

## Agenda Item 6

### Appendix 1

#### Member Standards complaints 23/24

	<b>Complaint summary</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b>1</b>	Complaint about a retweet by a councillor which was allegedly where it was alleged to be offensive. The Councillor immediately deleted the tweet and issued an apology.	No breach of the Code of conduct as the member was not acting in their official capacity as Councillor. It was also acknowledged that the Councillor took immediate steps to delete the retweet and apologise to the complainant.
<b>2</b>	Fraudulent activity by Councillor when involved with a Charity as a trustee.	Complaint does not engage the Code of Conduct as Councillor was not acting in an official capacity. The matter had previously been investigated with no further action.
<b>3</b>	Complaint that Councillor not suspended nor dismissed as Councillor pending an external enquiry.	Not a matter for the Code of Conduct as Councillor not acting in an official capacity. In addition Standards Committee has no power to suspend a Councillor.
<b>4</b>	Allegations of a Councillors connection to extremists and extremist groups.	Not a matter that engaged the Code of Conduct. Complainant advised to refer to the police.
<b>5</b>	It is alleged that a Councillors written response to a petition relating to reinstatement works carried out was inaccurate, misleading and selective.	This matter is subject to LGSCO complaint. The complaint is being dealt with by the relevant service area via the corporate complaints procedure.
<b>6</b>	Ward Councillors failure to respond regarding concerns relating to a neighbour's driveway and not applying for dropped kerb which has resulted in damage to grass verges.	Determined no breach of Code of Conduct but Councillor advised of the complaint Councillor confirmed that they had made contact and had visited the complainant to resolve the original issue.
<b>7</b>	It is alleged that a Councillor handled the probate for the Complainant's and charged the estate a fee for their services. Dispute arose which led to a complaint under the Code of Conduct.	This is not member standards matter as the member was not acting in their official capacity as Councillor.
<b>8</b>	Inflammatory comments made by Cllr regarding council employees on a public forum	Determined no breach of the Code of Conduct nor had the Councillor breached the Officer/Member protocol. The Councillor was critical of a service but not individual officers
<b>9</b>	The Complainant who privately owns her property raised concerns that a Councillor held a consultation meeting regarding regeneration and only Council tenants were invited to attend.	Determined no breach of Code of Conduct. Matter referred to relevant department to resolve.

<b>10</b>	Complaint relating to Councillors comments about a project which is alleged were incorrect.	Determined no breach as the comments were not misleading or untrue. Furthermore the Standards Committee could not address the complainants remedy to "recall" a cabinet decision or to ask cabinet to reconsider a decision already made.
<b>11</b>	It is alleged that the Complainant has been maliciously discriminated against by a large number of BCC managers. Information was sent to Councillor no 1 but no response received.	Determined no breach as the Councillor could not get involved in ongoing staffing matters.
<b>12</b>	It is alleged that the Complainant has been maliciously discriminated against by a large number of BCC managers. Information was sent to Councillor no 2 but no response received.	Determined no breach as the Councillor could not get involved in ongoing staffing matters
<b>13</b>	A Councillor was involved in two recent HMO planning application processes. The Councillor made contact with the complainant to discuss one of the applications and provided justification for the HMO in response to the Complainant's objection to the planning application. The Complainant alleges the Councillor was not acting in best interest of the public but more in the interest of the applicant.	Code not breached, no evidence provided in support of allegations that suggested the Councillor had acted contrary to the code.
<b>14</b>	A Councillor was copied into a number of emails concerning improvements to Cemeteries across the City. The Councillor never acknowledged these emails but when he did he lacked professionalism	No breach of the Code of conduct matter referred to the relevant department.
<b>15</b>	Complaint that a Councillor has not responded to the Complainant's correspondence regarding waste management	No breach of Code of Conduct - complaint related to service delivery and referred to the relevant department.
<b>16</b>	A complaint that a Councillor made false statements when summarising the meeting she had with the Complainant regarding an exempt accommodation property that the Complainant is a landlord for.	Determined no breach as Councillors are always called upon to make decisions and whilst they need to reflect the views of their constituents they need to make decisions in accordance with the code.
<b>17</b>	Allegations regarding the Complainant's dropped kerb application being refused/cancelled due to the influence of the councillor contrary to the Code..	No evidence that the councillor had acted contrary to the breach of Code of Conduct. No further action taken
<b>18</b>	A Councillor made comments during a Council public scrutiny meeting which the Complainant believes was a in a personal attack against them.	Determined that no breach as the Councillors comments were not a personal attack on the complainant but of the Council's procurement process. Consideration also given to impact of Article 10 under the Human rights Act.
<b>19</b>	The complaint concerns lack of response and forwarding the Complainant's email to third party regarding potential financial irregularities..	No breach of Code of Conduct as no evidence that Councillor had shared details without consent.
<b>20</b>	Complaint whether Councillor fit to serve in the role following media report?	No breach of the Code of conduct as the member was not acting in their official capacity as Councillor.

<b>21</b>	Potential breach by Councillor sharing constituent casework with a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party.	Whilst potential breach Councillor apologised and asked for additional training. As such agreed n further action.
<b>22</b>	Councillor failed to provide both a proper response and misled constituent.	Insufficient evidence to support the allegation that the Councillor had breached the code.
<b>23</b>	Various Councillors failed to declare their interest on their register of interest's form.	No breach of the code as Councillors had sought a dispensation to withhold sensitive information including home addresses
<b>24</b>	Councillor has failed to carry out their duties as a councillor.	No breach of the code – referred to the Group