

COMPLAINTS 01/07/15 – 30/06/16

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of Complaint	Route	Outcome	Turnaround time (days)
2015/08	Cllrs. A, B & C	Public	Cllrs (through their Committee role) failed to pursue a challenge to a Council policy	MO and IP	<p>Rejected – no evidence that the Cllrs received any correspondence from the complainant</p> <p>Rejected – complaint already dealt with by other means (complaint to officer over the policy)</p> <p>Noted – even had they received the correspondence, it may have been inappropriate to pursue as the Cllrs were members of the decision-making Committee</p>	25 days
2015/09	Cllrs. D & E	Public	Cllrs using their position to undermine and prejudice a local community group	MO and IP Review with second IP	<p>Rejected on the basis (i) no evidence to support allegations (ii) aspects of complaints did not relate to either Cllr / fell outside of the standards regime</p> <p>Outcome of the review supported the initial outcome and found no evidence/insufficient information provided in respect</p>	<p>250 days including review and meeting with Cllrs</p> <p><i>NOTE: There was significant delay in progressing this due to delays from the complainant in providing information and deciding on whether the Cllrs could be informed in addition to the need for some fact-finding at the outset to assist in deciding if there was any</i></p>

					of the complaint despite requests and extensions of time to allow for the complainant to submit it	<i>conduct and circumstances meaning that the code could have been engaged.</i>
2016/01	Cllr. F	Public	That Cllr approached complainant in the context of a dispute on a housing estate. That the Cllr refused to give their name, was rude and offensive and behaved in a threatening manner, which made the complainant feel intimidated.	MO and IP Review with second IP	<p>Informal resolution where (i) Code engaged and not breached, but where some gesture of reparation would still be in the interests of fairness</p> <p>Complainant was acting unlawfully and Cllr was challenging her.</p> <p>Outcome of 'review' was that there was no breach of the Code of Conduct. Gesture of reparation was merited and this was forthcoming in an earlier meeting with the Councillor and complainant and evident from the MO's investigations</p>	<p>35 days (including review)</p> <p><i>NOTE: The Councillor met with and apologised to the complainant</i></p>
2016/07	Cllr. G	Public	Allegation that Chair of decision-making meeting adopted unfair and biased procedure, leading to an unlawful decision	MO and IP	<p>Rejected – complaint discloses no breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct. No evidence of bias or procedural irregularity or unfairness in chairing of relevant meeting</p> <p>Rejected - complaint is covered by another process (i.e. potential legal challenge to the decision)</p>	25 days

COMPLAINTS 01/07/16 – 30/06/17

Reference	Subject Member	Complainant	Nature of complaint	Route	Outcome	Turn-around time (days)	Reparation
2016/8	Cllr. A	Council staff	Unacceptable comments alleging bias in analysis undertaken by staff	MO and IP	Rejected – does not disclose breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct	36 days	
2016/10	Cllrs. B	Public	Rude and threatening on the telephone to a Voluntary Sector employee	MO and IP	Informal resolution - no breach of Code of Conduct but some gesture of reparation would be in the interests of fairness.	44 days	Letter of apology
2016/11	Cllr. C	Councillor	Offensive remarks made during Council meeting	Standards Hearing Panel	<p>Breach found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to show respect - Failure to show Leadership - Bringing Council into disrepute <p>Panel outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue letter of reprimand - Standards Committee to publish the Hearing Panel's findings; - A full apology to be given to the complainant and to the public meeting 	179 days	

2016/15	Cllr. D	Councillor	Insulting remarks made during Council meeting	MO and IP Review with separate IP	Informal resolution - Code engaged but low level of breach only occurred such as not to warrant formal investigation	36 days 60 days with review	
2016/16	Cllr. E	Councillor	Failed to intervene at a public meeting when complainant was subjected to disrespectful and personal verbal attacks	MO and IP	Rejected – does not disclose breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct	32 days	
2016/17	Cllr. F	Councillor	Offensive remarks during a Council meeting, and had misled in relation to their “interests”	Deputy MO and IP	Rejected – does not disclose breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct	79 days	
2016/19	Cllr. G	Councillor	Failed to act with honesty and objectively in a Council meeting	MO and IP Review with separate IP	Rejected – does not disclose breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct Original complaint upheld	27 days 39 days	
2017/01	Cllr. F	Public (organisation)	Pattern of misconduct and bias against organisation	MO and IP	Rejected – does not disclose breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct	31 days	
2017/02	Cllr. H	Public	Failed to represent constituent’s views	MO and IP	Informal resolution – no breach of the Code but some form of	21 days	Letter of apology

			during a public consultation		reparation would be in the interests of fairness		
2017/03	Cllr. I	Public	Used their position to influence a building control matter.	MO and IP	Informal resolution - no breach of the Code but some form of reparation would still be in the interest of fairness	24 days	Letter of apology
2017/05	Cllr. J Cllr. K	Public	Did not taking duties seriously and did not help constituents	MO and IP	Rejected – does not disclose breach or potential breach of the Code of Conduct	34 days	