

COMPLAINTS 01/07/13 – 30/06/14

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of Complaint	Route	Outcome	Turnaround time (days)
2013/11	Cllr. A	Councillor	Conduct at Community Ward meeting.	Deputy MO and IP Review undertaken	Rejected - no public interest to pursue – does not warrant investigation. Review requested and rejected on same grounds.	25 (170 with review because complainant Councillor did not pursue Review once instigated, then later asked for it to be revived)
2013/12	Cllr. B	Public	Not responding to letters or following-up meetings.	MO and IP	Rejected - no potential breach of Code. Second complaint withdrawn.	19 (with second complaint 54)
2013/13	Cllr. C	Public	Bullying, intimidation, improper use of position as Councillor, conflicts of personal interests, behaviour.	MO and IP	Rejected– not directly related to Code; no public interest in pursuing; elements of vexatious behaviour by complainant.	29
2013/14	Cllr. D	Public	Delay in dealing with pursuing complainant's case with the Housing Ombudsman.	MO and IP	Informal resolution (low level breach, apology forthcoming).	32
2013/15	Cllr. E	Public	Repeatedly failed to	MO and IP	Informal resolution (low level	29

			respond to complainant's requests for assistance.	Review undertaken	breach, apology forthcoming). Complainant asked for review with different IP – review not upheld.	(with review – 76)
2013/16	Cllrs. F and G	Public	Failure to respond to request for assistance and failure to return phone calls.	MO and IP. For Cllr G element referred to Standards Committee.	(Cllr F element) – Code of conduct engaged but not a serious breach and informal resolution felt appropriate by way of apology and physical meeting which took place satisfactorily. (Cllr G element) – Code of Conduct breached to be dealt with by informal resolution by way of apology and to pursue original matter if that remains appropriate. No apology was offered, despite reminders Matter referred to Standards Committee for discussion. Cllr G subsequently summoned to meeting with Chair, IP and MO. Cllr G did write to apologise and offer meeting with complainant.	17 (Cllr F) 56 (Cllr G). Reply time until close following Committee - 132
2013/17	Cllr. H	Public	Actions in dealing with Ward funding bid were motivated by self-	Independent investigation	Following receipt of the Investigator's report a Standards Advisory Board was	146

			interest and bias as opposed to the public interest. Also failed to declare relevant interests	Standards Advisory Board	convened and the Board agreed with the findings of the report and concluded that no breach had occurred.	
--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--

COMPLAINTS 01/07/14 – 30/06/15

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of complaint	Route	Outcome	Turnaround time (days)
2014/1	Cllr. I	Public	Allegation that Councillor had unreasonably objected to a planning application and made “farcical” statements in a letter of objection without having had sight of the application area.	MO and IP -	Rejected - no breach or potential breach of the Code evidenced.	18
2014/2	Cllr. J	Public	Allegation that Ward Councillor had raised voice in public meeting, displayed aggressive behaviour and inappropriate shouting.	MO and IP	Rejected – no breach of the Code evidenced. No public interest in pursuing	12
2014/3	Cllr. K	Councillor	Derogatory remarks at Council and refusal to apologise when asked to do so by the Lord Mayor.	MO and IP	Rejected – no breach of the Code and no public interest in pursuing.	18
2014/4	Cllr. L	Staff member	Councillor’s alleged inappropriate involvement in	MO and IP. Mediator	Resolved by way of informal resolution (mediation).	29

			employment issues and other operational matters.	appointed.		
2015/1	Cllr. M	Councillor	Complaint from Councillor about alleged disrespect shown by another Councillor at a Scrutiny Meeting.	MO and IP Review undertaken	Complaint dismissed as (i) no breach of Code of Conduct evidenced; (ii) matter fell within the bounds of political expression; (iii) matter handled appropriately within the Scrutiny meeting itself. Review requested and rejected on same grounds.	21 (with review 34)
2015/2	Cllrs. N / O / P	Public	Failure to respond to numerous requests for assistance and that this may be "personal".	MO and IP	Complaint rejected as being trivial and misdirected. The issue concerned a national policy matter over which Ward Councillors had no control, and indeed no knowledge or involvement.	21
2015/3	Cllr. Q	Public	Complaint by member of public alleging Councillor was rude about him during electioneering visit in the neighbourhood.	MO	No jurisdiction. The provisions of the Code of Conduct cannot be utilised when Councillors are undertaking "political" as opposed to "Council" business.	4
2015/4	Cllrs. R / S	Public	Allegation that Ward Member did not speak out at a Committee meeting on behalf of	MO and IP	Complaint dismissed. No evidence that the Ward Councillor had ever agreed to represent the views of the	16

			<p>complainant and other residents as requested to do so by letter.</p> <p>At the meeting another Councillor failed to grant the complainant a right to speak.</p>		<p>complainant, nor indeed had ever been asked to do so directly. By contrast it was always clear that the Ward Member actively supported the scheme which the complainant opposed.</p> <p>The alleged conduct by another Councillor at the subsequent meeting could not conceivably engage the Code of Conduct.</p>	
2015/5	Cllr. T	Public	<p>Complaint by member of the public that an elected Member had made defamatory remarks in the course of correspondence.</p>	MO and IP	<p>Complaint dismissed as it had already been dealt with by another process e.g. earlier engagement with complainant's solicitors and the Subject Member.</p> <p>Review requested and rejected on the same grounds.</p>	<p>14 (with review 35)</p>