



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
STANDARDS HEARING SUB-COMMITTEE

Held: TUESDAY, 21 OCTOBER 2025 at 5.00pm

P R E S E N T :

Fiona Barber (Chair)

Councillor Susan Barton

Mike Galvin

In Attendance:

Kamal Adatia – Monitoring Officer

Mr David Lindley – Independent Person

Mr Alex Oram – Independent Investigator

Jessica Skidmore – Governance Services Officer

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Fiona Barber was confirmed as Chair for the meeting.

There were no apologies for absence.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no apologies for absence.

**3. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

**4. PRIVATE SESSION**

The meeting moved into Private Session to consider firstly, whether the rest of the hearing should be in private or not and secondly whether the papers should retain confidentiality for the duration of the hearing.

The Monitoring Officer recommended that the meeting be conducted in public as there was no overwhelming reason why proceedings should be held in private. In relation to the papers which comprised the complaint it was advised

those should retain their status of being private as they contained matters for which there would be a reasonable expectation of confidentiality, however the investigators report suitably anonymised could be made public following the meeting if findings were made on a breach of code of conduct and upheld by the Standards Committee due to convene after the hearing.

It was noted that the Complainant had been approached by the Monitoring Officer and had stated that they were comfortable for the meeting to be undertaken in Public Session in the knowledge that their names would be referred to.

The Sub-Committee addressed the Appellant, Councillor Kitterick, in which he had noted that he was comfortable to proceed in Public Session.

The Sub-Committee were agreed that the meeting should reconvene in public session for the purpose of openness and transparency and that the confidentiality of the papers should be retained until the outcome of the hearing.

#### RESOLVED:

1. That the press and public be permitted to remain in the meeting for consideration of the complaint against a Councillor,
2. That the papers for the meeting remain private as they are deemed to contain "exempt" information, in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended and as defined in the Paragraph detailed below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and taking all circumstances into account, it was considered that the public interest in maintaining the information as exempt outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

#### Paragraph 1

Information relating to any individual

#### Paragraph 2

Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual

#### Paragraph 7a

Information which is subject to any obligation of confidentiality

#### Paragraph 7c

The deliberations of a standards committee or of a sub-committee of a standards committee established under the provisions of Part 3 of the Local

Government Act 2000 in reaching any finding on a matter referred under the provisions of section 60(2) or (3), 70(4) or (5).

## **5. HEARING PROCEDURE**

RESUMED IN PUBLIC SESSION

The Monitoring Officer submitted and summarised the hearing panel procedure.

RESOLVED:

That the Hearing Panel Procedure be noted.

## **6. CONSIDERATION OF INVESTIGATOR'S REPORT INTO A COMPLAINT AGAINST A COUNCILLOR - COMPLAINT NO. 2024/15**

The Monitoring Officer submitted a report providing details of an investigation into a complaint against Councillor Kitterick made by Strategic Director for City Development and Neighbourhoods, Richard Sword, and of the Standards process so far leading to a Hearing Sub-Committee to take place.

The Investigator, Mr Alex Oram, introduced the report, setting out the nature of the complaint against Councillor Kitterick and the details of his investigations together with a view on whether the alleged conduct took place.

The report set out whether the conduct amounted to a breach of the code of conduct and the Investigator explained how he had reached his conclusions, establishing that Councillor Kitterick did act as alleged and within his councillor capacity and as such the code of conduct had been breached.

The Sub-Committee were invited to raise any questions on the facts outlined in the report. Members did not have any questions in regard to the report.

Councillor Kitterick was invited to raise any questions on the facts outlined in the report, during which, he highlighted the following points:

- The briefing Microsoft Teams briefing invite where the alleged code breach occurred, the PowerPoint presentation and alternative forms of communication via email or interview following the briefing did not explicitly state that it was private and confidential. Councillor Kitterick raised concern that the balance of probability, being the standard of proof by which the alleged breach was being tested, was based on the recollection of the parties present; not substantive evidence, and that greater importance had been placed on the witness statement.
- Councillor Kitterick believed that it was in the public interest that the contents of the briefing be disclosed to the public as he did not believe the public had been consulted widely enough on the topic.
- Councillor Kitterick called into question the behaviour and recollection of the complainant and witnesses, in which they had stated that they were

'surprised' at him being unhappy with the briefing, when it was considered common knowledge that he often held strong concerns regarding National Designated Space Standards (NDSS).

- Concern was raised regarding the changes in wording in the report, where 'Chris presided over the worst housing delivery in city history' to 'worst Director of Housing'. Councillor Kitterick stated that he had not said 'worst Director of Housing' to his recollection and had there been contemporaneous notes taken at the time of, or after the meeting, it would have been considered a greater level of evidence.
- Councillor Kitterick raised concern about the use of similar or same wording used by the complainant and witnesses involved in the complaint and further highlighted the insinuation of a mental health condition, which he clarified did not exist.
- Attention was drawn to the wordings regarding the sizing of the units for the Yoho Building. The report stated that the units were 'slightly smaller' than the National Designated Space Standards. The units themselves were measured at 23 square-meters compared to the NDSS requirement of 37 square-meters, which Councillor Kitterick emphasised was not a valid comparison.
- Councillor Kitterick strongly urged the Committee to consider the objective evidence when reaching a conclusion on the matter.

In response to the points raised by Councillor Kitterick, Alex Oram made the following additional points:

- While it was indeed not explicitly stated in the meeting invitation, related emails or presentation that the contents of the briefing be private and confidential and officers could have done more to be explicit about the context and nature of the information given, it was believed that Councillor Kitterick, as a long time Councillor at the Leicester City Council, should have been aware that, due to the nature of the information provided, the meeting and its contents were to be considered private and confidential.
- The wording of the complainant and witnesses used to describe Councillor Kitterick were considered reasonable to give their account of what they witnessed, and it was not considered unusual for accounts to use similar wording to describe their experience.
- In regard to a question raised by Councillor Kitterick enquiring whether or not it was more common for an investigation to be raised against a member of an opposition party, it was noted that investigations were often conducted without knowing if the Councillor under scrutiny was an opposition member, and that no consideration or weight was had been placed in that regard.
- Focus had been placed on areas where disrespect had been shown to officers and the comments made were considered to have gone beyond what was considered acceptable behaviour.
- While the investigation and resulting report had been established on a balance of probability, the Committee were recommended to do the same and the decision made should reflect their views in light of the challenges Councillor Kitterick had made.

Members of the Sub-Committee then discussed the report and asked questions of Councillor Kitterick and officers present. The following points were raised and noted:

- Councillor Kitterick had been an elected Councillor for 22 ½ years, 20 years of which had been as a Labour Party Councillor, and the remaining as a Green Party Councillor.
- Members inquired about whether Councillor Kitterick had been in receipt of confidential information during his time as an elected councillor. He confirmed that he had, in which the information had been explicitly labelled as confidential, of which he did not publicly disclose. Councillor Kitterick clarified that the information provided that was the subject of this hearing had not been labelled, nor had it been stated it was confidential information, and he felt that it was in the public's best interest that they be made aware of the proposal.
- Members requested further context regarding one of the statements made by Councillor Kitterick in the report. He clarified that he believed that the Council had a habit of selling assets too cheaply and purchased at too extortionate a price. It was noted that he had referred the matter to external auditors at the Council.
- Councillor Kitterick agreed that there was room to improve his behaviour, which he had noted to the Investigator at the time of his review. He also noted that there was much that could have been improved in the organisation of the briefing, such as being held in a face-to-face format. He added that if he was aware of the contentious nature of the meeting, he would've requested the presence of the relevant executive member.
- Members questioned the appellant believed his behaviour in the meeting could be considered unprofessional. Councillor Kitterick stated that he did not believe his behaviour was unprofessional, as he did his duty to represent his constituents as an elected member, and his behaviour during the meeting was in full support of the public.
- It was noted that Councillor Kitterick had attended training sessions provided by the Council. However, he admitted that he did not always attend every session but was keenly aware of the code of conduct expected of members.
- The Chair drew attention to the guidance provided by the Local Government Association on the disclosure of confidential information.

David Lindley, the Independent Person, was invited to give his advice in relation to the facts of the case. He drew attention to several areas in the report and highlighted strong concern regarding the behaviour of Councillor Kitterick during the briefing in question, which included the following:

- Attention was drawn to the lack of acknowledgement from Councillor Kitterick about the impact of his behaviour towards Officers and noted that there had been no reflection or apology made for his behaviour.
- It was unavoidable that Councillor Kitterick's actions had damaged relationships between Officers and Councillors and emphasised the

need to send a clear message to staff that such behaviour would not be tolerated.

- Concern was expressed about the likelihood of a similar incident happening in the future where confidential information would be made public by Councillor Kitterick.
- It was proposed that a motion of censure be made during the next Full Council meeting to ensure accountability was sought and taken.
- The Panel was advised that any recommendation made should be made on the merits of the findings found and placed clearly in the public domain.

The Investigator, Alex Oram summarised the positions and perspectives the panel should consider when reaching their decision.

Councillor Kitterick noted that he would not be in attendance for the decision rendered due to other commitments, thanked those present and left the meeting.

In reaching their decision the Sub-Committee agreed they should deliberate in private on the basis that this was in the public interest and as such outweighed the public interest of their deliberation taking place with parties, press or public present.

All those present aside from the Governance Service Officer left the meeting to allow the panel to deliberate in private. In addition, the Chair called for a two-minute comfort break.

The Sub-Committee gave full and detailed consideration to the points made by all parties in the meeting.

Public Session reconvened and those in attendance re-entered the meeting.

The Chair announced that the Sub-Committee had taken into consideration the written evidence, representations from the investigator and witness evidence and had made a unanimous decision.

RESOLVED:

1. To recommend to the Standards Committee the following:
  - a) **That Councillor Kitterick has breached paragraph 2(a) of the City Council's Code of Conduct by failing to treat others with respect.** On 11<sup>th</sup> November 2024 during a briefing he received from three senior officers over a matter that affected his Ward he was aggressive, angry, rude and offensive. He impugned the credibility and integrity of the officers by using language that questioned their motives, and the veracity of their briefing. His comments extended to personal criticism of officers, going beyond legitimate critique of the issues.

- b) **That Councillor Kitterick has breached paragraph 2(b) of the City Council's Code of Conduct by bullying.** His repeated interruptions, aggressive tone and personal criticism of the Director of Housing amounted to being offensive, insulting and humiliating. This conduct went well beyond what could reasonably be considered as robust criticism of ideas, policies and issues and it amounted to a misuse of power.
- c) **That Councillor Kitterick has breached paragraph 2(d) of the City Council's Code of Conduct by failing to respect the confidentiality of information entrusted to him as an Elected Member.** He used information provided in a briefing and disclosed it immediately to a journalist. We are satisfied that officers were clear in the meeting that the information being imparted was sensitive, and that it was being provided in confidence. Regardless of this, we find that as an experienced Councillor of over 22 years he knew, or ought reasonably to have been aware, that the content of the briefing was confidential.
- d) **That Councillor Kitterick has, for all of the above reasons, breached paragraph 2(i) of the Code of Conduct by bringing the Council into disrepute.** His conduct has both adversely affected the reputation of the Council's Elected Members in being able to fulfil their role and has had the effect of reducing public confidence in the Council being able to fulfil its functions and duties.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Hearing Panel makes the following recommendations to the Standards Committee:

- a) Councillor Kitterick to send a written apology, within 14 days of the Committee hearing to take place on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2025, to all three officers for the disrespect shown to them.
- b) Written censure of Councillor Kitterick by issuing of this Decision Notice to him by the Monitoring Officer on behalf of the Standards Committee.
- c) That there be a press release of the findings
- d) That a copy of the investigative report be released into the public domain
- e) That the findings of the Panel be reported to Full Council
- f) That the Monitoring Officer arranges training for Councillor Kitterick on the Code of Conduct.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7:33pm.

