- Note. 13/9/2012 claimed for Council meeting when gave apologies.
- Note. Additional passenger mlles claimed have not been included in the calculations.

July 2012 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

Summary – 225 miles claimed for; only 131 miles claimable = over claim of 94 miles, received £42.30 not claimable

- 6 journeys claimed for; 5x inflated mileage; 1 x start point from a place other than home.
- Note. Additional passenger miles claimed have not been included in the calculations.

May 2012 - 100% of journeys misclalmed

- Summary 134 miles claimed for; only 88 miles claimable = over claim of 46 miles, 27 miles not paid, received £8.55 not claimable.
- 5 journeys claimed for; 4 x inflated mileage.
- Note. Additional passenger miles claimed have not been included in the calculations.

Financial Year 2011/2012

2011/12 Summary - 808 miles claimed for; only 474 daimable = over claim of 334 miles, 130 miles not paid, received £91.80 not claimable

March 2012 - 89% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary 301 miles claimed for; only 150 miles claimable = over claim of 151 miles, 130 miles not paid, received £9.45 not claimable
- 9 journeys claimed for; 5 x inflated mileage.

January 2012 - 100% of journeys misclalmed

- Summary 138 miles claimed; only 87 miles claimable = over claim of 51 miles, received
 £22.95 not claimable
- 4 journeys claimed for; 3 x inflated mileage; 1 x start point from a place other than home.

November 2011 – 100% of Journeys misclaimed

- Summary claimed 190 miles; only 131 miles claimable = over claim of 59 miles, received £26.55 not claimable
- 6 journeys claimed for; 4 x mileage inflated home to March return mileage; 1 x start point from a place other than home.
- Note. 29/11/2011 Wisbech to March Return claimed 30 miles; Google Maps states22 miles claimable.

April 2011 - 100% of journeys misclaimed

- Summary claimed 179 miles; only 106 claimable = over claim of 73 miles, received £32.85 not
 claimable
- ◆ 4 journeys claimed for; 4 x inflated mileage; 3 x home to March return mileage.
- Note. 24/2/2011 Wisbech to March Return claimed 56 miles; Google Maps states 22 miles claimable.
- Note. 01/3/2011 Wisbech to Chatteris Return claimed 70 miles; Google Maps states 40 miles claimable.

Document 3

Documented advice and guidance provided to Councillor King in regards the Members' Allowances Scheme

05/11/2015 Councillor King was present at Council during which the Members' Allowances Scheme was approved.

10/12/2015 Email from Jane Bailey, Member Services to Councillor King advising that claims cannot be submitted from or to places other than your normal place of residence unless on Council business.

10/12/2015 Email from Carol Pilson, Corporate Director to Councillor King providing a link to the Members' Allowance Scheme and advising that claims cannot be submitted from or to places other than your normal place of residence unless on Council business.

8/1/2016 Email from Jane Webb, Member Services to Councillor King questioning additional mileage claimed and stating that visiting constituents does not fall within the Members' Allowances Scheme and providing general advice that miles can only be claimed when acting on Council business.

20/4/2016 Meeting between Acting Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer with Councillor King advising him that he cannot claim for meetings for which he has sent apologies and did not attend. Request for Councillor King to take care when submitting future claims.

7/7/2016 Email from Jane Bailey, Member Services to Councillor King advising that claims cannot be submitted from or to places other than your normal place of residence unless on Council Business.

6/4/2017 Email from Jane Bailey, Member Services questioning additional miles.

7/7/2017 Email from Jo Goodrum, Member Services to Councillor King questioning additional miles claimed and signposting the Members Allowances Scheme is set out at Part 6 of the Constitution and that visiting constituents is outside of the scheme. Also advised that claims cannot be submitted from or to places other than your normal place of residence unless on Council Business.

Document 4

Possible routes and mileage from Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March

- 1. South Brink/A47/A141/Wisbech Road/Norwood Road/Robingoodfellows Road/County Road = 10.7 miles one way or 21.4 miles Return
- 2. South Brink/Redmoor Lane/Coldham/Elm Road/County Road = 10.1 miles one way or 20.1 miles
- 3. South Brink/Churchill Road/Elm/Coldham/Elm Road/County Road = 10.8 miles one way or 21.6 miles return
- 4. North Brink/Barton Road/Wisbech St Mary/Tholomas Road/Guyhirn/Ring's End/A141/Wisbech Road/Norwood Road/Robingoodfellows Road/County Road = 12.3 miles one way or 24.6 miles return
- 5. South Brink/ A47/A141/Twenty Foot Road/Elm Road/County Road = 10.6 miles one way or 21.1 miles return

Claims submitted for the financial year 2011/12



ME	San	oh	Krue		CLAIM FOR MONTH	CLAIM FOR MONTH OF FEBRUARY				2011	
-	Departure	o Erom)	Anarous d Dudu				J		
)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Approved Duty (6)	Retur (7)	n to (8)	(9)	(40)	Travel and Subsistence	
ite	Place	Time	Start Time	Place	Description of Meeting	Place	Time	Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MARS	
2	Wisboch	4:00	430	March	Pork Mesting (Philothylis)	Wished	000	Cox	26	22	
2	N	9.30	10-00	11	Tourism (Vicki White		10.30	ધ	27	22	
23	11	3.30	400	n	Council	K	10.30	W	356	22	
3	n	9-15	10-00	Curious	Julian Met		1.00	1(70	40	
inote	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF 73 - Difference										
oid:	Jelay this cl which it rela	ates and n	rust be su	bmitted pro	d correctly up to the end of the calend nptly to the Democratic Services Sect aimed in columns 11 and 12 above	ar lon.			Pa	ild by:	



ME	Sund	n R	ing		CLAIM FOR MONT	H OF		April	- X	levermber 2014		
	Departure	From	,		Approved Duty	Retur	n to	•		Travel and Subsistence		
te	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GODGLE MAPS		
14	Swelling			March	Phil Hugger	Wisbali	4.30	Car	51	Not From home. 11		
5	(U) sheck	3.30	4.00	1 (Count	t c	6.30	<i>[11]</i>	25	22		
5	11	9.15	10.00	Willes	grantum	11	1.30	LC	\$ 6	*2 *		
13	()	3.30	400	Morg	Council	LL C	6.3	Cer	24	22		
19	Wilson	3.30	4.00	Mach	Cornell	Medich	630		25	2.2		
lie	Wishell	9.30	10.00	lotar	Toutisin		1:00	11	30	22		
1										131 - Naw Total		
2										(59)-Difference		
							ļ					
0				<u> </u>								
enote	in brackets wh	ich subsiste	nce allowan	ce is being cla	imed		<u> </u>	TOTAL	190			
	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF											
/old	delay this cl	aim must ites and n	be comple	eted fully and	d correctly up to the end of the cale aptly to the Democratic Services Se	ndar ection.			Pa	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		



#E	Sur	on	Ku	q	CLAIM FOR MONT	H OF		Dezem	DV 71	211 January 2012
-							!	0000	101 20	211 January 2012
	Departur		(4)		Approved Duty	Retu	n to			Travel and Subsistence
	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	(11) (12) (13) Passenger Taxi, Public Subsistence Allowance in miles Transport, "(B, L, T, EM, MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MARS
Z.	Cawbrilly	1.00	2:30	Morda	COT DOYATC GOLFAN	& West	5.8	Cor	49	Not From home !!
2	WUDER	9.15		Whelles	y Tourselle Most	11	130	11	40	34
2	h	-40	2.30	Morch.	Plenning	1 11	5.30	11	24	22
-		9.30	10.00	, ,	Bounder Bus Grow	d	1.00	u	25	22
rate i	n brackets whi	ch subsiste	nce allowan	ce is being clai	med			TOTAL	138	1879 New Total.
id e	elay this cia	im must l	be comple	ted fully and	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN I correctly up to the end of the calen aptly to the Democratic Services Sec	dar	RATIOI	V OVERLI	EAF Pai	_ (59)
of p	assengers a	nd/or deta	ils of tolls,	fares, etc cla	imed in columns 11 and 12 above					***** OF DB # FARFET DIS DOOR AND LAND LAND LAND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND



IAME	Sun	ou _	King		CLAIM FOR MONTH	I OF		Phros	211	- April 2012
						····		CONTO	7	10000
(4)	Departur				Approved Duty	Retur	n to			Travel and Subsistence
(1) Bate	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(8) Description of Meeting	(7) Piace	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van,	(10) No.of Miles	(11) (12) (13) Passenger Taxi, Public Subsistence
,					Gotfort			motorcycle/ cycle		INSING GOOGLE MAPS
12	Wesped			Marca	Mediglothe 1	who	3.00	Cor	25	22
12	P		3-00	11	Gro Kaldy Errotivo	H	43	> N	24	22
1/2	₩	200		u.	Corporate Governant	- 1	9.30		26	22.
12	- 11	9.30	10-5C	<u> </u>	Machine Kalland Carlot	· · · · ·	1230	V	25	Was not Paid
13	h	3.30	4.00	W	Louises ;	6	7.00	078	25	22
13	10 -8-0	9.12	10.00	appears	Townshi Parsues	· N	(00	n	674	2 / 40
13	The Same	2.15	7.15	MARK	MEDING GITTOURS	N.	10 3C	11.	55	
	WILLER	11/16	1200	N	Mary D. D. WILL	n	2:00	- 1	26	Was not raid.
10	n n	2.00	2.30	N	Planting	u		U	27	22
1									- 1	150 - New Total.
-										- 2D - New Tatal.
Jenote	in brackets wh	ich subsiste	nce allowan	ce is being cla	imed		<u> </u>	TOTAL	4	
e_				0	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLAI	RATIO	N OVERLE	AF	
re Page	delay this cla which it rela	aim must i	be comple just be sub	ted fully and	i correctly up to the end of the calend	ar ion.			Pai	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
les of	passengers a	ind/or deta	ils of tolls,	fares, etc cla	imed In columns 11 and 12 above					

Claims submitted for the financial year 2012/13



MAN	E Su	ioh	. Ki	inel	CLAIM FOR MONTI	HOF	. 1	10-	(· ·	
				1				Apri	KJZ	ray 2012
(1)	Departur (2)				Approved Duty	Retu	rn to			Travel and Subsistence
Date	Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/	No.of Miles	(11) Passenger Allowance in miles (5p per carried mile Parking (12) Text, Public Transport, Transport, Parking (13) Subsistence *(B, L, T, EM, 24hr)
HA	Waste S	230	2.30	March	Planing Makey	42 fod	142		27	Please also a MILEAGE VERIFIED box belo USING GOOGLE MAPS.
114	N.	3.30	4.00	11	Calina	((7.00	CO V		was not paid.
15	11	3.30	4.00	٠١.	(sweet	21.	7:00	10	26.	22
1/5	h	9:10	9.30	n	Mesters with load Wall	u	100	Įe.	26	2 22
7/5	21	12.55	1.00	11	" Ama	n	2.30	· ·	27	22
1					: .	-			2 (as:
2										20
/										0.3
										88 777
			`				2			(9) ×
Ş					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ř			
Denote	In brookete seld	ab susbalut			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				34	
>G 1018	In brackets whi	CH SUDSISIE	ice allowand	e is being clai	mad			TOTAL		52 1
Pa					PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLAR	RATION	OVERLE	IOZ-/	
	delay this cla which it rela	rea alla illi	ual ve suo	minaci prom	correctly up to the end of the calend aptly to the Democratic Services Sect	ar Ion.			Dail	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
nes of	passengers a	nd/or deta	is of tolis, 1	ares, etc clai	med in columns 11 and 12 above				Fair	d by:

CLAIM FORM JUBMITTED JULY 2012 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME	TU	voh	12	wa	CLAIM F	OR MONTH	OF	. 1	MI	al 1	> 1	Tul	4 201	-	
		0000		3					And the state of t	1	and) 300	9 201		
	Departure				Approved Duty		Retur	n to		/	Travel a	and Subsister	160		
1) inte	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of I	Reeting	(7) Piace	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Pa: Allowar (5p per per p: (Please a	ys,Na	GE VERI		
	WHICH	9.45	10.00	Merch	Bounday,	losting,	Wald	1/200	186V	29	28	22_	Passen	ger 22	
16	14	9.30	10-00	White	Tourism	Marky	11	1.00	, N.	42	42	32.	Passe	nger 36	
16	h	200	230	March	Plone	اب ب	T24/510	8.00	10	76		11 Not	returning	to Wist	,
17	t	3.30	400	Morch	Fell God	rel 1	n	5-30	41	26	52	22	Passer	ger 44	
16	11	1.30	2.00	March	Boundary	Pocos Ga	Grand Control of the	4.00	, .t	26		22			
15	u	12.30	1.00	n	Boundotop	1- v4	12	3.30	ti	27		22:			
1					J	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	:				ļ				
												131		Total.	
9			ļ ,							-		(94)	- DA	elence.	
												•		Passer	90
	***************************************													102.	
enote	in brackets whi	ich aubsiste	nce allowar	ice is being cla	med				TOTAL	225.	122			(5-)	
					PLEASE NOTE	AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF				(20)	
th to	which it rela	ates and n and/or det	nust be su ails of tolls	ibmitted pro , fares, etc cl	d correctly up to the emptly to the Democrat	lc Services Sec d 12 above	tion.			Pe	ald by:				
10	- Be War	19:1	Cllr	1) + (act)	son, con	and Cox									

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED NOJEMBER 2012 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AMI	Sin	ion	Lu	LC0	CLA	IM FOR MONTH	105				
			7000]	OL-	THE POR MONTE	1 UF		1	Victs"	- September, Ectober
Vas	Departur				Approved Duty		Retur	n to			To this control of
(1) ate	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Descript	(6) on of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le.car/van, motorcycle/	(10) No.of Miles	USING GOOGLE MAPS.
9	wested	1:30	2.00	Mords	Netve	with feel	Will	3-3)	Cor	24	OUT OF DATE
-		13 3c	4-00	. 16	Coox		♦ €	630		26	- GAVE APOLOGIES
1/9	u	6.30	7.00	16	SHEEF	lighting	re	230		26	OUT OF DATE
A A CO	10	2.00	2.30	10	Cot Dogo	Gerveran	2. 66	5.30		26	OUT OF DATE
10	11	2.00		11	Tracing	2 Coursel	u	6:30		28	22
14	V	9.00	9.30	lc	Traine	9 - Planning		5:00	10	28	22
)					
				,				, ,			_
											_
-											
											
-										56	44 NEW TOTAL
anote	in brackets whi	ich subsiste	nce allowand	e is being clai	med				TOTAL	1541	12 DIFFERENCE
PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF											
ui B	AUTICH ILIBISI	tee and m	rust de sub	mitted prom	iptiv to the Demo	he end of the calend craftic Services Secti	er ion			Pol	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
620 1	passengers a	ing/or defa	ils of toils, i	fares, etc clai	med in columns 1	and 12 above	,			Pan	d by:
12	1 x	-ch		and L	n - lub . 1 /	, 26 mil	ا حق				

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED JANUARY 2013 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



								0-1-61		
AME	Ru	ion	1/0		CLAIM FOR MONT	H OF		1340,07	- h 1.	de Dougestan Total
			- FC -	J .	OF THE LOW MICH I	ПОР		NOTE	uey	precuper, selvery.
	Departure				Approved Duty	Retu	m to			Travel and Subsistence
(1) ate	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (ie car/van,	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED
				i				motorcycle/ cycle	,	USING GOOGLE MAPS
10	Walash	200	3.30	March	Trouwer & Colymon	Wilgel	6-20	Lox	70	PAID IN NOV
		90	930		Typinian Planting) u	500	1 /.	22	PAID IN NOV
In	1/1	9.30	10.30	il	11 (Planning)	'n	1.30	· W	28	22
10		200	230	1.1.	1 Cottons		100	t	28	ATTENDANCE NOT RECORDED
In	N /	130	2.00	V	Boundage Mercin	11	3-30	VL.	22.	22
112	γl	1.30	5.00	71	11) 11	li	6-30	64	28	22
	4		100	u	Vanhing Tracerogs	. 14	5.00	(L	22	22
1	и	4.30	9.00	· u	Site tispertion	Ju.	4:00	V	20	27
1	u	100	2.30	le	Centino	K	6.00		23.	22
1	U		2.00	ll all all all all all all all all all	Planemy Taling	l'e	400	W	28	22
1/	H	1.30	2.30	MILLOURZG	Planting	10	11:00	11	35	.32
1	<i>(</i> '	2:50	3-00	weran	Briefwolorved	110	6.30		28	22.
enote	n brackets wh	lch subsiste	nce allowan	ice is being clai	med			TOTAL	543	208
D					PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	I DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	ZSY EAF	(51)
ith to	which it rela	tes and n	ust be su	bmitted pror	d correctly up to the end of the caler nptly to the Democratic Services Se imed in columns 11 and 12 above	ndar ction.			Pe	ald by:

CLAM FORM SYSMITTED MARCH 2013 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ADT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



ME	Sur	oh	lue		CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		Epber	ety.	March Z	013	
									31.			
1)	Departure		(4)		Approved Duty	Retur				Travel and Subsis	tence	
ita	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	Place Waterch	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	(11) Passenger Allowance in miles 150 per carried mile MILEAGE USING G	(12) Taxi, Public Transport, Parking VERAF	(13) Subsistence *(B, L, T, EM, 24hr)
2	Wassell	11:00	11.30	March.	Good Hent plouming		100	lar .	##9	22		
2	*	11.25	4.00	11	Course	11	630	£C.	27	22		
3	n	9.30	10.00	11.	tou flut	vi	11.30	Le	28	22		
										66 - (43)	VEW 100	TAL
	In brackets whi	ch subalate	nce allowan	ce is being cla	Imed PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLAI	RATIO	TOTAL	HOS NOS EAF			
n to	delay this cla which it rela	tes and n	rust be sul	bmitted pro	d correctly up to the end of the calen mptly to the Democratic Services Sec almed in columns 11 and 12 above	dar tion.			Pa	FOR OFFIC	CE USE ONLY	

Claims submitted for the financial year 2013/14

CLATM FORM SUBMITTED JULY 2013 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LUCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING AUT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AS	ME	Sev	won	14 1	wei	CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		40, 1	1	Ation & Design		
d	Denorture From												
1.						Approved Duty	Retur	n to			Travel and Subsistence		
(1 Da	ite	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5). Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, rnotorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Passenger Taxl, Public Subsistence MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MAPS		
1/	4	hisped	4	7.30	Moreh	Man Hom leaving	1000	11.00	Car	2	Il Did not return to wish		
9	-	и	2:00	3	4	a vot to dever	Capa	1 CO		25	CANE APOLOGIES.		
14	5	12 - VI	200		24:	Corwell	LPECE	19:00	. 71	73	11 Did not return to Wisb		
2	5	Land	12.00	2.00	ч	Cepart & Coursel	wale	\$ 30	, II	74	Il Not From Wistech.		
7	6	WUSLECK	1480	12.30	1 L	Grove Granford	и	2.00	· · ·	25	22		
	6	10		9-30	6.	Frod this we	bL	12-30	it	24	22		
?	6	И	10-30	11-00	u.	John Cosey	61	2.30	· (C	24	22		
2	6	u	3.00	3-30		Abetin Katiell	·8 L.	5.00	it	25	22		
17	6	и	2.30	3-00	11	about	H	7:30	H	24	22		
1	6	и	10-30	11.00	64	Armed Ferrer	Fl	130	. 40	25	27		
2	16	- 11	2.30	3-40	٠ ٢	Mosting - Logal	TL :	4.30	16	24	22		
Z	6	- 11	10-30	12.30	FL	Graham House	. 2.6	1830	ie.	25	22		
D	errote	In brackets whi	ich subsiste	ince allowen	ce is being cla	imed			TOTAL	44Z			
120	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF 209												
ar	reid into	Muicu it Leis	res and m	lust be su	bmitted pror	d correctly up to the end of the calend uptly to the Democratic Services Sect	ar fon.			Pt	209		
m	nea of passengers and/or details of toils, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above												



AME	>w	uch	K	net	CLA	M FOR MONTH	OF		July	1 2	013 (4	Part	August)
(1)	Departure From		Approved Duty (6)					1 to	Travel and Subsistence				
late	Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Description	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE USING C	VERIF RODGLE	MAPS	
17	Wille	46.00	7:00	Wides	Recep	froh	history	900	Car	43	16.Not F	rom w	nsbedh
\$1,7	Wasan	3-38	4.00	Morch	Moeter	y Kecherdy	11	8.00	• •	25	22		
117	U	12.30	1.00	la de la composition della com	Conscient	Course	u	7.30	e e	25	22		
117	n	3-30	4.00	Mesch	Alony	un .	it	53	(r	25	22		
18	4	2.30		n	Alan	fleu,	n.	5 100		25	22		
1/8	it	1.30	2.00		Gery Gr	doed	11	4.00	ìį	2.5	22		
8						0 .					126 1	lew Ti	otal.
											(42)	Affele	ence
8 2					<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					4 44 541 14 7-12 5		
Danote	in brackets wh	ich subsiste	nce allowan	ce is being cla	lmed			TOTAL 168					
PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF													
rath 3	which it rela	ites and n	nust be su	bmitted pro	d correctly up to aptly to the Dem	dar tion.	0	Paid by:					

FORM SUBMITTED SEPTEMBER 2013 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME Schon		Kive		C	CLAIM FOR MONTH OF				Acio	CUST	SPOR	ruba	+ Dito	River		
										0	1	- CPIO		10000	701	
"	Departure From				Approved Duty		Return to			Travel and Su	ibsisten	Ce				
(1) Date	(2) (3) Place Time		(4) Start Time	Start Place		(6) Description of Meeting		(7). Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles		PACIE	(12) IXI, Public Sub VERIF GOOGL		HPS
18	Merch	1.00	200	Wisk	1910	ou &	(all Bob	المعادر الما	2.00	Cax	17	×		—	~ ^1	4
1/8	Winforch	1.30	2.00	Morch	Decide	es Bill	west trees	Cual	12.00		1-0		NOI	From back t	~/ 20 e	ech,
1/2	Alexand	100	3.00	Choolerica	- 0	u		11)	13	6.3	100		V 57	/2 John		soech ?
1/8	Wastrah	12.00	17.30	Whother	4 Buch	war 1	essimon	6.0	2:00	1.0	32	V 3		الترشيد ١٦	9	2.
1/82	NI	1:30	2.00	Morch	Brid	ileo	1	u	5:30	1.7	25	22				
39	۲,	8.15	9.00	Cholons	CMI	J.		11	2.00	l.c	36-		36			
R	11	9.30	1.00)	Moson	Cabin	K 14	remeel	į,	6.30	f _z	25	22				
	tie	2-00	2.30	bi.	1025	all	EMA	11	5'0	16	25	22				
7/9	11	9.90		41	Noc	nello	n	n	10.15	11	25	22	•			
5/9	11	11.60	11.30	r.E.	Brie	KMER		u	3-30	"	25	22				
10	W.	3.00	3.30	н	Suffe	KARE	fueg (Alex	m) (c.	B00	15	27	22				
18	и	10.00		Coursel	HLF	Gar	u)	st.	3.30	u	98	8€				
Denote	in brackets whi	Ich subsiste	nce allowen	ce is being clai	imed	V					366				_	
										30	29	NEWT	STAI	-		
PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF (54) DIFFERENCE											CE.					
hth to	ivold delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar of															
nesof	passengers a	and/or deta	alis of tolls,	fares, etc cla	imed in colur	nne 11 and	12 above				- 1					

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED NOVEMBER 2013 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



VAME	Same Suion King CLAIM FOR MONTH OF October November 2013											
				J				V	0 0,00	7	November 2013	
	Departure From		Approved Duty			Retur	n to	Travel and Subsistence				
(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Description of	f Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Timei	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10)	MILEAGE VERIFIED (CUSING GOOGLE MARS)	
10	Wisko		9.30	Closofts	f (cum	rg /tamp	Waso	(3%	Cox	36.	V 36	
6/10	u	1.30	2.00	Maan	Marting	JOH GO BY	, le	130	11	26	22	
11/0	VL.	2.00	220	7 4	0450		11.	6.00	e ti	27	22	
6/10	n	5.20	6.00	1,	luce sol	ic by Meet	177	8.3	ίΓ	26	_ 22	
110	la .	4.60	9.30	1/ (/	Commet 1	ONT	1/	1.00	٧.	26	_ 22.	
3/6) <u>n</u>	6.70	7.30	Charles	Systemes	Society	16	10:00	11	39	_ 36	
\$10	N	2.30	3.00	-	Caronel	-10-/	11	6.00	. 14	27	_ 22	
2/10	N.	11.00	11.30		Moetingu	oshetty	-11	300	b ~.	29	_ 22	
1/10	и	3-00	-	A least		n nd	W.	8.30	11	26	_ 22	
77n	· ·	3.30		Charles	Caleur	12M7	u	5.00	11.	37	136	
-	<u> </u>	12.30	2.00	Mark B	Grafish	A David Mills	66	7.00	11	27	22	
Denote		4 1	nce allowan	ce is being dal	100	rucego	. (1	7-00	TOTAL	12	80 300) 100) 70-01	
	Denote in brackets which subsistence allowance is being dalmed TOTAL 321 3642 NEW TOTAL PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEASE STATEMENT OF TOTAL											
₂ D	TEACH TO LEAD OF DECEMBRITION OF ENLEAP											
avoid prittito	avoid delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar printing which it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section. The state of passengers and/or details of toils, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above											

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED NOVEMBER 2013 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NAME Swich King CLAIM FOR MONTH OF MOVEWBER, DECEMBER (Part												
	Departure From			Approved Duty				Travel and Subsistence				
(1) Date	(2) Place			(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles				
4	Wished	2:30	3.00	Mosch	Calonof	Notice	800	64	27	22		
6/1	41	9.00	3 30	n	Merting with Carry	n	5.00		26	22		
71	7 11	530	6.00	и	Cure Boccofies	16	\$ -00	11	28	22		
8/4	Karanahay		3:00	. 16	lesting with Gory	11	5:00	41	38	11 Not from Wishech.		
3/4	WUSER	6.30	7.30	Charlos	Charters Society	il	10:30		26	V 26		
fr		9.30		New	Planning / taling	1.1	200	al	27	22		
10		4,00	9.30		Cabant JamT	· (300	. 26	29	22		
1/17	u	11.00	11.30	ri	NEXTURNIBLES	ددد	430	6L	28	22		
7										<u>-</u>		
*								<u> </u>		-		
Deno	Denote in brackets which subsistence allowance is being claimed TOTAL 229 169											
PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF (60)												
TE® avoid delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar												
mes	mes of passengers and/or details of toils, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above											

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED JANUARY 2014 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME	1 Swen Kwa				0	CLAIM FOR MONTH OF				Dece	v7013, January 2014	
-			v:	J								
L.	Departure				Approved D	uty		Retur	nto.			Travel and Subsistence
(1) ate	(2) Place	(3) (4) (5) Time Start Place D		Dea	(6) Description of Meeting		(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MAPS.	
12	Pojo	3.00	3.45	Moren	Riche	de Co	ssiley	Combre	7.00	64	53	X Not From W. Sloech
2.7	Wisjea	12:30		N (then	Cabe	ust/	Course		1/20	Car	26	
	west life	12.00	2.30	l t	051	/		u	6.00	٠,	36	11 Not From Wisbech
1,1	Wiskon	3-700	3.30		Brue	eva		11	5.30	10.	25	22
1		5.30	6.00	. 12	Luci	Ju	sefug	<u> </u>	8.3	(c	26	22
15	h	12.30	1.30	Boto	(300	on Con	w Thou	a ca	5.45	- 10	44	vitt.
1	Pt.	2.30	300	Moran	Calso	not	· · ·	. 11	6.30	11	25	22
31	H	6.30	7.30	and the	Lu	ric/	Metro	3 6.	10.00	l i	36-	1/36
7/1	. 1/1	2.30	3-00	March	Bru	Lua		11	5.00	16	26	22
3/1	11	815	9.00	Choker	CNE	PIR	hund	ιι	1.00	/(35×	-/35
3/1	ξι	3.30	A'OC	March	Bru	fice	Mosio) Tellow	W30	· ic.	76	11 Not back to Disbech
3/1	£ į	10.15	11.00	White	9 Cets	the Six	Will Confu	in ll	12:30	· 16	32	√32
enote	In brackets wh	ich subsiste	ince allower	nce is being cla	imed		`	J		TOTAL	440	279 New TOTAL
Page					PLEAS	E NOTE	AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	27.9 New TOTAL DIFFERENCE
Ivoid delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar the power of the submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section. Pake open to the calendar promptly to the Democratic Services Section.												

Claims submitted for the financial year 2014/15

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NAM	- 12		17								
NAM	= 12 m	on	Kung			CLAIM FOR MON	TH OF		April		2014
	Departure				Approved	ed Duty Return to					
(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) (5) Start Place		h	(8) Description of Meeting		(8)	(9)	(10)	MILEAGE VERIFIED
	51	11110	Time	ridos	φ. υ	escription of Meeting	Place	Time	Mode and Class	No.of Miles	USING GOOGLE MAPS
									(le car/van, motorcycle/		
	<u></u>						_	.	cycle		
7/9	WHOW	2.00	230	Moren	02	5	Wisk	5-45	Cox	26	22
y/A	N	12:00	12:30	7/1	Mos	Sing with to	Ke n	2.30	и	27	22
ZA	SWEET	00-30	2:00	ıl	Coloc	ust -	٠,	3.30	. 11	52	II NOT FROM WISBECHI.
25 a	(NO	9.30	10.00	11	Não	and North Go	try 19	1.30	. 11	28	11 NOT FROM WISBECH.
29/4		6.45	10.00	Combine	d thou	do wood	n	6.30	LL	95	40 NOT FROM WISBECH
2	(1)	1220	1.00	Mordi	Plan	wwo	n	500	gt ·	27	II NOT FROM WISBECH
'		<u> </u>								,	
	·										117 New TOTAL (138) DIFFERENCE
											(33)
											(138) DIFFERENCE
* Deno	te in brackets wh	lich subsiste	ețice allowar	ice is being cla	ilmed				TOTAL	255] —
					0.5-	OF NOTE 4115		5.4 5. 0			_
					PLEA	SE NOTE AND SIG	in Decla	KATIO	N OVERL	EAF	•
NOTE			h	4-46-11				160			FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
month	u delay this cl to which it rela	arm must ates and n	De compk nust be su	bmitted pro	a correctly motiv to th	up to the end of the ca e Democratic Services	Section.				Pald by:
						lumns 11 and 12 above		٩Ś			
Ch .						•					

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED JULY 2014 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



ME	18,000	W	Live		CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		Mor	1,1	nue, July 2014,			
	Departure From Approved				Approved Duty	d Duty Return to			Travel and Subsistence				
ie e	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Placa	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MAPS			
5	Wished	3:30	400	North	Laptop Dtobletu	Wished)		Cov	27	22			
16	77"	0	1000	a.	Staff Comments	21.11		tl	26	22			
17	10	2.00	A.00	n	Correil	ارقيا		1.0	27	22			
1													
		-					ļ	·		[66 New Total			
-			ļ			·	· ·	ļ	ļ.	66 New Total			
i													
3		-						<u> </u>					
ınote	in brackets wi	nich subsist	ence allowar	ce is being da	limed ·		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	TOTAL	80	·			
				,	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIC	N OVERL	700				

0
rold delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar
to which it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section.
is of passengers and/or details of tolls, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
Pald by:		
		,

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED SEPTEMBER 2014 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



	Departure	Erom								1.
ŀ	(2)	(3)	(4)		Approved Duty	Retur				Travel and Subsistence
	Place	Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED By GOOGLE MAPS
	NOSCEN	16.00	16.30	Maron	Sommer	2	200	Cox	27	22
1	<u> </u>	15.30	16-00	Li	Coursel	Le	3.3		26	22
								·		
Ī									<u> </u>	
ı						-			 	
١							-			44 New Total
1	,						-		 	(9) Difference
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					· · · · ·		<u> </u>		
		-					ļ		}	
ŀ									 	
1						· ·				
				ce is being clai				TOTAL	53	

0	•
void delay this claim must be completed fully and cor	rectly up to the end of the calendar
in townich it relates and must be submitted promptly	to the Damocratic Services Section.
es depassengers and/or details of tolls, fares, etc claimed	In columns 11 and 12 above

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
Paid by:	

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED NOVEMBER 2014

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES



ME	SIM	ON	KING		CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		DETOB	ER 93	AND HOUEMBER 2014
	Departure	e From			Approved Duty	Retur				Marine Committee Com
1) ste	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class	(10) No.of Miles	MILETAGE VERIFIED USINGGOOGLE MAPS
3			12:30					(le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle		
0	WUBECK	12.00	12(0)	MARCH	1T HE LADSOD	WISREG	1.36	CAR	26	22
0	£4	A.00		C	Parl Medil	11	6.00	· /\	25	22
12		2.30	400		& Thomas	2014	930	-11	64	
10	. 14	9.30			Soution	VL	100	1.4	28	22
10	K	A 80	4.30	1.	1,		6.30	"(25	22
10	L ⁴	9.30	18.00	7/3	Staff Committee	21	12-30	·	23	22
te	h	3.30	A.00		lower	11	9.30	16 (66	22
tt	ıl	9.00	9.30	ıı	Tracening	u.	1.30	1.1	26	22
lu	h	1.00		į, t	Ols .	n	4.00	11 (43	22
14	1.1	400	4.30	۽ ٿ	BETWEET	11	600	. 11	20	22
e R				· ·						198 NEW TOTAL
note	in brackets wit	ich subsiste	ence allowan	ce is being cla	imed	J <u></u>		TOTAL	288	(90) DIFFERENCE

PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF

roid delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar in togethich it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section.

is of passengers and/or details of tolls, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above

Pai

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



	NAME	Suc	M	KIKLE	9	CLAIM FOR MO	NTH OF	DECE	UP	GID 721 1 1 1 2016
_							And the second second	Active to a second	112	MILEAGE VERIFIED
1	141	Departure				Approved Duty	Return to		<u> </u>	USING GOOGLE MAPS
	(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Piace	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) (8) Place Time	(9) Mede and Class	(40) No.of	
		RD			, 4g			fie parvan motorcycler cycle	Miles	
	1/12	W. T.	4.00	4.30	Merch	1 (potriguit	Re Word 63	lor	30	II NOT FROM WISBECH.
/ /	3/12		12:30	1.30	· ii	013 / 18	14 63		43	II NOT FROM WISBECH.
1	8/12	LEB)	2.80	A'CK	и	lowell		2' (02	IL NOT FROM WISBECH
2	5/1	THO,	8:30	9.30		085	u	i u	38	II NOT FROM WISBECH
i	3/1	MAN THE CO	1.30	2.00	11	ROBERION.	18 A 7.4	e l	76	I NOT BACK TO WISBECH
į	28/1		9 00	1000	.11	Staff Cohne	XX 200)	73	X NOT TO OR FROM WISBECT
	29/1	(RL)	330	4:30	17	Serman	63	0 11-	74	XNOT TO OR FROM WISBEA
					·.					
					;					-
					· .			111, 111-1		55 NEW TOTAL
										(353) DIFFERENCE
ĺ		1		<u> </u>						3333
	* Deno	te in brackets wi	alch subsist	tence allows	nce is being cl	aimed		TOTAL	410	
						DI FACE MOTE 4500		Markin.		
-						PLEASE NOTE AND	SIGN DECLARATI	UN OVERI	EAF	
	NOTE	id delay this c	ialm mus	it be comi	leted fully si	nd correctly up to the end of the	a calandar	**		FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
g .	month	to which it rel	ates and	must be a	ubmitted pro	omptly to the Democratic Service	es Section.			Paid by:
7	Names	or passengers	and/or de	etells of toll	s, fares, etc c	laimed in columns 11 and 12 abo	Ve-		- 1	

Claims submitted for the financial year 2015/16

WHITTOWN UNDINITIED NPKIL 2015

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



N/	ME	SIM	CH	KIKKE	•	CLAIM FO	R MONTH	OF		Febru	aky .	March, April
_		Departure				Approved Duty		Retur	1 to	. 11. 1		MILEAGE VERIFIED
0	1) ate	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Pface	(6) Description of Mee	ding	Place	(8) Time	Mode and Class (je carivan, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	USING GOOGLE MAPS.
3	2	WUBECH	3.00	4.30	March	So what.		Weshell	6 00	lar	25	22
	2	'n	1230	1.30		005		Jane 198	5.30	7. 4.	26	22
ğ	2		12.00	1:30	£3	vi e		. N	545	4	22	22
Ė	12	. 11	3:50	400	100	Conveil	1. 1. 1.	1.4	10.0	in sec	29	22
1	Z	K	2.00	2.30	64.		white	LA	530	. n	26	22
9	13	PiBoro	13,00	5.06	Warteck	Streetprick	(PAR	400	ic	69	X NOT FROM OR BACK TO
_	1.								1		1	MISBELH
_			<u></u>									
_						· .			11.			110 NEW TOTAL
_												(97) DIFFERENCE
												1 97 311 612
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>			·						1
Denote in brackets which subsistence allowance is being claimed TOTAL 2c7												
-					•	PLEASE NOTE	ND SIGN	DECLA	RATIC	N OVERL	EAF	·.

OTE					
o a wid delay this claim must be completed fully and	correctly up to t	he end of t	he cái	iend:	A.F
longs to which it relates and must be submitted prom	ptly to the Demo	cratic Serv	ices :	Sect	lon.
ames of passengers and/or details of folls, fares, etc clair	ned in columns 1	1 and 12 ab	ove		
<u>o</u>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		1.		
. 12					

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY											
Paid by:		. 12	1	 .							

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME	SIM	ORIK	ING		CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		MAY	Ju	R. Ruly
								/		
(1)	Departure		- 40		Approved Duty	Retur				Travel and Subsistence
Data	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Passenger Text, Public Subsistence (: MILERGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MARS
15	Wisbeet	2.30	4.00	Morda	Course	Wester	6 -∞	Cox	26.	22
35	N	4.45	10.00	Typa	John fosfor	v	11.30	. 6(17	14
16	(Kil)	9.00	9.30	Merch	Justwal agust	81	400	u	47	11 - NOT FROM WISBECH
16	(KD)		12:30	11	Bary & Wendy	u	4.00		48	11 - NOT FROM WISBECH
16	(11)		11.00	Tund	State Borclay	16	1.00	£ C .	18	7 - NOT FROM WISBECH
16	(1)	3.30	A100	March	Sermar)	11	6.00	LL	26	11 - NOTFROM WISBECH
16	Hursty	18.00	2-30	11	Canquet ,	House	9.00	и	72	X NOT FROM OR TO WISBECH
46	Photos	J-30	6.00	Cacup	Musoric Ecopsed	11	11.30	u	106	X NOTFROM OR TO WISBECH
16		130	2.00	WAFO	Street proces	PROVE	B15	110	67	X MEETING IN WISBECH
16	Michal	18:30	9.00	Metan	Turoraud Cabent	2 1	200	Ιί	25	11 NOT BACK TO WISBECH
1/6	Real Port	8-00	-	MOSEN	Gery & Werky	LOVE	5.30	. i(135	X NOT FROM OR TO WISBECH
47	Wisher !	2.00	Z.30		050	Wester	15-30		26	, 22
Nanot	e in brackets wh	nich subsist	ence allowar	ice is being da	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	i DECLA	RATIO	TOTAL N OVERL	615 v EAF	109 NEW TOTAL
nth A	delay this co	ates and r	must be su	bmitted pro	od correctly up to the end of the caler mptly to the Democratic Services Se almed in columns 11 and 12 above	ndar				_ (506) DIFFERENCE

CLANT FORM SUBMITTED JULY 2015 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

nes of passengers and/or details of toils, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above



ME	12 (M	CH	KINE	T	CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		July.	16n	<i>x.</i>)		
	Departure			. /	Approved Duty	Retur	ı to	<u> </u>	<u></u>	Travel and Subsis	tence	
e	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(6) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motoroycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	(11) Passenger Allowance in miles (5p per carried mile per passenger) (Please also complete box below)	(12) Taxl, Public Transport, Parking	(13) Subsistence *(8, L, T, EM, 24hr)
7		9.00	9.30	North	FACT	Wasted	2:30	Cox	24	22	Y	
7	11	100		l.c	CRP 1	L	12-30	11	25	22	الأفرار أأما	Per La
7	- 11	11.00	11.30	įt.	Capacit & course	u	7.30	(1 '	28	22	. Par	
11	n	2.45	3.00	11	Richard Cossidy	11	530	. L(24	22	3.3 李	TEN HATE
										(88) N	EW TO	RENCE
										(13)-1	214te	KFNCE
ote	in brackets wh	nich subalst	ance allower	ice is being cla	lmed			TOTAL	101	1 16 1		
					PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	.EAF			
Page 6	delay this c	laim must	be comple	eted fully an	d correctly up to the end of the caler mptly to the Democratic Services Se	ndar etion				FOR OFFI	CE USE ONL	Y

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

ith to which it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section.

ies of passengers and/or details of tolls, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above



AME	BULL	MO	KIN	G	CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF	•	3464	CONT.	1 AUGUST 2015
	Departure				Approved Duty	Retur	n to			
(1) late	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(8) Description of Meeting	(7) Piace	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (ie car/van,	(10) No.of Miles	USING GOOGLE MAPS.
1.								motorcycle/ cycle		
17	MISSER	9.00	4.30	MUH	FACTO	WISDER	200	GAR	32	
1	WAREG	1.00	11.30	MANCE	Californa Bicelina	Wille	23h	CAR	26	22
78	11	9:00	4. 30	1.0	Informal Coline	tx:	温·30	,(27	22
18	6.	9.30	10.00	4 (Catal Pelson	le	12:00		27	201 48 2013 2013 2013
18	11	1000	10.30	Typa	toster property	11	12.00	10	10	VIO.
12	il va	10.00	10.30	MARCH	RAIL BIDDERS	11	130	14	26	22
7	ι,	12.30	(.00	1/140/10	a street lights	ti.	9.00		3	/3
ति	n	2:00	230	South kell	Berynar	W.	5.30	1	26	22
19	16	436	4.30	u	Nomber Alloward		600	BUS	20	The second secon
19		8-35	9.30	u	Informal Cascust	70	5.30	Vl.		
lanoti	in brackets wh	lich subaist	ence allowan	ice is being cla	imed			TOTAL	172	145 NEW TOTAL (27) DIFFLEENCE
					PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	(27) DIFFERENCE
E	Printer this cl	alm must	ha comak	atad fully an	d competitues to the and of the col-					FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

20

Paid by:

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED SEPTEMBER 2015 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

 Fenland
CAMBRIDGESHIRE

₩	1214	COM	10	des	CLAIM	OR MONTH	OF		SEPY.	COP	(T), OC	1,20	15	
									1 10					
	Departure				Approved Duty	Return to					Travel and Subsistence			
8	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(6) Description of	Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycla/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MICHAN	e verin Goorle	MARS	
?	WISBERT	(Z-30)	1-00	MARCH	(about	Council	WEBRC	7:00	GAR	28	22		T.	
9	U.	17.30	2.00	Compres	CFT		13	600		116	80	***		
G	U	5.30	6.00	CLARCHE	CRP		u	230	11	27	22			
00	R. 2401	10.00	10 30	11	ROB Bride	Ne ·	Kehi	130	*(50	NOT FROM	M OR TO	WISBECH	
No. 2	9/09/15	expire to clearly	5:57 CIGHILI 131765:	p. Fee 2	CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL DEPART 10/15 5:57 Paid McLD. 50 CRSHIL1	E AND SIGN	I DECLA	RATIO	TOTAL	22 (EAF	1214 (97)-	NEW T DIFFER 2-50	OTAL	
fron	n ouiside of vehi	cie. NOT IK	t be comp	leted fully a	nd correctly up to the	and of the cale	ndar				FOR OF	FICE USE ONLY	·	

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED DECEMBER 2015

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NAN	ΙE	Sem	or in	Rive	7	CLAI	M FOR MONTH	OF		OCT (PAR	T) NOUPERT)
).							7
		Departure		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Approved Duty		Return	1 to			Fravel and Subsistence
(1) Deta		(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Description	(5) n of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le carivan, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Passanger Task, Public Substitutes MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MAPS.
7/10	2	WIEBELH	9.30	10.00	MIRCH	TAG		DISBEA	1.00	CAR	26	22
21	0	ğ-(1.00	2.30	· L	058		66	5.00	*	27	22
161	0		9.30	10.00	. 54	CRP	0	10 66 1	1.00	1.5 4. 10	26	12
19/1	0	ţ.	2.30	3.00		David	Bocley	\$1	43	1 V	26	22
22/1	0	43		2.00	\$c	Cabino	チノノ	4.5	6:00	W.	27	22
29/	10	. Ch. 1	2.30	3.00	υĹ	Cobine	-/somine	1.46	23	. 17	27	22
Z		DOWNA	12-45	1.30	j t	CRPN	18 ETING	Doct	MA	16	40	not from or to home.
544		1600 make	230	4-00		Course	1	TE PO	长野美	1	170	WAS NOT PAID.
31	-	WEBECH	17:00	12:30	12	morna	Court	WS	十五	. 16	27	22
12/1	4	1	1.00	130	16	IRP.	100	16 16	万克		26	22
17/	1	13	7.30	10.30	とかれまる	y Meedib	whoma place	e cc	1.36	11	33	32
18	ti.	16	17.30	1.00	Merch	COR S	simular (1 16	33		26	22.
* 03	nole	in brackets wi	nich subalet	ance allower	nce is being of	imed .		7.		TOTAL	38	
						DI 2402 4	OTE AND SIGN	Interi e	DATE	ia estatina	31	230
						PLEASE N	DIE AND SIGN	DECLA	RAIR	NA CAEKT	EAT	- (81)
HOT	E	ت مراجع ومراجع ا	lates sissed	Min 1		of an income difference in					, ,	
INOU	h to	which it rel	ates and o	unat pe ar	oned nuny ar somitted pro	mptly to the Dem	the end of the caler ocratic Services Se	otton.			Pa	ů
lare	8 0	passengers	and/or da	tails of tiolis	, fame, etc c	almed in columns	11 and 12 above	=,4				

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED DECEMBER 2015

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



Travel and Subsistence MILEAGE VERIFIED ASING GOOGLE MAPS 110 112 7 22
S 110
8 110
7 22
7 22
143-New Total
- (35)-DIFFIRENCE
3 4-3
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY Paid by:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME	Sur	00	Kin	3	CLAIN FOR MONTH	OF		Nov(af	Dre (Part) Ton (Port)
	Departur				Approved Duty	Return				
(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(3) Plece	(8) Description of Meeting	Pleas	(a) Time	(9) Mode and Clean (le car/war, motorcycle/ cycle-	(10) No.of Miles	
CI	Walton	11.00	4.00	March	Coursel	Wind	2.30	Cox	70	-decorate probability
12	и	1015	11.15	it.	wondy off	1 Lake	1.30	Ħ	42	
12	n	9.30	1000	KL_	laureng/ so cua	tt:	1.30			- Attended on behalf of
1/2	Webjech	12.00	4:00	Moren	Someker .	LL	2.00	COUN	16	
1			± (()).			71				22
1	f i	9.00	9.30	11	Tour HALRES	1.1	4.30	1.1	171	
1/1	n	7.30			TAG	((4-27	a.	35	
		1	<u> </u>							
	<u> </u>		 				-		ļ.	
	ļ		1				-			
lenot	e in brackets w	hich aubala	berice ellows	noe in being di	imed .		1	TOTAL	305	the do Total
		,		•	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGI	V DECLA	RATIC			1 44 New Total 7 Difference
					nd correctly up to the end of the cale unpity to the Democratic Services Se laimed it columns 11 and 12 above	ndar				ald by:
	125									

Claims submitted for the financial year 2016/17

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED MAY 2016

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME	Saus	er.	lung	<u> </u>	CLAIM FOR N	CMT	12.1		-	- Document					
			3		OLJUNI FOR N	IONTH	OF		Jan 1	Dest	1 4	es (p	ref)		
	Departur	e From			Approved Duty		Retu		·	, ,					
(1) Dete	(2) Pleca	(3) Time	(4) Stert	(ii) Place	(5)		(7)	(6)	(3)	1084	Travel	and Subsit	stance		
			Time	PINOS	Description of Meeting		Place	Time	Mode and	(10) No.of	P	MILE	HAE	VERIF	E
	COLLEGE	•]			电动频等		(le carivan,	North	(Sp. pe	USIN	a Go	ogue a	AAPS
1.	5/	n							motorcycle/ cycle	1 3	Place			<u> </u>	
1.	Laborator A	\$ 00	2.00	Morda	CRP	X.	Which	500	lese:	£75°	alo .	22			
	COURS LOVE	100	200	<u> </u>	160		- 11		(40-		200	77	.0.01	-00:1	
4	Western	12:30	1.00	12 K	Serverar	4	67	4 2			-	was:	ryot	paid	
10	44	9.00		15 11	FACT	:	2 4	6:30	11	27	-	22		_	
7	16 3	230	230	£4.	920	~		/ 00		26	- 1	22_			
7,	11200	2.00	2.30	j.			11	5-30	10	26		22	<u> </u>	- Carr	
1	724	140	2-00		Carelle		41	7:00	18.0	26	~	22		_	
17.	Carried to			e e				420	1.5	26		Was	not	Paid	
2//	1123000			Vet 1900	A47	X	P. I.C.	6:00	U	158	110	not a	TYON	Paid LHOME	55
10	No stay	•	2.00	BLOCK	Total Transper	1	11113	6-00	10	39		80			
4	I late	7:00	7.30	Benevi	Street Light	# LUB	4 5 3	1000	i je e	35		V35	5		
		9.60		Noun	Nich Hotaling	K		730	ite de	35	26	22			
du	Werray	· 1	7.50	Lt.	Cabcust		મ	200	(5	26		22			
STRUCT I	n brackets whi	in Subelete	708 allowend	te in being clas	med		7 3, 13	,	TOTAL	579		32	1	EN TO	stal
					The State of the S						\$5		7 7	lew to Differe	
P		<u>. </u>			PLEASE NOTE AND	Sign L	DECLA	MITO	V OVERL	EAF	1-4	(43) '	السين الر	
E G	inless thin also	lote ourself t						ŝ				-	-		
				18 F 11 - 1 - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	correctly up to the end of the pily to the Democratic Service	الاستبسال حجم	Pr Corp.				d by:				
1990 600 1	Masserigers at	nd/or deta	is of tolla, t	eres, etc clai	med in columns 11 and 12 above	/9				Pa	a. oy ;				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
						1.75	12								- 1

CLAIMFORM SUBMITTED MAY 2016

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



IAME	7		77							
	Suis	5h	K in	0	CLAIM FOR MC	ONTH OF	N E.	506/	0004	11- (12-6)
	Departur	e From			Approved Duty		Albania da		PC * 1), Merch (part)
(1) Date	(2)	(3)	(4)				um to .		på .	Travel and Subsistence
LAGIO .	Place	Time	Start Time	(5) Place	Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(8) Mode and Class (le car/van, motorcycle/ Cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED GUSING GOOGVENAPS
12	WOR	400	4.30	Marc	William 1621	fire 11 kd	ha		0	
1/2	ft	To co	4000	11	Corner	1	600	Cert	27	22
1/2	11	1.00	1.30	. 11	Course Course	de la	4000	1.1	26	22
12	le.	12:30	1.00	ELU	Hatroth Rep 16	NEW II	700		28	22
12	<u> </u>	000	200		The May 2000		30	£1	30	√30
3	(4	11.00	(1.30)	Mars	FSP PLO LANGE	V 16	536	LC	00	1 APOLOGIES GIVEN -NOT PAID
3	EL	11.00	11.30	Li	AAT	, (C	700	4.1	26	22
3	u.		3-00	10	Executor	(5	7.30		27	. 22
MMM	a			Not well	XING ON D.	L. u	5 cc	. (26	22
13	fe .	2	3.30	March	ROLLING ROLLING	0 60		100	107	V107
3	1	545	6.00	66	TRP J	9 16	73		26	22
13		1200	200	11	FSP	X U		76	27	
รางกับ In	braciostalismic	h subeletan	co allowence	e le being clain	ned	6 1 0	5.30	TOTAL	3	2 22
									774	- 335 - NED TOTAL
- D					PLEASE NOTE AND SI	IGN DECLA	RATION	V OVERLE	AF B	7 (41) - DIFFERENCE
Page de la volumenta	ley this cist	m must be	o complete	ed fully and initiad prom	correctly up to the end of the co	elender				
DE OF PE	sesongers en	dior details	s of tolls, fa	res, etc clair	ned in columns 11 and 12 above				Pai	
(1)	d ca	tet (CK							

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED MAY 2016

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



AME	Scure	The f	live			CLAIN	FOR MO	HTMC	OF.		Marc	1 (2	+t	1. Asid	(art)	ŀ
	Departure	From		*	Approve	d Duty			Retur	n to			Travel	and Subsistence		}
(1) lata	Places	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place		(8 Description	of Meeting		(7) Place	7) (8) (9) (10 éce Time Mode and No. Class (le carivan, motoroycle/ cycle			Allow MILEAGE VERIFICATION USING GOOGLE A			NAPS.
3	(= = 1	330	10.00		6	rde-	Son	حلي	LEAN	2-10	64	35	<u> </u>	was n	erpaid	
4	Wisto	1900	9.30	**	Cal	cus	2	-	LC :	1.30		27		22		
4	11	2.30	3.00	Ec	Se	ruei	int.		LL	6.00	14	27		22		
															80	
- 10 m	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEADS PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEADS PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEADS Please not must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar in columns and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section. In complete and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section.															

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



			, ,										CAM	BRIDGESHIRE
横E	Dui	54	Kin	87.		CLAIM FOR MONT	U OF		*			_		
- n	J		_	<i></i>		- THOM FOR	n UF		April	Post	- Made	100	(-)	2016
	Departur				Approved D	kuty	Retu							-0(0
3	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start	(5) Place		(6)			4		Travel and Subals	tenes		
			Time	- 1000	De	soription of Meeting	(7) Pinos	(8) Time	(9) Mode and	(10) No.af	Passe /			****
							TI-		(le carivan,	Miles	Allowence (5p per ca	-E 14	ME	VERIGIED
	40.1								motorcycle/ cycle	.1.	per pass U.S.	NG	Git	DOGLE MAPS
2		9.30		Much	TAG		Week	12.30	Car	26	box b			774110
13	, , , ,	0.30	1(.00	U	Deput	betug K. GESCAL		17.20	te	-	22			
Y		1.00	1.30	1.4.	Merci	Wellow P		4.00		27	. 22			
7	t.	880	9.00	L	Working	N Harding		*		30	22			
$\langle \Delta \rangle$	11	9:30	10.00		00	110101	10	11:00	C.C	26	22			•
V	1	900	930	Ľ.	SAM	ACM	10	1.00		26	22			
1	KL	345	4.3	- 13	12.00	a D D. You	· ·	1.00	e t	27	22			
	1	2.00	7	12.15		A. S. C.	и	£30		4.2	Was	n	0F	Paid
	Wilson	2:30	2 mmc)	More	DE	-		500		66	Was	Sr	Wh	Paid
		9-3-	19-2	There	11000	- /1/ 0/2-	W A	530	и	27	22			
V	Dellock	1-15	7,20		Dasily	Coursel Man		100		60	Was	NC	31- (Paid ·
7	1 51	1.00	2.30		POTEN	17.001.	WARE	9:20	LC J	40	35			
Title 1	n brackets whic	an subelisten	ica aliquiry	The balance of	- Bear	taus post	K	600	LL	95	80			
				~ ≈ तमान <u>ी छआ</u>	nred .	.₩			TOTAL	49		10		lew total
					PLEASE	NOTE AND SIGN	DECLAS			0	1) 	EN KOISI
*	U							A HOI	OVERL	AF -	5	5	}	Difference.
14 6	bley this cla	im must b	re complet	ted fully and	correctly ma	to the end of the calend		4						-
ry.	क्षणका है। जिल्हा विकास के स्थापक	ndfor date:	att be eith	mitted pron	ptly to the D	to the end of the calent emocratic Services Sec ins 11 and 12 above	tion.			Peld	l by:			
Ì	27		or or united!	mas, an cia	med in colum	ns 11 and 12 above	1.41.14				The state of the s			And the same of th
10										-				

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



Æ	Sum	ru	Live		GLA	UM FOR MONTH	OF		Weel	Part	Merce	e (Post)	anti	
	Departure	From			Approved Duty		tall	/	J				2016	
	(2)	(3)	(4)	****			Return	n to	· · ·	1 1	Travel and Si	ubalstance	·	·]
	Place	Time	(4) Start Time	(6) Place	Descrip	(d). Bon of Masting	Plooe	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (is can/van, motoroyols/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	(11) Pessenge Allowance in 1 (5p per samler per pesseng (Presse also so	MILEA By GO	QE √€	eified MPS
1	Mabook		CP-30	Morch	Mexime	WOHER	Webel	12.00	Car	26	box below	22		
}	U. N N.	2.30	3.00	į.e	600 000	Loweil	u	7.00	. t.	27	15	22		
5	Charles All	1.30	3-00	L*	146			MA	u	83		was	MAP	bic
34	MARCH V	5 19	9:30	LE STATES	1	Fup W. Off	iteres	1.30	L	40		V40		
1	Ge t	400	-6-05	AME	Constitute of			700	· W.	50		NOS W	OF PE	lid
!-		400	4-6G			lastic -	700 J.	400	LL.	39		Hesm	39 tc	3101
}_	- IA	10 20	1 2		7//-27/		Lord	Table 1	and the last	61		WOS 1	101 P	व्यंव ।
7	flict	3.00	فرورت كالمالية	March	Mercup	W. OGUET	ye or thank	1	11	33 (3	9		-	
2	() where	9-30			Marine	6-601/00	Wabic	130	,, I.(13		11		
	Cotobios	9.20	10.00		1/20/1/20/	O Care has	LARIN		21	26		27		
Į.	A.A.	12-00	August . arimuta	to be a second		L Daniel	14	600	CA.	27	2 ·	72		
(a)	r brackets wh	ich aubelete		ce in being die				00	TOTAL	ALL		was n	<u>o</u> t pa	ud:
	•					TEN W. AND THE			. 1		13	150-	New	total
					PLEASE N	OTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF \	7-2	(22)	DIFF	elence
13	STEDNESSEC	res suc II	ills of tolls,	ensitted pres	nptly to the Dain	the end of the calend locatic Services Sec 11 and 12 above	far tion.			Pesi	FOI d by:		ment byster or a . wire allegger obs	

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



Deb (3		From	745		Approved Duty	Return	to	12.		Travel and Subsis	tence	
Pla	D8	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(8) Description of Mesting	Piace	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (le car/ven, motorcycle/ dycle	(10) No.of Miles	Passenger Allowence in miles MUEAGE MCING G	(12) Tani, Public Transport	Substitute */R T
CC	M()			March	PHB.	WLIPC	600	Car	28	22		
ارانا	Took.	12.00	12.30	14	Coursel	l(7.00	= 60	20	22		
		-1-690-	2-00		Meeting W. Off	7	3.45		42	Wasn		-
413		2:30	4:30	- LL	FOUNCY MAKEN	127/5	200		25		3)- P	
						na uci t				and the same of th		
										- T	New Diffe	1
							-			109	DIA.	ريد
			-		APT.		1.		11			T
												1
							.5		-			
							5	,			İ	1
							:				/	
oraci	eta whi	en gubalatu	now ellowen	oe le being clui	med 1			TOTAL .	130		2 60	-
					PLEASE NOTE AND SK	ON DECLAR	ATIO	V OVERL	EAF S	54		
					correctly up to the end of the ca					FOR OFFICE	E USE ONL	,

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED OCTOBER 2016 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



MANN	Jun	Ju v	Lwa			CLAIM FO	R MONTH	OF	1	wull.	uf	·		
										الوا	7102			
(1)	Departur				Approved	Duty		Retur	n to			Travel and Subs	sience	
Date	Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	۵	(6) Jescription of Ma	sting '	(7) Pince	(8) Time	(0) Mode and Cleas (le carivan, motorcycles cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEY	HOE VERIF	IED VAPS.
[7]	Wistoch	130	2.00	Morch	MPE	two west	carch	Willed	500	Cor	26	22		
17	ા	6.30	7.00	No-str	Marke	M 1254	of when	= ()	93	11	10	V 10	-	
17	li.	9.30	10.00	March	CRA		J	te.	1.00	- 14	27	22	•	
1	10	1230	1.30	Poto	147	Allea	vec	ic.	6.00	4.	55	45	-	
1,7	પ	230	4.00	Mordin	500	uchst		LE	8.00	16	26	22	•	
17	14	12.30	200	· K	Caba	up for	wel	127	630	200	27	22	_	
17	u	6.45	1715	Tugo,	Mark	wo ras	test bee	C II	1000	11	28	14	-	
2/7	11	12:30	1.80	MARCH	20	20/60	ne hou	by u	430	K	10	2	_	
77	1-	9 00	9:30	Morch	FAS		V	ય	1000	Fc	26	22		
777	Vi	100	1.30	le	Port	434	LCLEUS	LC	5-00	Li	27	. 22	-	
7	- Annual Control	15-50	2400		Min plant	The part		and the	Service .		80	·	_	
10	in brackets wit			3-3/		Colonia Coloni	- u							
	THE STREET, ST	ariti aritinish		का १४ क्ष्मांचे क्ष	ILI SEL			1000		TOTAL	260,	207	3 New t	late
					PLEAS	SE NOTE A	ND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	(57	3 New to	rence
nen k	MUTCH IS LOT	stes and n	nust be su	bmitted pror	nptly to th	up to the end e. Democratic	Services Sec	dar			Da	id py:		
Trans o	passengers	and/or det	ails of totis,	farea, etc cla	imed in col	lumns 11 and 1	2 above							
														/6

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED OCTOBER 2016 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

lames of passengers and/or datails of toils, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above



N	AME	Kui	The state of	two		C	LAIM FOR	TACMS	i OE	1	4	Con Co	2 /0 /		- Marine sing
_)				- 101-01411	TOP		Accepts	217	ept (Port)		
	***	Departure				Approved D	uty		Retur	n to			Travel and Substate	RNO	
	(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Des	(6) cription of Mag	ing ·	Place	(3) Time	(8) Mode and Clacs (le cer/van, motoroycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Panneruner A MILEAG	(12) (13) Taid Public Reduction E VERIFIE OGUE MAPS	D
2	9	Wedlech	9.00	9:30	March	talor	wella	beut	Lidad	100	Car	27	22		
9	3	VL	3 400	3-30	ن	Marin	o walk	Gotu	11	5-30	11:	26	22		
红	18	V.	3.00		Sc	Copin	28	J	ec.	19.30	The state of the s	27	72		
16	4	į L	8-30		K.L.	L.WA	fatore	wigs	115	4.30		35	30		
	13	1,	300	3 30	March	Petf	dio Ri	صارات	MIL.	6.00		26	22		
3	12	10	6-15	7.00	0000	The Street	et Lin	رزار		10-00		335	32		
2	[8	e.L	6-30	7.00	Negurior	upper	4 HOLL	446	Lilly			10	10		
6	19	1 3.16	630	7.00		11	7 1000	Ju		99	C.	10	10		
É	*		(2)						W 4 //			1.1.			
12	10	Wasto	6.30	25 440	held	Sen LL	- AA	L.	Un Po			30	24		
16	7.(11	17.2	11.00	VOCTOR	14		-we	1	1.00	11	27	22		
1	Denote	in brackata wh	ich subeist	12'00	no le belog de	Call the	ET LET	will.	11/1	6.30	TOTAL	26	22		
					THE IS STORING THE					* *.	TOTAL	£17.	238	3 New 7	rotal.
						PLEASI	E NOTE A	nd Sign	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	(41)	3 New 7 DIFFE	ence
to	TE Wold	delay this cl	leim must	be compl nust be ea	eted fully en ibmitted pro	d correctly u	p to the end o	of the calen	day			Pit	ald I	-,	

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED OCTOBER 2016 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NAME	>C.	<i>5</i> 04	Km	3	1	CLAIM	FOR MO	NTH	OF		CPP	F(t	ert, Oct (Part)
441	Departur				Approved	Duty		1	Retur	n to			Tre
(1) Date	Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	D	(6) secription o	/ Meeting		(7) Platon	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (is carrivan, motorcycle/ syste	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED MUSING GOOGLE MAPS
99	Wester	15:30	6.00	Check	CR	6		77.	Webe	2.3	Car	20	22
2/9	13	6-00	6.30		3-10-60	sh G	Late	200	ιć	730	The state of the s	27	22
60	14	230	3-00	11	Part	Liz E	r Alexander	9	ilc :	53	Le :	27	22
7/9	11		330		Mess	wa L	JAR R		11	5-00		26	22
3/10	11	2.00	2.30	N.	OX.	UZ			a.	400	10	27	22
4/10	U.	9:00	430	- 64	140	twe	Carpo	4	111	100	- ((26	22
510	Ü	(Orac)	11.30	(DIO)	77.48	IT	muliby	4	V.	Salec	. در	96	80
39	1.1	3-00	3.30	Mesch	WPI	day	Otter		/ { (; .	5-00	I.L.	27	22
1									,				And Management of the Control of the
* Denote	in brackets w	nich aubsieh	ence atlower	ca is being de	imed						TOTAL	284	(50) Difference
					PLEA!	SE NOT	E AND S	IGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	(50) Difference
iOTE o g rok	delay this co	taim must	be comple	rind fully an brilliad pro	d correctly	up to the	end of the o	calend s Sect	er ión.			D.	ald by:
lenzes c	f passengers	and/or del	alls of tolle,	faree, etc ch	sizned in co	umna 11 a	and 12 above						34

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED JAN 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

ternes of passengers and/or details of tolls, ferse, etc delmed in columns 11 and 12 above



NAME		- 1/										A	
NAME	1 Dun	ou /	ung		CL	IM FOR MONTH	I OF		100 C	Part)	1 DEZ (Pa	*	
	Departure	From			Approved Duty		Retur	n to			Travel and Subsis	tence	
(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) ?une	Start Time	(5) Place	Descrip	(6) fron of Moeting	(7) Piace	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Class (a car/van, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAC	GOOGLE	FIED
811	Willed	9.30	9.30	March	Caracas	- wornal	Super	1.00	lox	27	22		
拉山	η.	2.30	D-00	1	Some	ا مد	N.	600	. (1	27	22		
MIN	44	2000	230	U.	Cowal	& Colours	14	6-00	10.7	27	22	_	
S. Lu	N	230	3.00	N	Sover	ax .	N	6.00	. 11	29	22	_	
24-4	. n	1030	1.00	N	Partiou	o Bridge	T. N.	1.30	V	5	22	_	
30/n	U	1.00	1-30	N	025		Įi.	130		27	22	•	
zalic	it	430	4.60	N	Bory 6	OX/SIOL:	ાત્	11.00	n	27	22	_	
29 u	14	2.80	2530	A STATE OF	a called	PURRELLA	鉄	1030	М	20	4		
647	N	8.15	10-00	T CONTROL	127	Massey	24	4.30	V	147	1.110		
9/12	n	9.60	4.90	March	twon	a laws	· M	200	N.	34	122		
2/12	h	11.00	1200	Constant	THAN!	Boughor	n.:	3.00	71	30	80	_	
19/12	fi	12:30	2.00	Morch	Rescust	(owww)	从	530		21	1 22	-	
Denot	e in breakets wi	hich subsist	tence allows	nos is being di	nimed				TOTAL	1	1 20	2 New	total
1-4					PLEASE	NOTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	_ (12:	2) Dif	feera
						to the end of the cale				.			

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED JAN 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NAME		- 1										
INDONE	Sum	in 9	ive			CLAIM FO	R MONTH	OF	Y	Late 6	41	act Nov (Post)
[D							2 =		J	<u> </u>	(100 (400)
(1)	Departure (2)		145		Approved			Retur	n to			Travel and Subsistence
Date	Place	(3)	(4) Start	(5) Place		(6) Description of Mea	tino	(7) • Plece	(B)	(9)	(10)	(11) ((2) (13)
			Time					1,000	1 HIZING	Mode and Class	No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED
,										(le car/van, motoroycle/		USING GOOGLE MAPS
in in	Washed	ana	930	1/4	01-1-	- 11	2 0/	1.5	-	Cycle		
2010		3-30		March	2000	on Mark	西州山山	LENC	103	lax	27	22
10110	^	AND .	4.00	2 1 50	Sin	war	· · ·	į į	1200	2,6	26	22
12/10	1/1	7.00	10.00	ANT	24	2 Com	nil Me	, K	1.30	u	87	80
ATIO	1	2.30		Moron	YATE	7		. W	12.30	N	27	22
Millio		700	1:30	n.	Dan	torn 1	22/5	1/1	520	n :	26	22
18/10	N	9.30	10.00	. ~	CRI	P .		H	1230	11	27	22
4010		17.00	1130	. 1/	TIZE	100 Wes	Ason	: U	1.00	n:	27	22
2010	N	2.3	300	1.31	Late	ner		. u	6-00	U	27	22
200	/ bh	9.00	930	n	PAL		1 11	- 12	12.00	2 (1	74	22
300	14	2.30	3,00	· · ·	Port	Joles Be	they	W	5.30	16 12	27	22
341	N	1.15	2:00	N HARROW	Street	3 Dr-11/60	ery file	N N	3-20	N	10	2
1	N	7.30	4.00	Mach	FOU	wor	J	271	6.30	· LA	27	22:
" Denote	in brackets wh	ich aubelste	HICE STOWN	ce is being del	med		SI 76			TOTAL	3/12	
					Maria dan							10.0
-					PLEA	SE NOTE A	ND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	302 - New Total
NOTE NOIS	dalay this at	illia mara-t	h				: ;;					
INTERNATIONAL DE	MINCH IF LAM	Marie Mild il	[LE SC 197]	pinimed bron	MOSEY SO SH	y up to the end se Democratic S	larulcáu Rani	int.				
Harnes of	Dassengers s	indfor deta	atls of tolls.	fatos etc ele	broad to an	derivers 44 mil 44	t electric	THE REAL PROPERTY.			Pal	

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED JAN 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NAME	0	a 11	1 4						· .				100
MAINE	Swo	u k	May 1			CLAIR	I FOR M	ONTH	OF		sec (F	art	(Farm fort)
	Departure	From			Approved	d Duty			Return	n to			Travel and Subsistence
(1) Dete	(2) Pisce	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place		Description	6) of Meeting		(7) Piace	(8) Three	(9) Mode and Chase (le carivan, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Passerger Tad, Public Substitution Attended FOR GOOGLE MAPS
25/17	AUCKLEO	N 30	2.00	Morch	Wou	du T	revot		Wilsel	4-20	lar	27	_22
zi (12	41.	1.45	2.00	Willed	post.		R Aug			2.30	V	10	2
416	'n	1030	1130	William	ea sol	affer to	CX		W	200	4.5	45	33
61	n	中元	18.00	March	TA	4		17	A May 12	1230	u.	27	22
5/1	W.	3 7	4.00	r	30	inci	04		· K	6:30	u	27	22
***************************************											TOTAL		
IOTE **	e in brackets with the control in th	clains mus	t be comp	leted fully a	PLE	tly up to t	the end of t	he calen	der	RATIO	ON OVER		36) Difference

Claims submitted for the current financial year 2017

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED APRIL 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



NA	ME	Sino	nK	MEY		CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF	-	T. 73	/	CI(NH) COLD
				<u> </u>					Tan P	ert)	Fob (port) ZO17
	,	Departure				Approved Duty	Retur	n to			Travel and Substationce
T)	te	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Pisce	(6) Description of Meeting	Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Clees (le canven, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	MILEAGE VERIFIED
10	47	Willisch	6-45	7.00.	arrive	- Kerch Conveil	Wister	100	Casi	4	V4
<u>u :</u>	17	*	6.45	7 60	ETEN OU	u u	1	10-CO	le .	14	V14
	17		230	3.00	Noch	FACT Meeting	11	\$350)	Lť.	25	22
61	17		5.30	in-cu	V.	CRP	1	10-30	uf	3-6	RECOUPED IOMILES
11	7	*	9.30	10.00		weeking working com		200	16	26	22
17	1	et.	330	-		Richard Cousty	N	5.20	11	26	22
19	1.	u	2.30	3,00	44	California	Le	5.30		26	22
13	_	H	10.15	10:45	11	FACT		1200	4	23	22
水	L.	-	5.30	9.30	11	mentinotes	N·	1000		52	
3	H	10	545	6.30	CWE 13	gant klups	u	830		34	32.
0	12	7	2.00	₹-30	riences	041	- u.	5:00	IL.	26	22
1	2	in brackets w	12:30	1:00		Carriet & Course	U	600		26	
		s ii) Sracaol w	INCHI DELLEGI		uent (e peinid en	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	TOTAL	318 · EAF	26 - DIFFERENCE
P	rigoic 1111 t	o which it re	letes and	must be st	shivithed pro	nd correctly up to the end of the caler imply to the Democratic Services Se atmed in columns 11 and 12 above	ider stion.			P	aid by:
1917	11	H PRESIDENT	entropor (19	HERIE OF TOLIS	i, teres, etc d	earned in occurrents 11 and 12 aboves	H				

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED APRIL 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



HE	Suro	n K	ilug		CLA	IM FOR MONTH	OF		G/. (n	4	14. 1	
-	Departure	From	U						TUL	7	Morel	(Jun)
ý	(2)		(4)		Approved Duty	<u> </u>	Retun	n to	· .	y., : '.	Traval and Subsi	sience
(a)	Place	(3) Tima	Start . Time	(5) Place	Descrip	(6) ion of Meeting	(7) Piace	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Chite (ie cer/ver, motorpycie/ cycle	(10) Na.of Miles	MILEAGE	E VERIFIED GOOGUE MAPS.
2	in which	20	3-00	Merch	Wendy	Mer	West	Tier	Car	30	REINLIA	ED SMILES.
3	Ŋ	11.40	11.50	11	THEVET	Literon		2.00		25	22	3000000
3	£r.,	11-30	1200	į l.	Cotola	regree (Letin	136	1-00	35 EE	26	.22	-
7	ιι 	9.30	10-00	iC	FACTA	+7/6 Yerwood		200	W.	74	155	_
1		400	6.30	Pecolo	otus	lowed	wished	14 -DC	13	11	10	-
p	NARCL	236	2.00	6 My	THE	Thank port	14	530	: (85	80	-
2	**	649	700	Execute	KIKK	1 Colwell	TILL	9:00	11 .	P	19	-
3	16	6:20	7.00	Respublica	A	NA S	16.	7.0C	· LC	12	V14	ma,
3	A V	3 -00	A 00	Perchan	W AA	7	2510	600	S 41 5	46	45	_
3		1.30	3-00	Wieled	Mony	A47	A STATE OF THE STA	5:00	1 AL (20)	8	~
5	Majech	730	7.30	Typa	Jesten	Christ	Lisboli	9.00	ે લ 🐰	24	14	•
3	и	6-45	700		A 300,11		11	10-0		4	14	-
iota	in brackets whi	ich aubelete	mes allowan	ce le buing cla	med ·	**			TOTAL	4.8.3		-
					PLEASE N	OTE AND SIGN	DECLAI	CITAS	N OVERL	EAF	69	- DIFFERENCE
10	Amich it Leis	pes and u	that he su	brnitted pror	notly to the Don	the end of the calen	dar tion.			Pa	<u> </u>	
of	်းအေးကွေers (ည	indfor det	Mis of tolls,	fares, etc cis	tried in columns	11 and 12 above					, see Management	and produced relations of the special art is reported by the special art in the special a

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED APRIL 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 8 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



Departun (2)	From (3)			Approved Duty		Return	n to	· ·		Travel and Subs	deterre	
Place	Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Description	of Meeting	(7) Place	(6) Three	(8) Mode and Class (to curvian, motorcycle/ cycle	2420	Passenger NILEAGE USING	Tune, Public	Substitution of the second sec
ishack	12 30	1.00	usech	Capinot &	Cowill	W Wes	9 00	Car	26	22		
<u> </u>	4.15	6.00	15	LRP		111	2.45	T: [1]	26			
1:	6-44	7.00	acres de	barish	Cowell	. e 191	900	114	7	va		11 4. k
		·					V &					/ 1 /1
	·		-							53-	New	lota
							11.			(8)-	Diffe	Jeno
	2					T V						
	<u> </u>			· ·		118.7				The Course of the Course		
						100						
												:
					-							
rackets wh	ich subsiste	nce alkywayı	ce is being clai	med				TOTAL	61			

d chiay this claim must be completed fully a to which it relates and must be submitted pr	ombily to the Demo	nestin Semilane	a Ministerior
of phesengers and/or details of tolls, feres, etc.	dalmed in columns 1	1 and 12 above	

ŕ		FOR OFFICE	USE O	NLY	
	Pald b	y:			<u> </u>
		•			•
٠.	45 - 15	. · · · · · ·			

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



ME	Sand	n 1k	LUG		CLAIM FOR MONTH	OF		1- 11-	11			- Andrewson - Andr
						101		pillp	hu)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
,,	Departure From				Approved Duty	Return to		Travel and Subsistence				
1) ste	(2) Pisce	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	(8) Description of Meeting	Place	(8) Time	(8) Mode and Chee (le cariven, motoroyale/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Passenger Allowede in miles (Sp per carried mile per passenger) Pless also complete	-12-	GOOGLE MAP
-	his beel	9:30		reton	1A4	Wilson	100	las	27	24 25	22	
k	At,	8.00	8.30	įl	GREATY ARABIC GOVERN		5.00		26	26 26 /	22	
4	£ L		10.00	V.	CRI	10	-60	10	27	16 26/	22	
4	ħ.	10.00	10-60	result	an' four merture	- 8	12.30	The Life of	26.	14	V14	
4_	f.,	645	7.00	A1 - 11	Parish Course	2 18 20	1600	(3)	151	2 (4-	V14	
4	()	9.30	10.00	Merch	Aughan photo	16	12:30	El	28	22	22	
4	li.	6.45	700	MARINA	- Pedrish Course	2	9.30	U'	4	1 Eq	14	
4	1.1	11:45	3.00	Post six	about	10 Mg -	5.30	L. C.	2	2 2	V2	
A	s,	10.30	11:50	Meser	FACT AGM,	in the mi	1.00	tt	26	26 26	22	
4	. 1.	950	920	Dodayse	Hansh Grucelstoff	up vi	4'00	11	77	2 30	v30	
4	- 4,5	7.00	7.30	ortson her	plotal lower) Le	10 CC		15	4 14	V14	
14	44	11.00	111.30	March	Dan from Medin	· it ·	100	- 11	27	26	22	
37:516	in brackets wh	ilch subsist	mak şilower	nce is being cla	imed .		•	TOTAL	274	2300	210	New total
					PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	DECLA	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF	334 (2	(31)	New total Difference
剛面	ALMON II LAN	ices and i	must be su	ibmitted pro	id correctly up to the end of the caler mptly to the Democratic Services Se	der stion,			Pa	FOR OFFI		
125 125	passengers	and/or det	mile of toffs	, fares, etc cl	almed in columns 11 and 12 above		•			The same of the sa	Tenantiffication trigging & and	mad difference of fermi spream party begins .

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



MAME	Sund	20 1	BAA		CLAIM FOR MONTH	A		10 1-1	<i>f</i> :	73 77	
	1/700-0	- 10	~		CLAIM FOR MON! H	Or_			2	1 May	Sur (prot)
\$100 tillion one, art Ant.	Departure	From			Approved Duty	Return	n to			Travel and Subels	lance
(1) Date	(2) Page	(3) Tima	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Clees (le curivan, matercycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	(11) Passenger Allowance in miles (3p per carried mile per passenger) Please also complete box below)	MILEAGE VERIFIED USING GOOGLE MAS
5	w wheel		7.00	Goy? Bu	Ketus Gruyel.	(lest/2)		Car	10	-8	V 8
12	+1	170	1.50	MOE CO		t _e	430	60	29	829	22
151	7 4	2.30	300		Council		6.00	1 1 1 1 1	292	24 26	22
65	7 11	6:45	7.00	at Clay	h just howell	11	9.30	น 🕔	4	4/	V4
7/51	7 11	1930	10.00	New	BP.	11	600	£ 4	28	280 26	22
7/5	1 '	6-45	700	Gereke	1 likely lightery	14	9.15	1.1	10	. 8	18
35	7 11	7.15	730	Toud	Parish Connot	il	9.00	17.	16	14	V14.
721	7 11	7.02	10.00	Landen	Alexp Conference	1 1	9.30	f.	854	404	V64.
11	V. Y	12.30	1.60	NEW	Street winter		3.40	LI .	29	1,32 2 L	22.
331	1	6.30	7.00	WAM	Pars Mouri	1,7	93)	15 Y		17
1727	7 11	6 30	7.00	POSSMA	ac 1	1.	Voa	, N =	150	-14	V14.
4	7	8.3	0 10:00	March	about		120	11/2	293	る みえしい	- WALL - 1
Dane	ote in brackets w	thich aubala	stence allows	nce is being d	imed	II = 1		TOTAL	299	海岛 海葵 .	229 - NEW TOTA
and deligence and deligence	PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF (288) TOTAL 299 NEW TOTAL 299 NEW TOTAL 299 - NEW TOTAL 299 NEW										
	POR OFFI I availd delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar I which it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section. I mail of passengers end/or details of toils, fares, stc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above										

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)



	Departure	From			Appropriate Parks					, ,		
m i	(2)				Retur		7		ence			
(1) late	Pleas	Time	(4) Start Time	(6) Place	Description of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Tane	(9) Mode and Class (ie carlven, motorcycle/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	(11) Passenger Allowance in tolles (Sp per certied rolle per passenger) (Please also completo box bulous)	MILERAE V	DAVE MAPS
8	il whech	<u> </u>		Leich	Whitesa Station	Custo	Afoc	Car	28	26 2426	22	
(4)1	- ((900	7	News Stateon	i div	100	įt "	19	NO. 26	22	
617	N	3.30	4.00	- 10	Sphing	1 the	6-30	Le	29	26 216 /	22	
61	13.	2 CC	17.30	(Brenden.	: 11	1.20		29	26 39 26 V	22.	
6	vl	800	10-00	Line	AAT Allana	60	8.00	11	185	134174	174.	au
617	N	6.15	630	Person	the Library Bislauich	1	200	£1.	15 v	14	vi4.	-
117	I.C	9.30	10.00	March	C-free-flithing	Bita	2.00	El	31	26 200 26	22.	-
117	31	200			a Augieu Wolfr	11	700	fr.	65	55 /	V 65.	-
117	4.	245	19.30	wer are	Kewal Housing	:			18	49.V	149	_
				1								
		<u> </u>	-									
Denote	in brackets wi	nich subsist	ence allowe	nce is being de	strand	A		TOTAL	478	485	412	New total
*******		· · · · · ·			PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN	11/11	RATIO	N OVERL	EAF (thit)	(32)) Difference
וווווי-	delay this c which it rel	ates end	Wifas Do a	nomittee bio	nd correctly up to the end of the cales empty to the Democratic Services Se	idar ction.			P	FOR OFF		

CLAM FORM SUBMITTED OCTOBER 2017-LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES



NAME	Swon King CLAIM FOR MONTH OF THE						Trelu (Dert	1 4	wayust	(part)	and processing the constitution of the constit		
(4)	Departure From		Approved Duty					Return to			Trave	MILEA	ST VER	500
(1) Date	(2) Pleca	(3) Time	(4) Starf Time	(5) Piace	(6) Description of Meeting		Place	(8) Time	(6) Mode and Cless (ie car/van, motoroyole/ cycle	(10) No.of Miles	Aflow (Sp pr per (Please	USING	GOOGLE	FIED MAPS
6/11	Waltel	100	200	Notch	GOYU		Webed	730	Car	29	26	22		
13/13	· A		10.00	14	CRP)	\(\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\)	il.	600	44	24	26	22		
1471	~	9.00	9.30		10 Werdy	Men	A Property	1100	. 44	24	26	22		
th	*	9.30	10.00	55	TAG)		WELECT	1230	. 66	20	عالم	22		
7年17	1	8-20	10.00	Cairbirde	Tirol Tra	MARIN	The state of	200	3 6	112	84	80		
118	fr	9.00	9.30	Much	FOLL		L.	1200		29	26	20		
7.8	. kr	6.45	730	Bernie	estilitation	Cowell	- 14	9.00	Sec gold	40		35		
98	W	6-50	7.00	Pekson Do	C	١٠.	L. M.	900		17		14		
143	l l	7.00	730	Charles	ective the	r.		9.00	LI	24		V 24		
15 3	n	6.45	7.00	Elen	il v	1 1	11	9.00	il	6		V 6		
1718		1000	10-30	March	Dan Hom		2 IN =	12:30	1.	29	26	22		
量程	. 66	3.45	4.00	4.6	Sprichat		ii ll	600	1.4	29	26	22		
* Conote	** Uprote in brackets which substitutes allowence to being claimed TOTAL 402 311 - New total. PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF 42 - DIFFERENCE													
PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF 42 - DIFFERENCE														
P wouth at	NOTE To avoid delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar month to which it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section. Names of passengers and/or details of toils, fares, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above													

CLAIM FORM SUBMITTED OCTOBER 2017

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972/LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING ACT 1989/ MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME (PART 6 OF THE CONSTITUTION REFERS)

MEMBERS' CLAIM FOR TRAVELLING AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES



[i	NAME	Buin	5V- 1	Ling		CLAIN	FOR MONTH	OF		Aug	ny f	Part)	September	out(put)
Γ	Departure From		From	Approved Duty				Retur	n to	Travel and Subsistence				
9	(1) Date	(2) Place	(3) Time	(4) Start Time	(5) Place	Description	of Meeting	(7) Place	(8) Time	(9) Mode and Cless (le car/ver, rectoroyde/ gydig	(10) Na.of Miles	(11) Passerige Allowance in (5p per deinte per passen place also oc box belos	MILEAGE	Statestance VERIFIED OOGLE MAPS
3	18	MASSON	9.30	10.00	Merch	2 covorus	PHB	Nestech	12.00	Car.	29:	10	22	
	79	10.	636	7.00	1 Brock	Party (the	kh Gund	111	90	17	8		18	
	र द	1,	6.45	7.00	Litter	Marriela		10	9.00	EL	2		.4	
-	119	r,	5.30	6.00	Much	CRY		("	9.30	1.65	29:	6	22	
1	29	67	6.39	7.00	14 Jours lings	in Votish	Council		9.00		30		V 30	
1	3/9	الما الما	6.45	7.00	rayson Il	ng 1,	, t' 🔊	- (1	9.30		17		14	
į	4/9		1230	(.00	Morde	Cabcut 1	Coursel	11	8.00			26	22	
2	(19	14	9.30	10.00	Words	Wender	Deter .	100	12:00		29	24	22	•
2	2/10	دا	7.00	7.30	Brun	a poriet	Lowell	UL	900		40		35	-
1	3 10	- CC	1	-	March	Tuorus	el cabinet		12.9	· c	8		V 8	
	10	-	46	4-00		3.								•
				<u> </u>	<u> </u>			7.0					187	- New total
	*Demote in brinchets which substitute allowence is being claimed TOTAL 227 215 28 - Difference PLEASE NOTE AND SIGN DECLARATION OVERLEAF										- Difference			
12	NOTE 6 To avoid delay this claim must be completed fully and correctly up to the end of the calendar 2 month to which it relates and must be submitted promptly to the Democratic Services Section.									P	FOI			
Names of passengers and/or details of tolts, fures, etc claimed in columns 11 and 12 above]		Control and the Art of	Service and the service of the servi		

STATEMENT FRONT COVER

Case Ref:

Name:

Carol Pilson

Position Held:

Monitoring Officer

wilkin chapman lip solicitors

Cartergate House, 26 Chantry Lane, Grimsby DN31 2LJ

a limited liability partnership registered in England number OC343261 authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

Page 1 of 6

wilkin chapman lip

Statement of: Carol Pilson

- I am the Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer for Fenland District Council. I have been Monitoring Officer since February 2015.
- 2. On 24 November 2017 I raised a complaint concerning the conduct of Councillor Simon King in relation to the submission of mileage claims which appeared to have been overinflated as well as attempting to claim for journeys outside the Members' Allowance Scheme equating to £1511.10 (3358 miles) paid to Councillor King and £736.65 (1637 miles) claimed but not paid between April 2011 and October 2017.
- 3. The Members' Allowances scheme is agreed by Council following the receipt of recommendations from the Independent Remuneration Panel. It was last agreed on 5 November 2015. The scheme includes a range of provisions but those particularly relevant to this complaint are Section 6 Travelling and Subsistence Allowances.
- 4. Section 6.1 sets out the meetings that can be claimed for under the Members' Allowances Scheme. Section 6.2 makes clear that "Mileage can be claimed from Councillors normal place of residence or from a subsequent appointment on Council business. Mileage can only be claimed for journeys undertaken wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council duties as set out in 6.1."
- 5. The background to the complaint is as follows:
- 6. Discrepancies in Councillor King's mileage claims were brought to my attention by the Member Services team who process claims for all Councillors. I was concerned by the fact that despite on numerous occasions Councillor King being advised of what was acceptable in terms of appropriate mileage claims, incorrect claims continued to be submitted. The details of this advice are provided at Document 3 of the original Conduct complaint. To my knowledge, I have not been informed of any occasions when Councillor King has sought advice on his mileage claim before submitting it for processing. No other Councillors have been brought to my attention as having a high number or repeated number of discrepancies within their claim forms.

To establish the seriousness of the issue I asked for an analysis of Councillor King's mileage claims from April 2011 up to the present (October 2017). This provided a whole term of office (2011-2015) amount of data and would allow any trends to be detected. This analysis showed a significant level of misclaiming since 2011/12 as per the table below:

Year	% of journeys misclaimed
2011/12	96%
2012/13	100%
2013/14	82%
2014/15	100%
2015/16	91%
2016/17	94%

- 8. The analysis showed that Councillor King had claimed for journeys that appeared inflated over and above what would be expected by comparison with Google Maps and journeys were claimed for that were outside of the scheme; mainly not travelling from home but another start point or travelling to another place which is not claimable on the way to Council business. The information outlined that there were consistent claims for differing amounts of mileage from home in Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March. This generally consists of 26 miles or more for a journey Google Maps states could be achieved within 22 miles.
- 9. A summary of the analysis of mileage claims by financial year showed the following:

Financial Year	No of miles claimed	No of miles paid	Difference between miles claimed & miles paid	Miles on further analysis that could have been challenged or not paid as outside of the scheme
2011/12	808	678	130	204
	(£363.60)	(£305.10)	(£58.50)	(£91.80)
2012/13	1026	756	270	219
	(£461.70)	(£340.20)	(£121.50)	(£98.55)
2013/14	2067	2042	25	586

Page 3 of 6

Financial	No of	No of	Difference	Miles on further
Year	mlles	mlles paid	between miles	analysis that could
	claimed	1).	claimed & miles	have been challenged
			paid	or not paid as outside
				of the scheme
	(£930.15)	(£918.90)	(£11.25)	(£263.70)
2014/15	1086	1086	0	606
	(488.70)	(£488.70)		(£272.70)
2015/16	2180	1856	204 (£91.80)	851
	(£981.00)	(£835.20)		(£382.95)
2016/17	4060	3232	828	597
1	(£1827)	(£1454.40)	(372.60)	(268.65)
2017	2542	2362	180	295
	(£1143.90)	(£1062.90)	(£81)	(£132.75)
Total	13,769	12,012	1637	3358
	(£6196.05)	(£5405.40)	(£736.65)	(£1511.10)

- 10. Journeys of note are outlined in the conduct complaint in section 3 Analysis of mileage claim by month however examples of very high mileage claims for the journey from Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March where a claim of 22 miles would be expected include:
 - a. 56 miles claimed February 2011
 - b. 54 miles claimed February 2013
 - c. 66 miles claimed November 2014
 - d. 43 miles claimed November 2014
 - e. 35 miles claimed November 2016
 - f. 34 miles claimed December 2016
 - g. 52 miles claimed January 2017
 - h. 38 miles claimed June 2017 Cllr King confirmed he returned vla Peterborough.
- 11. The use of Google Maps in this analysis was to provide an objective tool by which the mileage claimed could be assessed. Google Maps is widely accepted as an accurate tool that in these circumstances many organisations would use for this

purpose. This was to assist those making a decision in relation to this conduct case to make an interpretation of the situation of how many miles that journey could be achieved within versus the mileage claimed.

- 12. Other examples from the analysis that were particularly concerning were:
 - a. April 2017 claiming 57 miles instead of 30 miles
 - b. November 2016 claiming 20 miles instead of 4 miles.
 - c. November 2016 & July 2016 claiming 10 miles for meetings in Wisbech.
 - d. December 2015/January 2016 this claim consisted of a train ticket from Huntingdon to London return, pay and display ticket for Huntingdon station and 70 miles claimed from Huntingdon to March. Cllr King confirmed he was travelling from personal business and this was not paid. This same claim was submitted again in January 2016 but the journey altered to read Wisbech to March to Wisbech (which would comply with the scheme) instead of Huntingdon to March to London. This claim was also refused.
 - e. January 2016 claimed 71 miles instead of 32 miles and it is understood to have attended a dentist appointment in Peterborough.
 - f. Numerous journeys claimed not from place of residence but from another place e.g. Rugby, Swaffham, Cambridge, Leicester etc.
- 13. No detailed explanation has been provided by Councillor King in regards to many of these journeys.
- 14. Based on the analysis found, I sought external legal advice and advice from the Deputy Monitoring Officer, Stephen Gerrard as to how this matter should be dealt with. After careful thought and considering the financial nature of the issue and the quantity of potential misclaiming, it was considered appropriate that a conduct complaint should be raised.
- Due to this issue potentially being a criminal matter (potential fraud), I requested advice from the Police as to whether they wished to pursue the matter so that any conduct process would not fetter a police investigation. The police stated they wished to assess the information therefore the conduct process was paused whilst this occurred and resumed once the Police had completed their enquiries.

- 16. As Monitoring Officer, I have no formal decision making power in relation to resolving complaints; this is reserved for Councillors once the formal stage is reached therefore it was my role to collate the information found and put to the relevant part of the Council for assessment and determination.
- Due to the potential seriousness of the complaint, it could not be resolved informally, therefore at that point I removed myself from the process and the Deputy Monitoring Officer, Fiona McMillan led on the process.
- 18. When the conduct complaint was raised with Councillor King in November 2017, as well as being provided with the details of the complaint, Councillor King was also given a list of journeys and the mileage that would be acceptable for those journeys in future. This was to support Councillor King in submitting accurate mileage claims in the future given the information found regarding the past accuracy of his mileage claims. Councillor King has not complied with those mileage limits for journeys from Wisbech to March return. In January 2018, Councillor King submitted a further incorrect mileage claim. Councillor King claimed for a total of 360 miles which on further analysis only equated to 290 miles, an over claim of 70 miles or £31.50.

I Carol Pilson declare that this s to the best of my knowledge and	
Signed C. ROC	Date 1/6/2018

Appendix C WC 6

27 North Brink WISBECH PE13 1JR

30th November 2017

Dear Carol.

Thank you for your email of the 24th November clarifying your position. This amail is my initial response to the completet in accordance with paragraph 5.2.5 of the Conduct Committee Procedures.

I am concerned that this response is being made to you in your especity as Monitoring Officer when you are also the effective complainant, which does not seem to be a proper course of action under the procedure. This is probably of little importance if this matter can be resolved informally, but if formal procedures follow, either within the Council or externally, then this may assume greater importance and may become a material factor,

I am extremely sorry that this matter has escalated to the extent that it has become necessary for a formal complaint to be raised against me and the significant amount of officers' time this matter has taken up so far. I have done my best to comply with a Policy and claim form that to me lack clarity and with conflicting advice.

My initial response under the terms of paragraph 5.2.5 is as follows:-

- I agree that I have submitted the claim forms referred to, to Fenland District Council, and that I have received the payments stated in the documents provided with the complaint.
- 2. I accept that some of the claims may have been outside the officers' interpretation of the terms of the Members Allouance Scheme Policy. Where this has occurred, officers have disallowed the claims, and I have accepted this.
- 3. I accept that some of the claims may have been for greater mileages than the shortest distance between the start and end points of the journeys claimed as shown on Google Maps.
- 4. I do not accept that mileage claims are properly limited to the shortest route in every case, for the following remains:-
 - natitive the Policy or the claim form state that the route must be the shortest route. If this principle is applied, it should be stated dearly in the policy.
 - it is not always possible or desirable to travel by the shortest possible route.
 This can be due to traffic considerations, road cloaures, weather, safety considerations and improve other factors.

- 5. I do not accept that the mileages shown in document 4 within the complaint and the mileages indicated in the Summary as evidence of over-claims are correct. It has not been possible in the time allowed for this response to check every item in the Summary, but samples have indicated sufficient differences to warrant a thorough review of the mileages set out in the Summary.
- 6. I do not accept that there has been any intent on my part to deceive Fenland District Council or to claim more than the mileage to which I would be entitled under the policy. The claim form and its declaration regular me to state accurately my start and end points and mileage. I have done this in each case entirely openly so that the officers can correctly apply the Policy and rates to my journeys.
- 7. Whilst the Policy states what can be claimed, it does not state that this is exhaustive, nor does it state what cannot be claimed. For example, it is not clear from the policy whether the effect of a detour taken before or after a Council meeting to consult with or inform a constituent in relation to that meeting would wholly disallow a claim for that journey.

For the purposes of future claims for travel expenses, I will comply strictly with the Policy as set out and with the instructions of officers, in that I will:

- (a) claim my exact mileage to and from Feniand Hall from my home which would not normally exceed 25 miles;
- (b) exclude from any future claim any detours made from my normal route to visit constituents.
- (c) claim only in respect of journeys from my home to and from Fenland Hall and not from other points of departure.

For the reasons set out above, I do not accept that I have over-claimed and been overpeid any travel expenses. It is notable that Fenland District Council has not made any request to me for repayment of any sums overpeid, and has proceeded with the issue of a complaint.

As it is in the best interests of Fenland District Council to bring this matter to the <u>speedlest</u> possible resolution, entirely without accepting any liability or obligation on my part to do so, i have today paid to Fenland District Council the sum of £1,511.10, equivalent to the entire amount alleged to have been overpaid to me.



27 North Brink Wisbech Cambridgeshire PE13 1JR

7th February 2017

Dear Ms McMillan

As suggested in your email to my solicitor dated 22rd January 2018, this is a further written response to the complaint made against me that I have breached the Members Code of Conduct.

in simple terms, the allegations giving rise to the complaint are that:

- (a) I have diskned travel expenses for journeys from a starting point other than my home; and
- (b) There claimed travel expenses for more than would be werranted by the shortest mileage between my home and the relevant destination as indicated on Google Maps.

As a preliminary matter (before considering both the substantive allegations and the complaint), it is necessary to consider and decide two fundamental questions as follows:

- (1) What is the correct interpretation of Fernand District Council's Member's Allowance Scheme travel policy?
- (2) Has Estated District Council adopted policies that:
 - (a) a member may claim travel expenses only for travel on the shortest possible route from the relevant starting point to the dantination, traspective of the ectual route taken; and
 - (b) Google Maps is the standard by which any mileage claim by members is assessed for accuracy?

What is the correct interpretation of the Members Allowance travel policy?

Ciange 6.2 of the policy states:

"All claims for travel expenses and substitionce should be made on the appropriate claim form and backed by receipts as applicable. Idlinage can be claimed from Councilize normal place of realtence or from a subsequent appointment on Council turiness. Idlinage can only be claimed for formely surfactions wholly and exclusively in pursuance of Council's duties as set out in 8,1".

In the complaint, the Montioring Officer interprets the second sentence of Clause 6.2 as meaning that a Councillor is only entitled to claim travel expenses for Journeys starting either at the Councillor's frame, or starting at meeting on Council business to which the Councillor traveled from his or her home.

Simply on the basis of the <u>language used</u> in the clause, in order for the Montaring Officer's interpretation to be correct, the sentence should read:

"Mileage can only be claimed from the Councillare normal place of residence..." which is the phreseology used in the third sentence of Peragraph 6.2.

It is legitimate to ask why the second sentence of clause 6.2 has been inserted in the policy.

My solicitor has interviewed Mrs Nicola Barwell, who was the Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Committee which sat in 2011 to agree a revised Members Allowance Policy. It was during this Review that Clause 6.2 was inserted. Mrs Barwell has confirmed that the reason for the Indusion of the second sentence was to clerify that, in contrast to employees, Councillore are permitted to claim travel expenses from their home address to the Council offices.

As is well known, employees are not permitted to claim travel expenses for travel from their home to their normal place of work.

Mrs Barwell has also confirmed to my addition that her interpretation of the travel policy is that Councilors should be able to claim travel expenses to meetings on Council business from any starting point, whether it be their home, their place of work or elsewhere.

It is also the case that the travel policies for Cambridgeshire Council, Borough of King's Lynn & West Norfolk, South Norfolk District Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council to not contain any form of restriction which only permits travel expenses to be claimed for Journeye to Council business from the Councillor's home address.

Hiss Fentand District Council adopted the policies referred to at 2(a) and (b)?

These are not stated as policies in the FDC Members Alguance Scheme.

No proposal has ever been made to Councitors to adopt policies in these terms. When the Members Allowance Scheme was reviewed in 2015, neither of these policies was proposed for consideration. At no time have these policies been circulated or notified to Members.

Cuits simply, the propositions at 2 (a) and (b) above are not policies of Fersiand District Council.
Clearly it is open to Councillors and officers to propose the adoption of such policies, but this has not been done. The judgment to be made is not whether it is desirable that these should be the policies of FDC, but rather whether they are the policies of FDC.

This is an example of policies being created and applied by an officer of the Council which have not been accroved by Councillors.

Conclusion

A serious complaint has been made against me by the Monitoring Officer of Fertland District Council. That complaint is based on a flawed interpretation of the Council's policy, and the application of policies which are not the approved policy of FDC. The Monitoring Officer has furthermore confirmed by email that these policies have not been applied to the travel expense claims of any other Members.

The Monitoring Officer, acting outside her remit under e5 Local Government and Housing Act 1989 (and if within her remit — which I dispute — then not acting in accordance with the provisions of e5 (2) and (3), and acting in breach of e28(4) of the Localism Act 2011) has reported this complaint to the police.

Since I have not breached any Council policy in relation to my travel expense claims, I have not breached the Member's Code of Conduct, and the complaint against me is wholly without foundation, and indeed is versitious and should not go any further.



Questions for Councillor King

- 1. On the 24th of November 2017 a complaint was made against you in relation to the submission of mileage claims which appeared to have been overinflated as well as attempting to claim for journeys which were outside the Members allowance scheme equating to £1511.10 (3358 miles) paid and £736.65 (1637) claimed but not paid by the council. This was for the period April 2011 to October 2017. Do you wish to make any comment on the allegations made?
- 2. What is your understanding of the members allowance scheme?
- 3. What is your understanding of what you can and can not claim?
- 4. An analysis of your claims by month April 2011 to October 2017 suggests that there are claims for differing amounts of mileage from your home in Wisbech to Fenland Hall, March. This generally consists of 26 miles or more, google maps would equate the journey to 22 miles. Our information suggests that no other routes could be found that would result in the additional mileage. Can you provide any explanation as to these claims?
- 5. Looking at the financial years in detail, can you provide any explanation with regards the following:-
 - 2011/12 an over claim of 334 miles?
 - 2012/13 an overclaim of 489 miles?
 - 2013/14 an overclaim of 611 miles?
 - 2014/15 an overclaim of 606 miles?
 - 2015/16 an overclaim of 1055 miles?
 - 2016/17 an overclaim of 1425 miles?
 - 2017/18 an overclaim of 475 miles?
- 6. Looking at some of the claims in more detail, why did you consider a train journey (5 November 2015) from personal business to a Council meeting would be paid as part of the members allowance scheme?
- 7. Why did you consider that a claim for a £30 taxi and £4.20 bus fare following your attendance on 7 December 2015 at the West Norfolk Planning Committee on behalf of a constituent, would be paid?
- 8. On 6 June 2017 you claimed for a journey from Wisbech to London return via Huntingdon station, a claim of 85 miles, google maps states 64 miles, can you explain this?
- 9. On 5 January 2016 you claimed 71 miles following using your car to follow a bus that had been provided to 'Tour the Assets'. It is suggested that the claim should have amounted to 32 miles. Can you explain this claim?
- 10. Finally, can you provide any explanation why you have made claims which clearly do not fall within the scheme and despite being advised with regards your claims by Council Officers, you continued to make claims in excess of what was allowed?

Complaint Answers

1. Comments on allegations

I used my phone to record council meetings and council business and any non-standard mileage, which I would measure using my car trip odometer. I would not record the mileage on every standard trip as I was familiar with them and had measured them and claimed them without any issue since 1999, when I became a councillor.

I attempted to record matters in a timely fashion, however that was not always possible, and I would, at the end of an expenses period, usually consult the record in my phone in order to complete the expenses form for the balance of the period.

For familiar trips I knew the mileages, having travelled them on innumerable occasions since 1999. I would have originally measured these mileages on the car odometer but ceased to do so having established the mileages.

In order to travel from my home to the Council Offices in March, I would usually take a route out of Wisbech via Wisbech St Mary and Guyhirn to join the March Road at Ring's End. This route was the most convenient, as it avoided Wisbech Town centre. This is a reasonable route to take. My route into and out of March would vary according to the time of day and year and the traffic conditions. There has never been any issue raised as to these mileages and they were accepted in claims and by emails as late as July 2017.

The challenging of expenses back to 2011 provides me with some considerable difficulties in dealing with the precise route used for any particular journey. There are often when travelling, traffic problems, accidents and road works that make it expedient to take an alternative route, which is not necessarily the shortest, but may well be the quickest, or even obligatory if directed by police.

I have never used Google Maps to establish the mileage for trips, using the trip odometer on my car, when required. I have no knowledge of the accuracy of Google Maps or of the odometer on any of my cars, although I now understand having looked into the matter, that odometers may provide as much as a 10% over-reading of mileages (consistent with a 10% over-reading of speed on the speedometer, to which it is connected).

It appears to me that the factors of alternative routes, odometer over-reading and inaccuracy in Google Maps would account for the vast majority of the differences in mileages.

The policy does not state that the geographically shortest route must be used or will be paid. Neither does the policy state that Google Maps has any status in relation to the implementation of the policy, including the route to be used.

I do not accept that the mileages that I have recorded are inaccurate or misleading or were submitted dishonestly. Further there was no attempt on my part to gain any advantage for myself, simply to claim for expenses incurred.

The expenses form requires that actual departure and destination locations and times are recorded. I have always recorded truthfully and accurately to the best of my ability the actual journeys completed.

2. Understanding of the scheme

My understanding of the scheme is that expenses can be claimed for journeys completed on council business as set out in section 6.2. I understood that I could claim from home or another location from which I departed to a destination to conduct council business.

As I understand it, the amendment in 2011 to add Clause 6.2 was a permissive amendment to make it clear that mileage could be claimed from home (as well as from other locations) on council business, in contrast to the position for employees.

The claim form provides spaces for actual distances from actual departure points to actual destinations which I completed.

3. What can and cannot claim

My understanding is as set out above

4. Home Route

I have been making journeys from my home in Wisbech to the Council Offices in March since 1999, when I was elected a Councillor. At the outset of making those journeys I measured them using the car odometer. I have no knowledge of the accuracy of the odometer in the car I used to establish these mileages, although I now understand that odometers may provide as much as a 10% over-reading. Further I have no knowledge of the accuracy of mileage readings provided by Google Maps. This in itself may provide an explanation for much of the difference alleged in the report. Indeed, considering route 4 on document 4, which uses the start of the route I would usually use, the mileage is stated as 24.6 miles using Google Maps. Leaving aside the issue of accuracy of Google Maps, a 10% over-read on my car odometer would provide a distance of 27.06 miles, entirely consistent with the mileage I have recorded and claimed.

My usual route out of Wisbech is to take the Barton Road out of Wisbech, towards Guyhirn, joining the March Road at Rings End. This route, whilst not the shortest route I could take, is usually the most convenient as it avoids the centre of Wisbech, traffic lights and congestion. It is a reasonable route to take. There is no requirement in the policy that Councillors must travel by the shortest route available.

My route into March depends upon the time of day and year. Some routes are to be avoided, for example the route back from March along the Twenty Foot Road, turning right onto the A141 by Hobbs Lot Bridge as there is often a long delay waiting to make the turn onto the A141.

Depending on the routes I take into March the mileages I recorded were 26, 27 and 28 miles. I have used those mileages since I commenced as a Councillor. They have always been accepted.

5. General Mileage allegations year by year

I do not accept the suggestion that the amounts claimed are over-stated.

The route I took in relation to home together with errors in reading from my car odometer and Google Maps would provide an explanation for the vast majority of the alleged over-stating.

In respect of mileages which were disallowed due to departure location, I claimed them believing that I was entitled to claim them (see for example my email of 15th December 2015). I entered the actual departure locations in order that the claim could be processed. It is for the Council to determine the policy not officers. To my knowledge no additional clarification or guide to interpretation of the policy has been agreed by Councillors and issued.

6. 5th November 2015 Train fare

I was acting as a consultant and had arranged a number of meetings in London on business on that day. I had been recently appointed to the Cabinet. I was specifically asked to attend the Council meeting. As a result of that request, I cancelled two of my later meetings in London and attended Council Meeting. As a result of so doing, I had to travel again to London a few days later to attend the meetings that I had cancelled. As the policy and claim form are not clear as to whether I should have claimed for all or part or none of my journey on the day of the Council meeting, I decided that it was best to show the full journey so that member services could decide whether to pay all or part or none of the journey.

My understanding of the policy was as set out above.

7. 7th December 2015 West Norfolk Planning Meeting

There was a planning application in West Norfolk affecting an area of land which bordered my constituency. Several of my constituents raised concerns in relation to the planning application and I attended the meeting to represent their interests, which I believed was official business. My car was not available as my wife had inadvertently taken my car keys which I only discovered as I was preparing to leave. The only way I could attend the meeting in time to make the representations I had promised was by taxi. I got a bus back after the meeting as the cheapest way of making the journey home.

I made the claim in accordance with my understanding of the policy as set out above.

8. 6th June 2017 Huntingdon Mileage

I believe that due to traffic conditions I travelled back from Huntingdon via the A14, A1 and A47. This was a reasonable route in the circumstances.

I made the claim in accordance with my understanding of the policy as set out above.

9. 5th January 2016 Tour the Assets

I had to travel from Wisbech to March to begin the tour. I cannot recall all the stops on the tour to confirm the accuracy of the mileages. I believe that the tour went to March, Manea, Elm, Leverington and Wisbech St Mary. I had to leave the tour early because of a personal commitment. As far as I can recall, there was an informal Cabinet meeting that day and I subsequently visited the locations that I had not been able to see.

I made the claim in accordance with my understanding of the policy as set out above.

10. Claims despite advice

As I indicated when challenged about the matter I took the view that the officer's interpretation of the policy was wrong. There has never been any clarification, interpretation or guidance issued in relation to the making of claims that was agreed by Councillors. I always made it clear what my interpretation of the policy was and made the claims openly.