

Complaints Received during 2023

Resolved at Initial Assessment Stage

	Ref	Complainant (s)	Details of Complaint	Outcome	Review Requested	Review Outcome
1.	27.02.23	Member of Public	Neither of the councillors responded to an email from the complainant on 11 November 2022 about a fallen tree incident and they also failed to respond to a follow up email the complainant sent to them on 25 November 2022	Decision under Initial Assessment criteria. Members against whom the allegation has been made has remedied or made reasonable endeavours to remedy the matter and the complaint does not disclose sufficiently serious potential breaches of the Code to merit further consideration.	No	N/A
2.	18.08.23	Member of Public	An account of a conversation between a resident's partner and a member of staff of the developer at a consultation meeting, for a proposed development, which indicated that a Cllr may have brought influence of an improper nature on the planning process.	Decision under Initial Assessment criteria. Expectation is that serious concerns about a member's behaviour will be brought to the attention of the council within 6 months of the behaviour occurring. The formal complaint some 13 months after the behaviour was known and could have been brought sooner. In view of the period since the alleged behaviour, and the evidential	No	N/A

Summary of Member Code of Conduct (MCC) Complaints, Appendix A

				weaknesses, it is considered to be inequitable, unreasonable or otherwise not in the public interest to pursue.		
3.	27.11.23	Councillor	Cllr behaviour included repeatedly and persistently interrupting officers, raising their voice and questioning officer's professionalism and expertise.	Decision under Initial Assessment criteria. Member against whom the allegation has been made has remedied or made reasonable endeavours to remedy the matter and the complaint does not disclose sufficiently serious potential breaches of the Code to merit further consideration.	No	N/A

Resolved at Assessment Stage

1.	07.06.23	Member of Public	Cllr did not act "appropriately as a councillor" or "act as a neutral party" in a neighbour dispute.	Decision under Assessment Criteria. No breach of the code. Cllr had investigated and sought to assist both parties.	Yes	Not upheld
2.	09.09.23	Member of Public	Cllr behaved in a manner which was racist when dealing with issues in relation to their ward, was biased by virtue of differential treatment, drafted communications which was to the detriment of residents, and behaved in a harassing and intimidatory manner.	Decision under Assessment Criteria. Insufficient evidence to substantiate an allegation that the Cllr was harassing the complainant. On the contrary, information submitted by the Cllr demonstrated they had raised concerns in relation to the harassment, intimidation and safety arising from the complainant's	Yes	Not upheld

Summary of Member Code of Conduct (MCC) Complaints, Appendix A

				<p>conduct preceding this complaint.</p> <p>The Cllr denied any suggestion of being racist and / or behaving in a manner which would be racist; and made reference to the positive relationships, supported by evidence, that they have with residents in their ward, who are from diverse backgrounds and the support they have received with respect to their written communications representing them.</p> <p>On the balance of probabilities there has been no breach of the Code</p>		
3.	09.09.23	Member of Public	<p>Cllr initially listened to the complainant's complaints but after speaking with a fellow ward Cllr refused to communicate with them thereafter.</p>	<p>Decision under Assessment Criteria:</p> <p>The Cllr confirmed they did listen to the complaint. It was upon speaking with the Chief Whip and the Leader that they were advised to limit her interactions with the complainant. This was in turn explained to the complainant.</p> <p>On the balance of probabilities there has been no breach of the Code</p>	Yes	Not upheld