

COMPLAINTS UPDATE: 01/07/19 – 30/06/21

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of complaint	Route	Outcome	Turn-around time (days)	Reparation
July 2019 to June 2020							
2019/18	Cllr 1	Public (representing a faith organisation)	Cllr taking part in public demonstration condemning the actions of a foreign Government discriminated against a faith group here	Externally investigated & reported to Standards Advisory Board	Rejected by Standards Advisory Board. (i) Cllr not acting as a Cllr at the event and (ii) his comments were not inflammatory. Criticism of the actions of foreign Governments can be legitimate	172	Cllr advised to be careful about social media posts/photos to avoid accidental insensitivity
2019/22	Cllrs 2,3,4	LCC employee	Conduct of Members towards Council Officer at a Ward meeting	MO + IP	Rejected - no breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct. The exchanges were at times robust but did not amount to bullying.	49	A better planned Agenda could have averted some of the frustration that occurred at the meeting due to a mismatch of expectations between the officer and the Members

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of complaint	Route	Outcome	Turn-around time (days)	Reparation
2020/04	Cllr 5	Public	Ward Cllr breached confidentiality by keeping surgery room door open during constituent's query	MO + IP and Review	Rejected - no breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct. The Cllr had dealt with the issue (effectively) multiple times previously and kept the door ajar (without breaching any confidence) because he felt that the constituent might misrepresent the exchange later	53	
July 2020 to June 2021							
2020/16	Cllr 6	Public	Lack of response from Cllr over issues raised over period of 2 years	MO + IP	Rejected – no breach. Cllr had regularly dealt with the constituent's issues as best he could. A Corporate Complaint about the policy over which the constituent was aggrieved had also been concluded.	34	Cllr could have written to the constituent to explain why he would no longer engage in further correspondence over this same issue.

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of complaint	Route	Outcome	Turn-around time (days)	Reparation
2021/01	Cllr 7	Public	Cllr made derogatory comments about another local business (applicant) at Planning Meeting – quoted in press	MO + IP	Rejected – no breach of code of conduct. Being ‘objective’ does not mean being ‘neutral’. Cllrs are entitled to criticise and challenge proposals. The negative language used by the Cllr was directed at the ‘proposals’, not at any ‘people’.	15	
2021/05	Cllr 8	Public	Lack of response to correspondence on Housing matters	MO + IP	Rejected - no breach of code of conduct was found. Constituent had written to all three Ward members over the issue and one had taken the lead	29	Cllr could have replied to constituent after receiving a chaser to clarify that the co-Cllr was leading.
2021/06	Cllr 9	Public	Comments tweeted by Cllr are anti-Semitic and neither impartial nor objective	MO + IP	Rejected – no breach of the Code of Conduct. Cllrs are not required to be “impartial” and criticising the actions of a foreign Government is not, of itself, antisemitic.	2	