



Joint Standards Committee

To: Councillors Rowley BEM (Chair) Fisher, Pavlovic, Runciman and Kent
Councillors Waudby (Vice-Chair), Chambers and Geogheghan-Breen (Parish Council Members)

Mr J Leigh and Ms R Mazza (Independent Persons)

Date: Thursday, 23 January 2025

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: West Offices - Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

To receive and note apologies for absence.

2. Declarations of Interest (Pages 7 - 8)

At this point in the meeting, Members and co-opted members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest, or other registerable interest, they might have in respect of business on this agenda, if they have not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. The disclosure must include the nature of the interest.

An interest must also be disclosed in the meeting when it becomes apparent to the member during the meeting.

[Please see the attached sheet for further guidance for Members.]

3. Exclusion of Press and Public

To consider the exclusion of the press and public from the meeting during consideration of exempt Annexes A(ii) and B (ii) to Agenda Item 10 (Monitoring report in Respect of Complaints Received) on the grounds that it contains information which is likely to reveal the identity of individuals.

This information is classed as exempt under paragraph 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as revised by The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

4. Minutes (Pages 9 - 12)

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Standards Committee held on 12 November 2024.

5. Minutes of Sub-Committees (Pages 13 - 16)

To approve and sign the minutes of the following meetings of the Joint Standards Sub-Committees:

- Joint Standards Hearing, 12 November 2024.

6. Public Participation

At this point in the meeting members of the public who have registered to speak can do so. Members of the public may speak on agenda items or on matters within the remit of the committee.

Please note that our registration deadlines are set as 2 working days before the meeting, in order to facilitate the management of public participation at our meetings. The deadline for registering at this meeting is **5:00pm on Tuesday, 21 January 2025.**

To register to speak please visit www.york.gov.uk/AttendCouncilMeetings to fill in an online registration form. If you have any questions about the registration form or the meeting, please contact Democratic Services. Contact details can be found at the foot of this agenda.

Webcasting of Public Meetings

Please note that, subject to available resources, this meeting will be webcast including any registered public speakers who have given their permission. The meeting can be viewed live and on demand at www.york.gov.uk/webcasts.

During coronavirus, we made some changes to how we ran council meetings, including facilitating remote participation by public speakers. See our updates (www.york.gov.uk/COVIDDemocracy) for more information on meetings and decisions.

7. Urgent Business

Any other business which the Chair decides is urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

8. Open Consultation on strengthening the standards and conduct framework for local authorities in England (Pages 17 - 50)

This report provides a briefing for Members on the Government consultation on standards and conduct for local authorities.

9. Review of Work Plan (Pages 51 - 52)

To consider the Committee's work plan for the current year and decide whether any amendments or additions are required.

10. Monitoring Report in respect of Complaints Received (Pages 53 - 64)

To receive a routine update report on recent standards complaints.

Democracy Officer:

Jane Meller

Contact Details:

Telephone: (01904) 555209

Email: jane.meller@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above.

Alternative formats

To request reasonable adjustments or to provide this document in an alternative language or format such as large print, braille, audio, Easy Read or BSL, you can:



Email us at: cycaccessteam@york.gov.uk



Call us: **01904 551550** and customer services will pass your request onto the Access Team.



Use our BSL Video Relay Service:
www.york.gov.uk/BSLInterpretingService

Select 'Switchboard' from the menu.



We can also translate into the following languages:

我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)

এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)

Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)

Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)

یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)

Declarations of Interest – guidance for Members

- (1) Members must consider their interests, and act according to the following:

Type of Interest	You must
Disclosable Pecuniary Interests	Disclose the interest, not participate in the discussion or vote, and leave the meeting <u>unless</u> you have a dispensation.
Other Registrable Interests (Directly Related) OR Non-Registrable Interests (Directly Related)	Disclose the interest; speak on the item <u>only if</u> the public are also allowed to speak, but otherwise not participate in the discussion or vote, and leave the meeting <u>unless</u> you have a dispensation.
Other Registrable Interests (Affects) OR Non-Registrable Interests (Affects)	Disclose the interest; remain in the meeting, participate and vote <u>unless</u> the matter affects the financial interest or well-being: (a) to a greater extent than it affects the financial interest or well-being of a majority of inhabitants of the affected ward; and (b) a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest. In which case, speak on the item <u>only if</u> the public are also allowed to speak, but otherwise do not participate in the discussion or vote, and leave the meeting <u>unless</u> you have a dispensation.

- (2) Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to the Member concerned or their spouse/partner.
- (3) Members in arrears of Council Tax by more than two months must not vote in decisions on, or which might affect, budget calculations,

and must disclose at the meeting that this restriction applies to them. A failure to comply with these requirements is a criminal offence under section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

City of York Council

Minutes

Meeting	Joint Standards Committee
Date	12 November 2024
Present	Councillors Rowley (Chair), Fisher, Kent, Pavlovic and Runciman Parish Councillors Chambers and Geogheghan-Breen Ms R Mazza (Independent Person)
Apologies	Parish Councillor Waudby and Mr J Leigh (Independent Person)
Officers Present	Frances Harrison (Head of Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer)

16. Apologies for Absence (4.02 pm)

Apologies had been received from Parish Councillor Waudby and Mr Joe Leigh, Independent Person.

The Chair welcomed Parish Councillor Diane Geoghegan-Breen who had recently joined the committee.

17. Declarations of Interest (4.03 pm)

Members were asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial interests or disclosable pecuniary interests which they might have in respect of business on the agenda.

None were declared.

18. Exclusion of Press and Public (4.04 pm)

Resolved: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the exempt versions of Annexes A and B to Agenda Item 8 (Monitoring Report in Respect of Complaints Received), on the grounds that they contain information likely to reveal the identity of individuals, which is classed as exempt under Paragraph 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended

by the Local Government (Access to Information)
(Variation) Order 2006.

19. Minutes (4.05 pm)

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Standards Committee held on 17 September be approved as a correct record.

20. Public Participation (4.05 pm)

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

21. Review of Work Plan (4.30 pm)

Members considered the committee's work plan for the current municipal year.

Resolved:

- i. That the work plan be approved subject to the following additions:
 - January
 - Community Governance Review (if available)
 - YLCA Representative
 - March
 - Draft Annual Report
- ii. Should a briefing paper on the proposed changes to the local government standards framework become available, the Chair and Vice-Chair to decide when it should be added to the work plan.

Reason: To ensure that the committee has a planned programme of work in place.

22. Monitoring Report on Complaints Received (4.06 pm)

Members considered a report which provided an update on current business as regards complaints.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

Reason: To ensure that the committee is aware of current levels of activity.

Cllr M Rowley BEM, Chair

The meeting started at 4.01 pm and finished at 4.51 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

City of York Council

Committee Minutes

Meeting	Joint Standards Committee Hearings Sub-Committee
Date	12 November 2024
Present	Cllrs Kent and Runciman (CYC Members) Cllr Chambers (Parish Council Member) Ms R Mazza (Independent Person)
Officers in Attendance	Frances Harrison (Deputy Monitoring Officer) Lucy Waller (Lawyer)
Observing	Cllr Geoghegan-Breen (Parish Council Member)

13. Appointment of Chair (6:00pm)

Resolved: That Cllr Runciman be appointed as Chair of the meeting.

14. Declarations of Interest (6:01pm)

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interests or other registerable interests they might have in respect of business on the agenda, if they had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests.

No interests were declared.

15. Exclusion of Press and Public (6:01pm)

Resolved: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the private reports at Agenda Item 4 (Code of Conduct Complaints received in respect of a Parish Councillor), on the grounds that they contain information relating to individuals and information likely to reveal the identity of individuals, which is classed as exempt under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

[Note: following the above resolution, the Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that she had nothing further to add in respect of the public reports in the agenda papers, and the remainder of the meeting took place in private session.]

16. Complaint against a member of a Council Covered by the Joint Standards Committee (6:02pm)

The Hearing Panel considered a complaint from an employee of a partner organisation alleging that Councillor Warters had breached the Code of Conduct by using offensive and inappropriate language in an email and by recommending a course of action to a member of the public for which there was no basis.

The complaint was investigated by a CYC lawyer and a report prepared and presented to the Hearing Panel. The subject member and complainant had opportunity to comment on the draft report and their views were considered by the investigating officer. The parties were also invited to attend the hearing panel but declined to do so.

The panel asked questions of the investigating officer and retired in private to consider the complaint.

Accepting the investigating officer's analysis of the facts, they concluded as follows:

1. Cllr Warters was acting in his capacity as a city councillor in sending the email complained of.
2. Whilst Cllr Warters acted appropriately in advocating for a constituent and challenging what he identified as poor service from a partner organisation, his manner of so doing was disrespectful.
3. There was no evidence of a racially aggravated element to the original issue raised by the constituent and subsequently taken up by Councillor Warters on their behalf.
4. Panel Members did not consider that Cllr Warters seriously expected the constituent to reframe their original

complaint as being racially aggravated following his intervention.

5. The tone and language Cllr Warters used and his flippancy in respect of racially motivated behaviour demonstrated a lack of awareness and sensitivity to the issue unbecoming of the role of a councillor.

Having considered the Investigating Officer's report and the Local Government Association guidance and advice of the Deputy Monitoring Officer, the panel

Resolved: That Cllr Warters breached the Code of Conduct in the following respects:

- i. Breach of rule 1 in failing to treat the complainant with respect.
- ii. Breach of rule 2 in failing to promote equalities.
- iii. Breach of rule 5 in bringing the role of councillor into disrepute.

Members of the Panel found that Cllr Warters did not abuse his position (rule 6)

Reason:

- Cllr Warters is an experienced member of more than one local authority and can be taken to be familiar with the requirements of the Code of Conduct.
- Cllr Warters has not acknowledged any fault in his behaviour or made any commitment to avoiding similar breaches in the future.
- Cllr Warters' comments to the investigating officer (although made with appropriate courtesy and respect) were dismissive of the importance of upholding standards of conduct in general.

Sanctions:

The Panel considered what, if any sanctions it was proportionate and appropriate to apply. In doing so they

Resolved:

- i. Formal censure

For transparency, the Independent Persons' views were that there had been multiple breaches of the code and sanctions should be imposed.

Cllr C Runciman, Chair of Hearings Panel
[The meeting started at 6.00 pm and finished at 7.10 pm].



Joint Standards Committee**23 January 2025**

Report of the Monitoring Officer

Open Consultation on Strengthening the standards and conduct framework for local authorities in England**Summary**

1. On 18 December 2024, the Government published a consultation paper on strengthening the standards and conduct framework for local authorities in England. This report sets out: (a) the main elements of the proposed changes and (b) invites members to respond either collectively or individually. The consultation closes on 26 February 2025.

2. Article 10 of the Council's Constitution sets out the terms of reference for the Joint Standards Committee. This includes:

"To respond to consultation documents and raise awareness of proposed changes to the Code of Conduct but adoption and revisions to the Members Code of Conduct shall be reserved to Full Council;"

3. Appendix 1 of the Constitution provides:

The Leader of the Council, the relevant Executive Member and the Chief Operating Officer must be consulted about responses to consultation papers issued by Government Departments or National or Regional Bodies.

Background

4. The Localism Act 2011 provides the legislative framework for the current standards regime in English authorities. It provides local authorities ("LAs") with a broad discretion as to the 'arrangements' they implement and the form of the Member Code of Conduct they adopt. It also removed the requirement for LAs to have a Standards Committee.

5. Members and co-opted members of the Council Joint Standards Committee, as well as the wider local government community, have long voiced frustration with the weakness of sanctions available for dealing with poor conduct. This is recognised in the consultation paper. The ability for LAs to deal effectively with conduct issues with the backing adequate sanctions is considered in the context of the wider devolution agenda.

“Members take decisions affecting critical local services such as social care, education, housing, planning, licensing, and waste collection. With greater devolution, local authorities will increasingly be taking decisions to shape local transport, skills, employment support, and growth. Decisions that are the responsibility of members impact virtually every citizen’s life at some level, and the electorate has a right to expect that it can trust its local elected members to uphold the highest ethical standards and act in the best interests of the communities they serve.”

6. Responses to the consultation are invited from local authority elected members and officers from all types and tiers of authorities. Responses are anonymous and must be submitted via the online consultation platform, Citizen Space.

Options

7. The JSC may choose to respond:
 - a. Not at all;
 - b. As individuals by completing the online survey;
 - c. Collectively on behalf of the Council in consultation with the Leader and Chief Operating Officer;
 - d. Individually and collectively.
8. If members of the JSC wish to make a corporate response it is proposed that the survey questions replicated at Annex 1 should be debated and the agreed responses recorded. The Monitoring Officer and JSC Chair will then consult the Leader, relevant Executive Member and Chief Operating Officer before the agreed survey responses are submitted by an officer.

Implications

9. **Financial** There are no financial implications to submitting a consultation response.

10. **Human Resources (HR)** There are no HR implications to submitting a consultation response.
11. **Equalities** There are no equalities implications to submitting a consultation response .
12. **Legal** As detailed within the report.

Recommendations and Reasons

13. Members may choose to respond to the consultation in whatever way they consider most appropriate. In light of long-standing concerns in respect of ineffective standards sanctions, responding is recommended.

Author:

Frances Harrison
Head of Legal Services &
Deputy Monitoring Officer
frances.harrison@york.gov.
uk

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Bryn Roberts
Director of Governance & Monitoring
Officer

**Report
Approved Y**

Date

6 January
2025

Specialist Implications Officer(s): None

Wards Affected: All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Annexes

Annex 1 Strengthening the standards and conduct framework
for local authorities in England

Background Papers:

- Consultation paper link:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/strengthening-the-standards-and-conduct-framework-for-local-authorities-in->

england/strengthening-the-standards-and-conduct-framework-for-local-authorities-in-england#scope-of-this-consultation

- CYC webpage Councillor Conduct
<https://www.york.gov.uk/CouncillorConduct>

This page is intentionally left blank



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Open consultation

Strengthening the standards and conduct framework for local authorities in England

Published 18 December 2024

Applies to England

Contents

1. Scope of this consultation
2. Ministerial foreword
3. Background: Standards and Conduct framework and sanctions arrangements
4. Who we would like to hear from
5. Strengthening the Standards and Conduct framework
6. Introducing the power of suspension with related safeguards
7. Public Sector Equality Duty

Annex A: Personal data



© Crown copyright 2024

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/strengthening-the-standards-and-conduct-framework-for-local-authorities-in-england/strengthening-the-standards-and-conduct-framework-for-local-authorities-in-england>

1. Scope of this consultation

Topic of this consultation

This consultation seeks views on introducing a mandatory minimum code of conduct for local authorities in England, and measures to strengthen the standards and conduct regime in England to ensure consistency of approach amongst councils investigating serious breaches of their member codes of conduct, including the introduction of the power of suspension.

Scope of this consultation

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is consulting on introducing strengthened sanctions for local authority code of conduct breaches in England.

This includes all ‘relevant authorities’ as defined by Section 27(6) of the Localism Act 2011, which includes:

- a county council
- a unitary authority
- London borough councils
- a district council
- the Greater London Authority
- the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
- the Common Council of the City of London in its capacity as a local authority or police authority
- the Council of the Isles of Scilly
- parish councils
- a fire and rescue authority in England constituted by a scheme under section 2 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 or a scheme to which section 4 of that Act applies,
- a joint authority established by Part 4 of the Local Government Act 1985, an economic prosperity board established under section 88 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009
- a combined authority established under section 103 of that Act,
- a combined county authority established under section 9(1) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023
- the Broads Authority

- a National Park authority in England established under section 63 of the Environment Act 1995

It does not cover:

- police and crime commissioners
- internal drainage boards
- any other local authority not otherwise defined as a 'relevant authority' above

All references to 'members' refer to elected members, mayors, co-opted and appointed members of each of the 'relevant authorities' defined above.

Geographical scope

The questions in this consultation paper apply to all relevant local authorities in England as defined above.

They generally do not apply to authorities in Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland, except in relation to Police and Crime Panels in Wales.

Impact assessment

We will produce a full Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) assessment, and all necessary impact assessments, as the policy proposals develop further following this consultation.

Basic information

This is an open consultation. We particularly seek the views of individual members of the public; prospective and current elected members/representatives; all relevant local authorities defined above; and those bodies that represent the interests of local authority members/representatives at all levels.

Body responsible for the consultation

The Local Government Capacity and Improvement Division of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government is responsible for

conducting this consultation.

Duration

This consultation will last for 10 weeks from 18 December 2024.

Enquiries

For any enquiries about the consultation please contact:

LGstandardsreform@communities.gov.uk

How to respond

You can only respond to this call for evidence through our online consultation platform, [Citizen Space \(https://consult.communities.gov.uk/local-government-standards-and-conduct/strengthening-the-standards-and-conduct-framework\)](https://consult.communities.gov.uk/local-government-standards-and-conduct/strengthening-the-standards-and-conduct-framework).

2. Ministerial foreword

The government is determined to fix the foundations of local government so councils can sustainably provide decent public services and shape local places, and so elected representatives can be fully accountable to the public they serve. Doing so is critical to national renewal, our missions, and our plans to push power out of Westminster and into the hands of local people with skin in the game.

At the core of this agenda is a plan to make local government across England fit, legal, and decent – so that councils have the backing from central government to deliver the high standards and strong financial management that they strive for, without needless micromanagement of day-to-day local decision-making. This plan includes:

- fixing our broken audit system
- improving oversight and accountability
- giving councils genuine freedoms to work for, and deliver in the best interests of, their communities
- improving the standards and conduct regime

This consultation is focused on the proposed reforms to the standards and conduct regime that will contribute to making sure England is covered by effective local and strategic authorities that are well-governed, with high standards met and maintained.

It is an honour and a privilege to be elected as a member and with it comes an individual and collective responsibility to consistently demonstrate and promote the highest standards of conduct and public service.

Members take decisions affecting critical local services such as social care, education, housing, planning, licensing, and waste collection. With greater devolution, local authorities will increasingly be taking decisions to shape local transport, skills, employment support, and growth. Decisions that are the responsibility of members impact virtually every citizen's life at some level, and the electorate has a right to expect that it can trust its local elected members to uphold the highest ethical standards and act in the best interests of the communities they serve.

I strongly believe that the vast majority of local elected members maintain high standards of conduct and that they are driven by duty and service. I believe that people stand for elected office in their local communities with the best intentions to act in the interests of those communities, bringing an energy and commitment to working collaboratively, creatively, and respectfully.

Members, officers, reporters and members of public are entitled to support and participate in the local democratic process in the confidence that high standards are maintained. This government wants to celebrate the positive power of public service and, in doing so, we want to give individual authorities appropriate and proportionate means to deal with misconduct effectively and decisively when it does occur. We also want to ensure that anyone can rightly feel confident about raising an issue under the code of conduct whether it impacts them personally and/or is a code conduct breach that brings the reputation of the council into disrepute.

With approximately 120,000 councillors in England across all types and tiers of local government, we know there are rare instances of misconduct.

Robust political debate is part of our democratic system, but we know from local councils that there are examples of bullying, harassment or other misconduct, when from even a very small minority of members can have a seriously destabilising effect, potentially bringing a council into disrepute and distracting from the critical business of delivering for residents.

This government is committed to working with local and regional government to establish partnerships built on mutual respect, genuine collaboration and meaningful engagement. Our ambition is to create a rigorous standards and conduct framework that will actively contribute to ensuring that local government throughout the country is fit, legal, and decent. With this in mind, this consultation seeks your views on a range of proposals to give local leaders the tools they need to establish and maintain a strong and ethical public service and democratic culture, and the people they serve the confidence that local democracy works for them.

3. Background: Standards and Conduct framework and sanctions arrangements

The [Localism Act 2011](#)

(<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/part/1/chapter/7/enacted>)^[footnote 1] established the current standards and conduct framework for local authorities.

The current regime requires every local authority to adopt a code of conduct, the contents of which must as a minimum be consistent with the 7 [‘Nolan’ principles of standards in public life](#) (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life>) (selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership), and set out rules on requiring members to register and disclose pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests. Beyond these requirements, it is for individual councils to set their own local code. The Local Government Association (LGA) published an [updated model code of conduct and guidance](#) (<https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/local-government-association-model-councillor-code-conduct-2020>) in 2021, which councils can choose whether to adopt or not.

Every authority must also have in place arrangements under which it can investigate allegations of breaches of its code of conduct and must consult at least one independent person before coming to decisions. These decisions are normally taken in one of two ways depending on an authority’s specific arrangements. The decision can be made by full council following advice from their standards committee (or equivalent). Alternatively, the decision can be made by the standards committee if they have been given the power to do so. Although a standards committee may contain unelected independent members and co-opted members, only principal councils’ elected members may vote in a decision-making standards committee.

There is no provision in current legislation for a sanction to suspend a councillor found to have breached the code of conduct. Sanctions for member code of conduct breaches are currently limited to less robust measures than suspension, such as barring members from Cabinet, Committee, or representative roles, a requirement to issue an apology or undergo code of conduct training, or public criticism. Local authorities are also unable to withhold allowances from members who commit serious breaches of their code of conduct, and there is no explicit provision in

legislation for councils to impose premises bans or facilities withdrawals where they consider that it might be beneficial to do so.

The government considers that the current local authority standards and conduct regime is in certain key aspects ineffectual, inconsistently applied, and lacking in adequate powers to effectively sanction members found in serious breach of their codes of conduct.

4. Who we would like to hear from

Responses are invited from local authority elected members and officers from all types and tiers of authorities, and local authority sector representative organisations. We are also particularly keen to hear from those members of the public who have point of view based on their interest in accessing local democracy in their area or standing as a candidate for local government at any tier to represent their local community at some future point.

Please be assured that all responses to this consultation are anonymous, and no information will be disclosed in any future published response to the consultation, or reporting of the consultation results, that will compromise that anonymity.

Question 1

Please tick all that apply - are you responding to this consultation as:

a) an elected member – if so please indicate which local authority type(s) you serve on

- Town or Parish Council
- District or Borough Council
- Unitary Authority
- County Council
- Combined Authority / Combined County Authority
- Fire and Rescue Authority
- Police and Crime Panel
- Other local authority type - please state

b) a council officer – if so please indicate which local authority type

- Town or Parish Council
- District or Borough Council

- Unitary Authority
- County Council
- Combined Authority / Combined County Authority
- Fire and Rescue Authority
- Police and Crime Panel
- Other local authority type - please state

c) a council body – if so please indicate which local authority type

- Town or Parish Council
- District or Borough Council
- Unitary Authority
- County Council
- Combined Authority / Combined County Authority
- Fire and Rescue Authority
- Police and Crime Panel
- Other local authority type - please state

d) a member of the public

e) a local government sector body – please state

5. Strengthening the Standards and Conduct framework

a) Mandatory minimum prescribed code of conduct

The government proposes to legislate for the introduction of a mandatory minimum code of conduct which would seek to ensure a higher minimum standard of consistency in setting out the behaviours expected of elected members. The government will likely set out the mandatory code in regulations to allow flexibility to review and amend in future, this will also provide the opportunity for further consultation on the detail.

Codes of conduct play an important role in prescribing and maintaining high standards of public service, integrity, transparency, and accountability. At their best, they establish clear guidelines for behaviour and expectations that members always act ethically in the public's best interest. Currently,

there is significant variation between adopted codes, ranging from those who choose to adopt the LGA's full model code to those who simply conform with the minimum requirement of restating the Nolan principles.

A prescribed model code which covers important issues such as discrimination, bullying, and harassment, social media use, public conduct when claiming to represent the council, and use of authority resources could help to uphold consistently high standards of public service in councils across the country and convey the privileged position of public office. It could also provide clarity for the public on the consistent baseline of ethical behaviour they have a right to expect.

We would be interested in understanding whether councils consider there should be flexibility to add to the prescribed code to reflect individual authorities' circumstances. They would not be able to amend the mandatory provisions.

Question 2

Do you think the government should prescribe a mandatory minimum code of conduct for local authorities in England?

- Yes
- No
- If no, why not? [Free text box]

Question 3

If yes, do you agree there should be scope for local authorities to add to a mandatory minimum code of conduct to reflect specific local challenges?

- Yes – it is important that local authorities have flexibility to add to a prescribed code
- No – a prescribed code should be uniform across the country
- Unsure

Question 4

Do you think the government should set out a code of conduct requirement for members to cooperate with investigations into code breaches?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

b) Standards Committees

Currently, there is no requirement for local authorities to constitute a formal standards committee. The only legal requirement is for local authorities to have in place 'arrangements' to investigate and make decisions on allegations of misconduct.

The government believes that all principal authorities should be required to convene a standards committee. Formal standards committees would support consistency in the handling of misconduct allegations, applying the same standards and procedures to all cases and providing a formal route to swiftly identify and address vexatious complainants. Furthermore, having a formal standards committee in place could support the development of expertise in handling allegations of misconduct, leading to more informed decision-making. Removing the scope for less formal and more ad hoc arrangements would also enhance transparency and demonstrate to the public that standards and conduct issues will always be dealt with in a structured and consistent way.

This section of the consultation seeks views on two specific proposals to enhance the fairness and objectivity of the standards committee process. Firstly, it considers whether standards committee membership would be required to include at least one Independent Person, as well as (where applicable^{[footnote 2](#)}) at least one co-opted member from a parish or town council. Secondly, it seeks views on whether standards committees should be chaired by the Independent Person.

Question 5

Does your local authority currently maintain a standards committee?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

Question 6

Should all principal authorities be required to form a standards committee?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

Question 7

In most principal authorities, code of conduct complaints are typically submitted in the first instance to the local authority Monitoring Officer to

triage, before referring a case for full investigation. Should all alleged code of conduct breaches which are referred for investigation be heard by the relevant principal authority's standards committee?

- Yes, decisions should only be heard by standards committees
- No, local authorities should have discretion to allow decisions to be taken by full council
- Unsure

Question 8

Do you agree that the Independent Person and co-opted members should be given voting rights?

- Yes – this is important for ensuring objectivity
- No – only elected members of the council in question should have voting rights
- Unsure

Question 9

Should standards committees be chaired by the Independent Person?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Question 10

If you have further views on ensuring fairness and objectivity and reducing incidences of vexatious complaints, please use the free text box below.

[Free text box]

c) Publishing investigation outcomes

To enhance transparency, local authorities should, subject to data protection obligations, be required to publish a summary of code of conduct allegations, and any investigations and decisions. This will be accompanied with strong mechanisms to protect victims' identity to ensure complainants are not dissuaded from coming forward for fear of being identified,

There may be a range of views on this, as publishing the outcome of an investigation that proves there is no case to answer could still be considered damaging to the reputation of the individuals concerned, or it could be considered as helpful in exposing instances of petty and vexatious complaints.

Question 11

Should local authorities be required to publish annually a list of allegations of code of conduct breaches, and any investigation outcomes?

- Yes - the public should have full access to all allegations and investigation outcomes
- No - only cases in which a member is found guilty of wrongdoing should be published
- Other views – text box

d) Requiring the completion of investigations if a member stands down

In circumstances where a member stands down during a live code of conduct investigation, councils should be required to conclude that investigation and publish the findings. The government is proposing this measure to ensure that, whilst the member in question will no longer be in office and therefore subject to any council sanction, for the purposes of accountability and transparency there will still be full record of any code of conduct breaches during their term of office.

Question 12

Should investigations into the conduct of members who stand down before a decision continue to their conclusion, and the findings be published?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

e) Empowering individuals affected by councillor misconduct to come forward

The government appreciates that it can often be difficult for those who experience misconduct on the part of elected members, such as bullying and harassment, to feel that it is safe and worthwhile to come forward and raise their concerns. If individuals believe there is a likelihood that their complaint will not be addressed or handled appropriately, the risk is that victims will not feel empowered to come forward, meaning misconduct continues without action. We recognise that standing up to instances of misconduct takes an emotional toll, particularly in unacceptable situations where the complaints processes are protracted and do not result in meaningful action. We are committed to ensuring that those affected by misconduct are supported in the right way and feel empowered to come forward. This section seeks feedback from local authorities with experience of overseeing council complaints procedures, or sector bodies and individuals with views on how this might be carried out most effectively. We are also keen to hear from those who work, or have worked, in local government, and who have either witnessed, or been the victim of, member misconduct.

Question 13

If responding as a local authority, what is the average number of complaints against elected members that you receive over a 12-month period?

[Number box]

Question 13a

For the above, where possible, please provide a breakdown for complaints made by officers, other elected members, the public, or any other source:

- Complaints made by officers [Number box]
- Complaints made by other elected members [Number box]
- Complaints made by the public [Number box]
- Complaints made by any other source [Number box]

Question 14

If you currently work, or have worked, within a local authority, have you ever been the victim of (or witnessed) an instance of misconduct by an elected member and felt that you could not come forward? Please give reasons if you feel comfortable doing so.

- Yes

- No
- [Free text box]

Question 15

If you are an elected member, have you ever been subject to a code of conduct complaint? If so, did you feel you received appropriate support to engage with the investigation?

- Yes
- No
- [Free text box]

Question 16

If you did come forward as a victim or witness, what support did you receive, and from whom? Is there additional support you would have liked to receive?

[Free text box]

Question 17

In your view, what measures would help to ensure that people who are victims of, or witness, serious councillor misconduct feel comfortable coming forward and raising a complaint?

[Free text box]

6. Introducing the power of suspension with related safeguards

The government believes that local authorities should have the power to suspend councillors for serious code of conduct breaches for a maximum of 6 months, with the option to withhold allowances and institute premises and facilities bans where deemed appropriate. This section of the consultation explores these proposed provisions in greater detail.

While the law disqualifies certain people from being, or standing for election as, a councillor (e.g. on the grounds of bankruptcy, or receipt of a custodial sentence of 3 months or more, or it subject to the notification requirements of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 - meaning on the sex offenders register) councillors cannot currently be suspended or disqualified for breaching their code of conduct.

Feedback from the local government sector in the years since the removal of the power to suspend councillors has indicated that the current lack of meaningful sanctions means local authorities have no effective way of dealing with more serious examples of member misconduct.

The most severe sanctions currently used, such as formally censuring members, removing them from committees or representative roles, and requiring them to undergo training, may prove ineffective in the cases of more serious and disruptive misconduct. This may particularly be the case when it comes to tackling repeat offenders.

The government recognises that it is only a small minority of members who behave badly, but the misconduct of this small minority can have a disproportionately negative impact on the smooth running of councils. We also appreciate the frustration members of the public and councillors can feel both in the inability to deal decisively with cases of misconduct, and the fact that offending members can continue to draw allowances.

Question 18

Do you think local authorities should be given the power to suspend elected members for serious code of conduct breaches?

- Yes – authorities should be given the power to suspend members
- No – authorities should not be given the power to suspend members
- Unsure

Question 19

Do you think that it is appropriate for a standards committee to have the power to suspend members, or should this be the role of an independent body?

- Yes - the decision to suspend for serious code of conduct breaches should be for the standards committee
- No - a decision to suspend should be referred to an independent body
- Unsure
- [Free text box]

Question 20

Where it is deemed that suspension is an appropriate response to a code of conduct breach, should local authorities be required to nominate an alternative point of contact for constituents during their absence?

- Yes – councils should be required to ensure that constituents have an alternative point of contact during a councillor's suspension

- No – it should be for individual councils to determine their own arrangements for managing constituents' representation during a period of councillor suspension
- Unsure

a) The length of suspension

The Committee on Standards in Public Life recommended in their 2019 Local Government Ethical Standards^{[\[footnote 3\]](#)} (CSPL) report that the maximum length of suspension, without allowances, should be 6 months and the government agrees with this approach. The intent of this proposal would be that non-attendance at council meetings during a period of suspension would be disregarded for the purposes of section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, which states that a councillor ceases to be a member of the local authority if they fail to attend council meetings for 6 consecutive months.

The government believes that suspension for the full 6 months should be reserved for only the most serious breaches of the code of conduct, and considers that there should be no minimum length of suspension to facilitate the proportionate application of this strengthened sanction.

Question 21

If the government reintroduced the power of suspension do you think there should be a maximum length of suspension?

- Yes – the government should set a maximum length of suspension of 6 months
- Yes – however the government should set a different maximum length (in months) [Number box]
- No – I do not think the government should set a maximum length of suspension
- Unsure

Question 22

If yes, how frequently do you consider councils would be likely to make use of the maximum length of suspension?

- Infrequently – likely to be applied only to the most egregious code of conduct breaches
- Frequently – likely to be applied in most cases, with some exceptions for less serious breaches

- Almost always – likely to be the default length of suspension for code of conduct breaches
- Unsure

b) Withholding allowances and premises and facilities bans

Giving councils the discretion to withhold allowances from members who have been suspended for serious code of conduct breaches in cases where they feel it is appropriate to do so could act as a further deterrent against unethical behaviour. Holding councillors financially accountable during suspensions also reflects a commitment to ethical governance, the highest standards of public service, and value for money for local residents.

Granting local authorities the power in legislation to ban suspended councillors from local authority premises and from using council equipment and facilities could be beneficial in cases of behavioural or financial misconduct, ensuring that suspended councillors do not misuse resources or continue egregious behaviour. Additionally, it would demonstrate that allegations of serious misconduct are handled appropriately, preserving trust in public service and responsible stewardship of public assets.

These measures may not always be appropriate and should not be tied to the sanction of suspension by default. The government also recognises that there may be instances in which one or both of these sanctions is appropriate but suspension is not. It is therefore proposed that both the power to withhold allowances and premises and facilities bans represent standalone sanctions in their own right.

Question 23

Should local authorities have the power to withhold allowances from suspended councillors in cases where they deem it appropriate?

- Yes – councils should have the option to withhold allowances from suspended councillors
- No – suspended councillors should continue to receive allowances
- Unsure

Question 24

Do you think it should be put beyond doubt that local authorities have the power to ban suspended councillors from council premises and to

withdraw the use of council facilities in cases where they deem it appropriate?

- Yes – premises and facilities bans are an important tool in tackling serious conduct issues
- No – suspended councillors should still be able to use council premises and facilities
- Unsure

Question 25

Do you agree that the power to withhold members' allowances and to implement premises and facilities bans should also be standalone sanctions in their own right?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

c) Interim suspension

Some investigations into serious code of conduct breaches may be complex and take time to conclude, and there may be circumstances when the misconduct that has led to the allegation is subsequently referred to the police to investigate. In such cases, the government proposes that there should be an additional power to impose interim suspensions whilst and until a serious or complex case under investigation is resolved.

A member subject to an interim suspension would not be permitted to participate in any council business or meetings, with an option to include a premises and facilities ban.

We consider that members should continue to receive allowances whilst on interim suspension and until an investigation proves beyond doubt that a serious code of conduct breach has occurred or a criminal investigation concludes. The decision to impose an interim suspension would not represent a pre-judgement of the validity of an allegation.

We suggest that:

- Interim suspensions should initially be for up to a maximum of 3 months. After the expiry of an initial interim suspension period, the relevant council's standards committee should review the case to decide whether it is in the public interest to extend.

- As appropriate, the period of time spent on interim suspension may be deducted from the period of suspension a standards committee imposes.

Question 26

Do you think the power to suspend councillors on an interim basis pending the outcome of an investigation would be an appropriate measure?

- Yes, powers to suspend on an interim basis would be necessary
- No, interim suspension would not be necessary
- Any further comments [free text box]

Question 27

Do you agree that local authorities should have the power to impose premises and facilities bans on councillors who are suspended on an interim basis?

- Yes - the option to institute premises and facilities bans whilst serious misconduct cases are investigated is important
- No - members whose investigations are ongoing should retain access to council premises and facilities
- Unsure

Question 28

Do you think councils should be able to impose an interim suspension for any period of time they deem fit?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

Question 29

Do you agree that an interim suspension should initially be for up to a maximum of 3 months, and then subject to review?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

Question 30

If following a 3-month review of an interim suspension, a standards committee decided to extend, do you think there should be safeguards

to ensure a period of interim extension is not allowed to run on unchecked?

- Yes – there should be safeguards
- No – councils will know the details of individual cases and should be trusted to act responsibly

Question 30a

If you answered yes to above question, what safeguards do you think might be needed to ensure that unlimited suspension is not misused?

[Free text box]

d) Disqualification for multiple breaches and gross misconduct

When councillors repeatedly breach codes of conduct, it undermines the integrity of the council and erodes public confidence. To curb the risk of repeat offending and continued misconduct once councillors return from a suspension, the government considers that it may be beneficial to introduce disqualification for a period of 5 years for those members for whom the sanction of suspension is invoked on more than one occasion within a 5-year period.

This measure underlines the government's view that the sanction of suspension should only be used in the most serious code of conduct breaches, because in effect a decision to suspend more than once in a 5-year period would be a decision to disqualify an elected member. However, we consider this measure would enable councils to signal in the strongest terms that repeated instances of misconduct will not be tolerated and would act as a strong deterrent against the worst kind of behaviours becoming embedded.

Currently a person is disqualified if they have been convicted of any offence and have received a sentence of imprisonment (suspended or not) for a period of 3 months or more (without the option of a fine) in the 5-year period before the relevant election. Disqualification also covers sexual offences, even if they do not result in a custodial or suspended sentence.

Question 31

Do you think councillors should be disqualified if subject to suspension more than once?

- Yes – twice within a 5-year period should result in disqualification for 5 years
- Yes – but for a different length of time and/or within a different timeframe (in years) [Number boxes]
- No - the power to suspend members whenever they breach codes of conduct is sufficient
- Any other comments [free text box]

Question 32

Is there a case for immediate disqualification for gross misconduct, for example in instances of theft or physical violence impacting the safety of other members and/or officers, provided there has been an investigation of the incident and the member has had a chance to respond before a decision is made?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- [Free text box]

e) Appeals

The government proposes that:

- A right of appeal be introduced for any member subject to a decision to suspend them.
- Members should only be able to appeal any given decision to suspend them once.
- An appeal should be invoked within 5 working days of the notification of suspension; and
- Following receipt of a request for appeal, arrangements should be made to conduct the appeal hearing within 28 working days.

The government believes that were the sanction of suspension to be introduced (and potentially disqualification if a decision to suspend occurs a second time within a 5-year period) it would be essential for such a punitive measure to be underpinned by a fair appeals process.

A right of appeal would allow members to challenge decisions that they believe are unjust or disproportionate and provides a safeguard to ensure that the sanction of suspension is applied fairly and consistently.

We consider that it would be appropriate to either create a national body, or to vest the appeals function in an existing appropriate national body, and views on the merits of that are sought at questions 38 and 39 below. Firstly, the following questions test opinion on the principle of providing a mechanism for appeal.

Question 33

Should members have the right to appeal a decision to suspend them?

- Yes - it is right that any member issued with a sanction of suspension can appeal the decision
- No – a council's decision following consideration of an investigation should be final
- Unsure

Question 34

Should suspended members have to make their appeal within a set timeframe?

- Yes – within 5 days of the decision is appropriate to ensure an efficient process
- Yes – but within a different length of time (in days) [Number box]
- No – there should be no time limit for appealing a decision

The government is also keen to explore if a right of appeal should be provided, either in relation to whether a complaint proceeds to full investigation and consideration by the standards committee, or where a claimant is dissatisfied with the determination of the standards committee.

Question 35

Do you consider that a complainant should have a right of appeal when a decision is taken not to investigate their complaint?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Question 36

Do you consider that a complainant should have a right of appeal when an allegation of misconduct is not upheld?

- Yes
- No

- Unsure

Question 37

If you answered yes to either of the previous two questions, please use the free text box below to share views on what you think is the most suitable route of appeal for either or both situations.

[Free text box]

f) Potential for a national appeals body

There is a need to consider whether appeals panels should be in-house within local authorities, or whether it is right that this responsibility sits with an independent national body. Whereas an in-house appeals process would potentially enable quicker resolutions by virtue of a smaller caseload, empowering a national body to oversee appeals from suspended members and complainants could reinforce transparency and impartiality and help to ensure consistency of decision-making throughout England, setting precedents for the types of cases that are heard.

Question 38

Do you think there is a need for an external national body to hear appeals?

- Yes – an external appeals body would help to uphold impartiality
- No – appeals cases should be heard by an internal panel
- Any further comments [free text box]

Question 39

If you think there is a need for an external national appeals body, do you think it should:

- Be limited to hearing elected member appeals
- Be limited to hearing claimant appeals
- Both of the above should be in scope
- Please explain your answer [free text box]

7. Public Sector Equality Duty

Question 40

In your view, would the proposed reforms to the local government standards and conduct framework particularly benefit or disadvantage individuals with protected characteristics, for example those with disabilities or caring responsibilities?

Please tick an option below:

- it would benefit individuals with protected characteristics
- it would disadvantage individuals with protected characteristics
- neither

Please use the text box below to make any further comment on this question.

[Free text box]

Annex A: Personal data

The following is to explain your rights and give you the information you are be entitled to under the Data Protection Act 2018. Note that this section only refers to your personal data (your name address and anything that could be used to identify you personally) not the content of your response to the consultation.

1. The identity of the data controller and contact details of our Data Protection Officer

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is the data controller. The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at dataprotection@communities.gov.uk.

2. Why we are collecting your personal data

Your personal data is being collected as an essential part of the consultation process, so that we can contact you regarding your response and for statistical purposes. We may also use it to contact you about related matters.

3. Our legal basis for processing your personal data

The Data Protection Act 2018 states that, as a government department, MHCLG may process personal data as necessary for the effective performance of a task carried out in the public interest. i.e. a consultation.

4. With whom we will be sharing your personal data

We use a third-party platform, Citizen Space, to collect consultation responses. In the first instance, your personal data will be stored on their secure UK-based servers.

5. For how long we will keep your personal data, or criteria used to determine the retention period.

Your personal data will be held for 2 years from the closure of the consultation.

6. Your rights, e.g. access, rectification, erasure

The data we are collecting is your personal data, and you have considerable say over what happens to it. You have the right:

- a) to see what data we have about you
- b) to ask us to stop using your data, but keep it on record
- c) to ask to have all or some of your data deleted or corrected
- d) to lodge a complaint with the independent Information Commissioner (ICO) if you think we are not handling your data fairly or in accordance with

the law. You can contact the ICO at <https://ico.org.uk/> (<https://ico.org.uk/>), or telephone 0303 123 1113.

7. Your personal data will not be sent overseas

8. Your personal data will not be used for any automated decision making

9. Your personal data will be stored on a secure government IT system

Your data will be transferred to our secure government IT system as soon as possible after the consultation has closed, and it will be stored there for the standard 2 years of retention before it is deleted.

-
1. [Localism Act 2011 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/part/1/chapter/7)
(<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/part/1/chapter/7>)
 2. Only around 36% of the population of England is covered by a parish or town council.
 3. [Local government ethical standards: report - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-ethical-standards-report)
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-ethical-standards-report>)

This page is intentionally left blank

Work Plan for Joint Standards Committee 2024/25

Meeting Date (4.00pm start time)	Items	Notes
24-23 January 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monitoring report in respect of complaints received.• Review of Work Plan• Local Government standards framework briefing paper• Community Governance Review Update (tbc)• YLCA Representative	Standard Item Standard Item
18 March 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monitoring report in respect of complaints received.• Review of Work Plan• Draft Annual Report• Community Governance Review Update (tbc)• YLCA Representative	Standard Item

Pending items for consideration:

- Review of Citywide Democratic Engagement of Parished and Non Parished areas
- Case Handling Procedures

This page is intentionally left blank



Joint Standards Committee**23 January 2025**

Report of the Deputy Monitoring Officer

Monitoring Report in respect of Complaints Received**Summary**

1. This report is to update the Committee on the position regarding ongoing and recently closed complaints.

Background

2. The Joint Standards Committee is responsible for promoting a culture of openness, accountability, probity and the maintenance of high standards of conduct by members. In order to do this, it reviews all code of conduct complaints. This enables, amongst other things:
 - Monitoring overall numbers of complaints allowing comparison with similar authorities
 - Monitoring trends of increasing/decreasing levels of complaints and identifying links to key events or triggers
 - Identifying common types of complaints which may illustrate a need for enhanced training and information
 - Assessing the efficacy of sanctions imposed by linking an increase/decrease in complaints regarding a particular member or from a particular locus to intervention or sanctions previously imposed.
 - Assessing the efficacy of the complaints procedure and identifying possible improvements.

Commentary on Case Logs**Open cases**

3. Case reference 2023/21 falls under paragraph 5 of the complaints handling process and was considered by a JSC Assessment Sub Committee on 30 January 2024. The Committee decided to refer the matter for investigation which it indicated should be external. The cost of

an external investigation was explored and found to be disproportionate. An investigation was undertaken by CYC lawyers who completed and circulated their draft report to the parties for comment. Significant representations were received in response during December 2024. The report is now with the Monitoring Officer for consideration.

4. Case reference 2024/15 falls under paragraph 5 of the complaints handling process and was due to be considered by a JSC Assessment Sub Committee on 9 January 2025. Due to illness of 2 panel members that sub committee meeting was inquorate and has been rescheduled to 23 January 2025.

Cases closed since last JSC

5. Case reference 2024/12 was referred for investigation by the Deputy Monitoring Officer. An investigation was completed by a CYC lawyer and a report was sent to the parties for comment. Following receipt and consideration of further representations the report was finalised and the matter presented to the JSC Sub Committee. Members of the Sub Committee considered the LGA guidance set out in the report and concluded that the Councillor had breached the Code of Conduct. The Panel agreed that it was proportionate and appropriate to apply a sanction of formal censure.

Implications

6. **Financial** Not applicable to this report.
7. **Human Resources (HR)** Not applicable to this report.
8. **Equalities** Maintaining standards across the City through the Code of Conduct ensures that an ethical framework can be adhered to, including ensuring that equality issues form an integral part of that framework.
9. **Legal** As detailed within the report.
10. **Crime and Disorder, Information Technology and Property**
Not applicable to this report.

Recommendations

11. That the Joint Standards Committee notes the report, in order to ensure that the Committee is aware of the current levels of activity and is able to provide oversight of the complaints procedure.

**Author & Officer Responsible
for the report:**

Frances Harrison
Deputy Monitoring Officer
frances.harrison@york.gov.uk

**Report
Approved**



Date 13 January
2025

Wards Affected:

All ☒

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

- Annex A (i) Table showing open complaints received.
- Annex A (ii) Table showing open complaints received (confidential)
- Annex B (i) Table showing recently closed complaints.
- Annex B (ii) Table showing recent complaints (confidential)

This page is intentionally left blank

Open Complaints Log - Public

Case ref	City or Parish	Complainant	Date Received	Nature of Complaint	Status / updates
2023/21 (LT)	CYC	York residents	26/11/23	The complainants allege that the behaviour of the 3 Councillor's is not in line with the code. Multiple examples of these allegations over a period of time have been provided by all complainants.	<p>This complaint falls under paragraph 5 of the complaints handling process. It will therefore be referred to a JSC Sub Committee for assessment.</p> <p>Views of the IP sought.</p> <p>Assessment Sub Committee arranged for 30th January 2024.</p> <p>The Assessment Sub Committee assessed the complaint and recommended to progress to investigation. Parties notified.</p> <p>An investigation has been completed and a draft report has been prepared. This has been shared with the parties and IP in accordance with the case handling procedure. Further representations have been made which will be considered by the investigating officer and the report updated before a Sub Committee is asked to determine the outcome.</p> <p>The draft report is now with the Monitoring Officer for their review and consideration.</p>
2024/15 (FH)	CYC	CYC Officer	06/11/24	The complainant alleges that during a Council meeting, the Councillor breached the code of conduct and points	This complaint is currently being assessed by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

Open Complaints Log - Public

Case ref	City or Parish	Complainant	Date Received	Nature of Complaint	Status / updates
				1.2, 1.3, 2.4, 4.2, 4.3 & 4.4 of the Protocol for Officer / Member Relations.	<p>IP views sought.</p> <p>This complaint falls under paragraph 5 of the complaints handling process. It will therefore be referred to a JSC Sub Committee for assessment.</p>

Recently Closed Complaints Log - Public

Case ref	City or Parish	Complainant	Date Received	Nature of Complaint	Status / updates
2024/12	CYC	Member of the public	24/07/24	The complainant alleges the Councillor breached the code of conduct by using offensive language in an email.	<p>This complaint is currently being assessed by the Deputy Monitoring Officer.</p> <p>Views of the IP sought.</p> <p>The Deputy Monitoring Officer assessed the complaint and recommended to progress to investigation. Parties notified.</p> <p>Investigation concluded and report produced. Hearing to be convened on 12th November. Parties notified.</p> <p>Members of the Hearings Panel considered the LGA guidance set out in the report and concluded that the Councillor had breached the Code of Conduct. The Panel agreed that it was proportionate and appropriate to apply the following sanction: Formal censure. The decision notice will be sent to both parties and will be published on the website. Complaint closed.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank