

STANDARDS ASSESSMENT SUB-COMMITTEE
20/10/2022 at 3.45 pm

Present: Councillor Williams (Chair)
Councillors Byrne and Williamson

Independent Members: Karen Williams

Also in Attendance:

Laila Chowdhury	Constitutional Services
Paul Entwistle	Director of Legal Services
Kaidy McCann	Constitutional Services

1 **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR**

RESOLVED that Councillor Williams be elected Chair for the duration of the meeting.

2 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence received.

3 **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest received.

4 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they contain exempt information under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and it would not, on balance, be in the public interest to disclose the reports.

5 **CONSIDERATION OF A STANDARDS COMPLAINT**

Consideration was given to a report which required assessment of a complaint in relation to Councillors which said that the Councillors had breached the Council's Members Code of Conduct. The Legal Services Officer set out the complaint, as detailed in the report, and outlined the criteria to be used by the sub-committee for deciding whether a complaint should be accepted for investigation, dealt with informally or rejected.

Members gave thorough consideration to the agenda pack which included the complaint form and the responses provided by the Elected Members.



The criteria considered in relation to the complaint was:

- Whether a substantially similar allegation had previously been made by the complainant to Standards for England or the Standards Committee, or the complaint had been the subject of an investigation by another regulatory authority;
- Whether the complaint was about something that happened so long ago that those involved were unlikely to remember it clearly enough to provide credible evidence, or where the lapse of time meant there would be little benefit or point in taking action now;
- Whether the allegation was anonymous;
- Whether the allegation disclosed a potential breach of the Code of Conduct, but the complaint was not serious enough to merit any action; and
 - The resources needed to investigate and determine the complaint was wholly disproportionate to the allegations; and
 - Whether in all the circumstances there was not overriding public benefit in carrying out an investigation.
- Whether the complaint appeared to be malicious, vexatious, politically motivated or tit-for-tat;
- Whether the complaint suggested that there was a wider problem throughout the Authority; or
- Whether it was apparent that the subject of the allegation was relatively inexperienced as a Member or had admitted to making an error and the matter would not warrant a more serious sanction.

Members applied the facts to the criteria adopted to assess complaints, considered the information provided to them and the options available. Members sought and received clarification related to criteria as defined by the Members' Code of Conduct.

RESOLVED that:

1. An apology to be given by the Elected Member in regard to complaint number one.
2. No further action be taken in relation to the complaint number two.

The meeting started at 4.45 pm and ended at 5.29 pm