

Standards Hearing Sub Committee

Complaint against Councillor Aspden – City of York Council

Complainants :

Subject Member : Councillor Keith Aspden

Investigator : Wilkin Chapman LLP Solicitors

1. Background

- 1.1 In February/March 2017 there was a concern that an officer had leaked confidential information to the press. Councillor Aspden has stated that after discussion, he reported this to the Chief Executive as soon as this was discovered.
- 1.2 The Chief Executive was then informed of concerns raised by Person A. The Chief Executive subsequently had a meeting with Person A on the 8th March 2017 in the presence of their line manager.
- 1.3 In light of the concerns raised by Person A,, a 'desk top review was completed on 25th April by Mr R.J.B Morris, who was appointed through the Local Government Association on behalf of the Chief Executive. .
- 1.4 A decision was then made to procure external investigators to complete the investigation under the Council legal procurement framework. Gowling Solicitors were appointed to report to the Council's Human Resources department. They produced a report, known as Project Rose which investigated further the allegations made. This investigation was completed in August 2017

- 1.5 A separate solicitor from Gowlings was appointed to advise the Chief Executive with regard to the findings of the investigation and that solicitor was not be part of the investigation.
- 1.6 On the 17th October 2017, Wilkin Chapman Solicitors were appointed to investigate the issues as they concerned Councillors.
- 1.7 Wilkin Chapman Solicitors have produced a Report of their investigation into allegations concerning Councillor Keith Aspden of City of York Council attached at appendix 1.
- 1.8 Councillor Keith Aspden has provided two responses which are attached as Appendix 2.

2. The Complaints

- 2.1 The potential breaches of the Council's Code of Conduct from Project Rose and subsequent legal advice appear in full at page 4 of the Wilkin Chapman Report, but can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) *Allegation in relation to the pressure applied on officers in relation to a council appointment contrary to Paragraph 3(3) and 3(4) of the Code of Conduct for Members*
 - (b) *Allegation in relation to obtaining an advantage for another in relation to the appointment contrary to paragraph 3(8) of the Code.*
 - (c) *Failure to disclose a personal interest in relation to appointment in effectively chairing the Appointments Panel without disclosing that matter*
 - (d) *Allegation that the Councillor disclosed confidential information regarding a Congestion Commission and investments in local mental health services contrary to paragraph 3(9) of the Code*
 - (e) *Allegation in relation to the use of Council facilities by Liberal Democrat Interns contrary to Paragraph 3(9) of the Code.*
- 2.2 The investigation as detailed in Appendix 1 has concluded that in the Investigator's opinion, the Councillor did:

- (a) *Use his position as a Councillor to improperly to obtain an advantage for an administrative role contrary to paragraph 3(8) of the Code by reason of his involvement in the process whilst having a personal interest.*
- (b) *Did disclose confidential information (the paper applications for the administrative role) contrary to paragraph 3(5) of the Code.*
- (c) *By failing to follow paragraphs 3(5) and 3(8) of the Code in relation to the appointment of the administrative role, he acted in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Council or his position as a Councillor into disrepute contrary to paragraph 3(7) of the Code.*

2.3 The investigation also concluded that, in the Investigator's opinion, the Councillor did :

- (a) *Not bully or intimidate officers contrary to paragraph 3(3) of the Code.*
- (b) *Not compromise the impartiality of officers contrary to paragraph 3(4) of the Code.*
- (c) *Not disclose confidential information regarding the Congestion Commission paper contrary to paragraph 3(5) of the Code*
- (d) *Not disclose confidential information regarding budget proposals for local mental health services contrary to paragraph 3(5) of the Code.*
- (e) *Abide by the Council's reasonable requirements when authorising the use of Council facilities by the Liberal Democrats and therefore did not use them for political purposes contrary to paragraph 3(9) of the Code.*

3. The Code of Conduct for City of York Council

3.1 As required by the Localism Act 2011, the Council has adopted a Code of Conduct which sets out the conduct expected of Councillors when acting as such. The Code of Conduct appears at Appendix 3. The Investigators have investigated a number of matters where breaches of the Code have not been found. However the remaining alleged breaches relate to the following sections:

- 3(5) You must not disclose information which is confidential, unless:
- (a) You have the permission of a person authorised to give it; or
 - (b) You are required by law to disclose the information; or
 - (c) You disclose it 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 reasonable; and is in the public interest; and is made in good faith.
- 3(7) You must not conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Council into disrepute, or your position as a Councillor into disrepute.
- 3(8) You must not use your position as a Councillor improperly to obtain any advantage or disadvantage for yourself or any other person, or attempt to do so.

4. The Hearing Process

4.1 The Standards Committee has approved a procedure for hearings which appears at Appendix 4. In line with that procedure the subject member has been asked to complete a pre hearing check list indicating whether they intend to attend the hearing, to identify facts which they say are in dispute, and state whether any part of the hearing should be in public.

- 4.2 Submissions have been made by Councillor Aspden in line with the questions asked within the pre hearing checklist. Councillor Aspden does not wish the hearing to be held in private, and is content for the Investigator's Report and other relevant documents to be made public. Councillor Aspden has indicated that he would like a number of witnesses to attend the hearing.
- 4.3 Councillor Aspden's submissions are at Appendix 2. He disagrees with the Investigating Officer's view as stated in his responses dated 6th August and 9th November 2018.

5. Issues to be determined

- 5.1 Has Councillor Aspden breached the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of one or more of the allegations?**
- 5.2 It is noted that a number of allegations were investigated and dismissed. Therefore a large part of the Investigating Officer report and documentation shows matters that were investigated and were not found to be a breach of the Code. Therefore for this report, it is helpful to concentrate on the areas where the Investigating Officer has concluded that there has been a breach of the Code and which Councillor Aspden disputes those conclusions as presented in his responses.
- 5.3 Those matters which the Investigating Officer has assessed that there have been breaches of the Code, concern the facts around two aspects of the recruitment and appointment of Person B during the period of May and July 2015. For the sake of clarity, there is no allegation that Person B did anything wrong or improper.
- 5.4 The allegations concerns Cllr Aspden's involvement in the process due to an alleged 'close association' with the successful candidate , and the alleged disclosure of confidential information concerning the paper applications. and thereby bringing the Council or his position as a Councillor into disrepute. There is not an agreed set of facts

regarding this matter and therefore the Sub-Committee will be asked to consider the conflicting evidence presented.

6. The Background of the allegations

6.1 Following the Council election in May 2015, it was agreed with then Chief Executive that given the three largest political groups had a similar number of councillors there would be additional administrative roles for the Leader, Deputy Leader and the Leader of the opposition which would be funded from existing budgets.

6.2 Councillor Aspden wanted to be involved in the recruitment process. However the law provides that Councillors should not make decisions regarding the appointment of non-chief officer posts as this should be an officer decision and not a political appointment. The details of the discussion regarding this issue is provided in paragraph 4.23 to 4.33 which resulted in an agreement that there would be an interview panel for the post which would comprise of two officers and would include Councillor Aspden.

6.3 At 9.57 of 26th June 2015 an officer e-mailed Councillor Aspden and other Panel Members with the applications forms for all of the applicants for this post which was marked high importance and confidential. One of the Applicants was Person B who was an intern for the Liberal Democrat Party in York. Councillor Aspden had previously interviewed Person B for this role.

6.4 In the Summer of 2015 there was a conversation between Councillor Aspden, Person D, Person A and Person C (a Liberal Democrat activist but not a Councillor) in a York Pub. The details of what was said and what happened at the pub are not agreed and are in dispute.

6.5 The following is what is said by each of the individuals who were present at the pub:

6.6 Person A's Statement

6.7 Person A alleges that this was a 'pre-short listing' meeting to prepare for the 'official' short listing meeting on the 29th June 2015. Person A alleges that Councillor Aspden had printed copies of the application forms and CVs of the applicants and passed the forms around all the persons present and they considered their suitability for the post. Person A states *"the meeting and the passing around of the papers was run by Councillor Aspden. They were reading them and making comments as to their suitability. Councillor Apsden was keen to have two individuals on the short list/put through to interview and they were Person B and Person H because he knew both of them and knew them to be Liberal Democrats.*

6.8 *"it was discussed that they would need to put at least some other candidates in the short list to make things look credible and that was done. It was also discussed what good points the two favoured applicants had and what they needed to do to enhance those points, as well as what were not so good areas that the other applicants had. The other candidates mainly had administration/PA skills which were better than the favoured two. However, they were not as experienced applicants in political areas."*

6.9 Person A states that *"it was not correct to do a pre short listing in a public house with people not involved in the process or even Council employees."*

[page 21-22 paragraphs (ff) to (gg)]

6.10 Person C's's Statement

6.11 Person C states that circa late June 2015 he had agreed to meet up for a social drink at the Pub at around 7pm or 9pm. He states that:

6.12 *“after about 10 minutes or so after sitting down Keith Aspden turned to [Person D] and said “Do you want to get the applications out?”*

6.13 *“[Person D] had a large brown envelope which he opened as instructed, producing a large bundle of what were completed job application forms.*

6.14 *“at first he had no idea what was happening but it was then explained to him by Keith Apsden that they were the application forms for candidates for the new job of [REDACTED] who would work directly for him as Deputy Leader of the Council.*

6.15 *“Person C was not clear what the post was but after a short while he became aware that it was a Council employee post and not a Liberal Democrat post. He had been uncomfortable with what was happening.*

6.16 *“Keith Aspden explained that he wanted the right person for the job and wanted the four of them to read the applications and give their views on who were the best candidates;*

6.17 *“the application forms were handed out amongst them and they looked at them. He had no liked what was going on. He had thought that they were confidential papers, people had applied for the post in good faith and that was not the correct way that applications and applicants should be treated.*

6.18 *“He estimated that there were in the region of 80 pieces of paper. Keith Aspden asked for feedback on the applications and the group gave their views.*

6.19 *He expressed that he was uncomfortable with it and said specifically that he {Councillor Aspden} should seek to employ the best candidate for the job....*

6.20 *“It was apparent that Keith Aspden wanted someone he knew and trusted and had stated that two applicants were his favoured choices. They were Person H and Person B. Both were known to Keith Aspden and had worked as interns for the Liberal Democrat Group.*

6.21 *“Councillor Aspden then asked them for their opinions on the good points in their applications so he could use them later.*

6.22 *“There were a further 4 applications selected so it would not have been so obvious that there were a favoured two. They were then asked to find weaknesses in the 4 applicants’ forms so the two favoured ones could be enhanced at the next stage of selection. He had refused to do that.*

6.23 *It was clear to him that that process was inappropriate – that a sifting for a job had occurred in the pub, in public and that he had no relation to the Council but had been shown applications. He also felt that Keith’s intention to try and employ a Liberal Democrat activist rather than the best qualified person in the role was counter productive and unethical.” [page 30-31 paragraphs (k) to (x)]*

6.24 Person D’s statement

6.25 Person D states that:

6.26 “[they] attended the Duke of York pub with Person A, Person C and Councillor Aspden, which was one of many similar occasions with Councillors and Person A whilst he was the [REDACTED].

6.27 Aspects of the discussion at the pub focussed on the desire to have the best person to replace [them] as [REDACTED], but there was no request for him to get the applications out, and [they] would not have brought them to the pub for a social occasion. There was no request from Councillor Aspden or others for feedback on the strengths of individual candidates, and any discussion on the [REDACTED] role would have been limited amongst a much wider discussion. [Person D] did not taken any notes on any aspects of their conversation which was social in nature and described the evening as a social evening over a number of hours with all attendees having a number of drinks and the conversation covered a number of topics.

6.28 [Person D] was sure Councillor Apsden would have met with [Person B] at some point before the interview as they had on-going interactions as [Person B] had just started working as an [REDACTED] with Councillors.

6.29 [Person D] would have been present for some of those conversations, but there was no meeting concerning the [REDACTED] interviews between Councillor Aspden and [Person B] that [they] attended, and was never part of any conversation with [Person B] on the detail of the interview” [pages 32 to 33 paragraph (g) to (j) of the Investigators Report]

6.30 Councillor Keith Aspden’s Statement

6.31 Councillor Aspden states:

6.32 *"In respect of 'the appointment of [REDACTED] it was agreed shortly after May 2015 that there would be [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to the Leader of the Council, the Deputy Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition, and that the [REDACTED] had a Council job description which outlined their role. He agreed that officer appointments below Chief Officer level were made by Officers but that there were a limited number of roles where Councillors were consulted in an advisory capacity, as confirmed by Officer A who stated:*

6.33 *"In general, elected members should not be involved in the selection process of non Chief Officer posts, except where they have regular contact with the role eg Head of Communications"*

6.34 *He relied on the evidence of the appointed officer, Officer A who stated that Person B was the best candidate for the job, which was supported by the evidence of Person A, a member of the interview panel, and stated his role as Chair was to simply welcome the candidates and make initial remarks, but not to lead the process or make the final appointment;*

6.35 *He did not give Person B advanced information of the contents of the 'in tray exercise', which formed part of the recruitment process, as alleged by Person A;*

6.36 *That the connection between him and Person B was clearly identifiable on the recruitment papers as it was declared that Person B was, at the time of his application and appointment, [REDACTED]*

working for York Liberal Democrats. He confirmed he took part in the interview panel for that role, but he did not know Person B or any of their family until they were interviewed for, and worked for the Liberal Democrats in summer 2015. He did not believe his connection with Person B was that of having 'a close association' within the terms of paragraph 6(1) of the Code of Conduct; [Councillor Aspden confirms that he took part in an advisory capacity]

6.37 He could not recall a specific conversation, but thought it likely that he would have mentioned in passing to Person B to consider applying for the position;

6.38 He agreed that in summer 2015 he had a drink and a conversation in a York pub with Person A, Person C and Person D about the process and candidates who had applied for the role, that it was an informal discussion but not a meeting or a short-listing meeting. He confirmed there was a long conversation in a pub about the strength and skills looked for in a colleague but that Person A and Person C were misrepresenting that drink and conversation as a pre-short-listing meeting, which it was not, and stated that for unknown reasons he and Person C unfortunately never got along particularly well;

6.39 His recollection of that evening and conversation was that it was a social evening, not a meeting and not chaired. Nobody raised any concerns, left the pub or refused to take part in the conversation. Person C did not repeatedly say they should employ the best qualified person for the job. Nobody had paper copies of the applications, he did not print off paper copies of the applications, nor did he instruct anybody else to do so. No notes were taken and there was no short-listing or pre-short-listing. He suggested that Person D should be approached regarding that evening;

6.40 *The short-listing meeting was held at West Offices on Monday 29 June 2015. He Officer A, Officer E and Person A had attended, and Officer A had circulated electronic applications the previous week. He recalled that 7 candidates were selected for interview and 6 of the 7 candidates were at least known to him, as to other members of the panel;*

6.41 *Person B stayed at his house for 5 weeks from 1 September 2015 until his family had purchased a flat Person B had needed temporary accommodation and colleagues within York Liberal Democrats provided temporary accommodation to those new to the City. There was no formal agreement and he had received a one-off payment of £500 towards the cost of rent, wear and tear and all bills for the duration of the 5 weeks which had been in line with the rental costs in his area". [Page 40 to 41, paragraphs (q) to (y).]*

Areas of Dispute

6.42 It is clear from the above that whilst the four individuals met in a pubis not in dispute the contents of the conversation and whether paper application forms were distributed are in dispute. It is not in dispute that this conversation occurred prior to the short listing process on the 29th June 2015

6.43 The Investigating Officer has been presented with two witness statements which state that application forms containing confidential details were disclosed at the pub meeting and two witness statements which state that they were not. The Investigating Officer has concluded that

6.44 *"7.37 Notwithstanding the fact that Councillor Aspden and Person D have said the applications were not taken to the public house, based*

on the available evidence we are of the view that the applications were taken to the public house, shared and openly discussed”

6.45 Whilst the Investigating Officer’s report had concluded that there was a disclosure of confidential information the Sub-Committee will need to make a determination whether this was the case.

6.46 Councillor Aspden has stated that Person D’s statement is clear in that he states:

6.47 “Aspects of the discussion at the Duke of York Pub will have focused on the desire to have the best person to replace myself as [REDACTED] – this would only have been natural as the recruitment process was just beginning and I had just taken on the temporary role.

6.48 “There was no request for me to get the applications out, and I would not have brought them to the Duke of York Pub for a social occasion. As such there was no request from Councillor Aspden or others for feedback on the strengths of individual candidates any discussion on the [REDACTED] role would have been limited amongst a much wider discussion and would not have focused on individual candidates.

6.49 “I did not take notes on any aspects of our conversation which was social in nature. This was a social evening over a number of hours with all attendees having a number of drinks and the conversation covered a number of topics.”

6.50 Councillor Aspden further states:

6.51 *“It is equally clear that I did not instruct [Person D] to get the applications out as alleged by [Person A] that [Person D] did not have a large brown envelope and that he did not therefore open this in the pub as alleged by [Person B], that I did not ask for feedback on the individual candidates as alleged by [Person B], that [Person D] did not make notes as alleged by [Person A] and that nobody had paper copies of the applications at the pub. This was a wider discussion which was part of a social evening, unlike the allegations from [Person A]. The statements and the inconsistencies in the evidence throughout the investigations does not seem to have been given appropriate consideration ... I wish to repeat that I did not print off paper copies of the applications for the evening, nor did I instruct anybody else to do so, and paper copies of the applications were not shared.”*

7. Conclusions of the Investigating Officer

7.1 Does the Code apply: Official Capacity?

7.2 Section 28(2) of the Localism Act requires a Council to adopt the Code of Conduct dealing with conduct that is expect of Members when acting in their official capacity. The Investigating Officer has concluded that in the appointment of Person B Councillor Aspden was fully engaged in the recruitment process, including the short-listing and interviews of which he chaired. For the purposes of the investigation, the Investigating Officer has concluded that Councillor Aspden was acting in his official capacity during the recruitment and appointment of Person B. It is understood that this point is not in dispute.

- 1. *Alleged Breach: You must not use your position as a Councillor improperly to obtain any advantage or disadvantage for yourself or any other person, or attempt to do so (Paragraph 3.8)***

7.3 Paragraph 3.8 of the Code of Conduct states that you must not use your position as a Councillor improperly to obtain an advantage or disadvantage for yourself or any other person, or attempt to do so.

7.4 The Investigating Officer has considered this part of the Code by asking the following three questions and answering them accordingly:

(a) **Whether Councillor Aspden had an interest in the recruitment process by reason of his association with Person B**

7.5 The Investigating Officer has considered that Councillor Aspden had an interest in the recruitment process by reason of his association with Person B. The Investigating Officer refers on page 61 of his report to guidance that was published by the Standards Board for England in 2007 regarding the previous Statutory Code of Conduct. This guidance refers to the concept of “close association” and states that “*a person with whom you have a close association is someone that you are either in regular or irregular contact with over a period of time who is more than an acquaintance. It is someone who reasonable member of the public might think you might be prepared to favour or disadvantage when discussing a matter that affects them. It may be a friend, a colleague, a business associate or someone who you know through general social contact*”. The Investigating Officer has stated:

7.6 *“In determining whether Councillor Aspden had a close association with [Person B] we have considered the following points:*

- *Councillor Aspden interviewed [Person B] for the post of [REDACTED]*
- *Councillor Aspden had regular contact with [Person B] when working as an [REDACTED]*
- *Councillor Aspden was shown as the contact/employer on [Person B’s] application for the post of [REDACTED]*

7.7 *In addition to this following his successful application for the post of ESA [Person B] lodged for a short period of time with Councillor Aspden for which he paid him rent.*

7.8 We consider that Councillor Aspden had a close association with [Person B] and therefore that Councillor Aspden had a personal interest in the outcome of the appointment process. We also consider that the sharing of the applications in the Duke of York Public House was an inappropriate disclosure of confidential information.

7.9 Whilst the outcome of any recruitment process will result in the conferring of an advantage on the successful applicant, in this case Councillor Aspden's involvement and conduct in relation to this process was improper for the reasons set out above. We have concluded that Councillor Aspden did breach paragraph 3.8 of the Code of Conduct."

7.10 Councillor Aspden disagrees with this conclusion and queries the appropriateness of relying on guidance from the Standards Board for England, rather than the current Code of Conduct, in that th regime, requirements and guidance was entirely abolished in 2012. He states that the Investigating Officer's report failed to appropriately assess close association, including with the timescales involved, the available evidence and accumulative evidence. He further states that the Investigating Officer has ignored the presented evidence that any association was both already declared and did not need to be declared in any event.

7.11 Councillor Aspden's submission in Appendix 2 outlines the areas in which he wishes to explore to demonstrate the reasons for his disagreement.

(b) Whether the paper sift was appropriate (ie the alleged conversation at the meeting in the pub)

7.12 As stated above the Investigating Officer has concluded that confidential information was shared at the Duke of York Public House at some time after the applications were sent to Councillor Aspden on 26 June 2015. The Investigating Officer states at paragraph 7.35 of his report:

7.13 “[Person D] from memory suggests that applications were printed off from Councillor Aspden’s inbox prior to the short-listing panel. He also confirmed together with [Person A] and [Person C] that a meeting did take place in the Duke of York Public House and that the post of [REDACTED] was discussed. Councillor Aspden also confirms that the meeting did take place in the public house about the strength and skills that they would look for in a colleague. What is in dispute is whether the applications were taken to the public house; whether they were openly shared and whether the application of [Person B] was prematurely highlighted as a preferred applicant together with the application of [Person H].”

7.14 Whilst the Investigating Officer concludes that based on the available evidence he was of the view that the applications were taken to the public house shared and openly discussed, Councillor Aspden disputes this and states that his evidence and the evidence from Person D have failed to be fully considered. He also raises general concerns with regard to timescales, failing to deal with the background and motivation behind the complaint, credibility of witnesses and the number of allegations that ultimately were proved to be unfounded, mistaken or were not breaches of the Code of Conduct as outlined in his response in paragraph 4.72 of the Investigating Officer’s report

7.15 Councillor Aspden’s additional submission in Appendix 2 outlines the areas in which he wishes to explore to demonstrate the reasons for his disagreement, including

(c) **Whether interview questions were provided to Person B in advance**

7.16 The Investigating Officer did not consider that this allegation was founded.

2. Alleged Breach: Disclosure of confidential information

7.17 The Council's Code of Conduct states:

"3(5) You must not disclose information which is confidential unless you rely

- (a) You have the permission of a person authorised to give it
- (b) You are required by law to disclose the information or
- (c) You disclose it to a third party for the purposes of obtaining professional advice, provided that the third party agrees not to disclose that information to any other person
- (d) The disclosure is reasonable and is in the public interest and is made in good faith.

7.18 As stated above the Investigating Officer has concluded that applications were taken to the public house, shared and openly discussed. Councillor Aspden has categorically denied that application forms were disclosed and the conversation was of a more general nature.

3. Alleged Breach: Bringing the Council or the position of Councillor into disrepute

7.19 As the Investigating Officer has concluded that there has been breaches of two parts of the Code of Conduct, he has also concluded that paragraph 3(7) of the Council's Code of Conduct has been breached due to the same set of circumstances. This paragraph states:

"You must not conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Council into disrepute or your position as a Councillor into disrepute".

7.20 The Investigating Officer has concluded the following:

7.82 In this case it is a suggestion that Councillor Aspden did attempt to obtain an advantage for Person B during the recruitment process for the post of [REDACTED] and did openly share confidential and private completed application forms in the Duke of York Public House in York.

7.83 In applying the circumstances of the disclosure of the application forms we consider that Councillor Aspden's actions would have an adverse effect on the public's confidence in the Council to carry out its duties. As such we consider that Councillor Aspden did bring the office of the Councillor and the Council into disrepute."

7.21 Councillor Apsden in his responses has stated that he did not disclose confidential information and that he did not use his position to improperly obtain an advantage. He has stated that given his detailed comments to rebut the allegations of a breach of paragraphs 3(5) and 3(8) of the Code of Conduct, he feels that it is very difficult to see how in the circumstances this could then be stretched to become a breach of 3(7),

8. Matters for the Sub-Committee

8.1 The Sub-Committee is asked to follow the City of York's procedures in dealing with alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct and make a determination on this matter as to whether there has been any breaches of the Code of Conduct.

8.2 In the event that the Sub-Committee finds that the Code has been breached it will need to determine whether a sanction should be imposed, and if so, what sanction.

Report Author:

Barry Khan, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) and Monitoring Officer for North Yorkshire County Council as legal advisor to the Sub-Committee

Background papers:

None

Annexed Documents

- (1) Wilkin Chapman Solicitors Report and schedule of Evidence of their investigation into allegations concerning Councillor Keith Aspden of City of York Council attached at appendix 1 (excluding documents which are exempt and documents which are no longer relevant to this Standards Hearing sub-committee).
- (2) Pre Hearing Submissions submitted by Councillor Aspden attached at Annex 2
- (3) Code of Conduct of York City Council attached at Annex 3.
- (4) Hearing Procedure attached at Annex 4.

Certain personal information has been exempted as it relates to individuals and the business of the council, in accordance with Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 (as Amended).