

<b>STANDARDS COMMITTEE</b>			
<b>Report Title</b>	<b>PRE ASSESSMENTS OUTCOME</b>		
<b>Key Decision</b>			<b>Item No.5</b>
<b>Ward</b>			
<b>Contributors</b>	<b>Kath Nicholson, Monitoring Officer</b>		
<b>Class</b>	<b>Part 1</b>	<b>Date: 9 NOVEMBER 2010</b>	

Complaint No : 113631

1. On 28<sup>th</sup> July 2010 a complaint was received of an alleged breach of the Member Code of Conduct . The complainant alleged that the manner in which the Mayor spoke on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2010 at a Mayor & Cabinet Meeting showed a lack of respect and brought the Council into disrepute. The matter was referred to Standards (Assessment) Sub Committee C, which met on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2010 to consider whether the matter should be investigated.
  
2. The Assessment Sub Committee was unanimously of the view that as the incident had been widely reported and not denied by the Mayor, there would be nothing to be achieved by further investigation , without making any finding of fact, it decided instead that provided the parties agreed, the matter should be dealt with by way of conciliation.
  
3. The Mayor consented to conciliation in writing and wrote to the Monitoring Officer and the Committee (copy supplied for the Complainant) apologising for the language he had used on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2010.
  
4. The Complainant did not agree to conciliation, seeking a more public response from the Mayor.
  
5. In the absence of mutual consent to conciliation, the Sub Committee reconvened on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2010 and having considered further written

submissions from the Complainant and the Mayor, decided that whilst making no finding of fact on this complaint, it would take other action by referring the Mayor once again to a submission made in writing by him to the Standards Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 about his approach to ethical behaviour by Members. The Sub Committee decided to commend to the Mayor as a guiding statement.

6. The parties were informed of the Sub Committee's decision on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2010. There is no right of review of a decision to take other action.