

PSOW Reference	Type of Council	Councillor	Complainant	Alleged breach	Gatekeeper	Outcome by stage	
						Investigation	Hearing
2022/00603	County	A	Public	Failure to declare on register of interest that the Cllr is a Clerk of a T&CC	PSOW did not investigate - no breach of the Code found. Satisfied that the Cllr has made the necessary declaration. This has also been confirmed by the MO.		
2022/01136	County	B	Councillor	Post on Social Media seen as a slur on the Councillor's character. Comments are allegedly contrary to para 6 (bring the Council into disrepute)	Investigation ongoing	The councillor failed to show respect (para 4b) and could reasonably be regarded as bringing both the council and his office into disrepute (6(1)). The Ombudsman took into account events since the comment on social media was made. The Member publicly apologised for the comment and the apology was accepted. The member subject to the comments said that he suffered no lasting anxiety or loss of reputation and wished to withdraw his complaint. In view of this, the Ombudsman did not consider that it was in the public interest for any further action to be taken. Had the Member not publicly apologised and had the member subject to the comments taken a different view on the matter, further action would have been taken. The Member was reminded of his need to take care when posting on social media.	
2022/01184	County	B	Town Councillor	Messages sent to complainant that they felt were threatening in nature.	Investigation ongoing		
2022/01509	County	B	Public	Disrepute, bullying, failure to declare interest, disclosure confidential information	Investigation ongoing		
2022/02457	Community 1	C	Public	Alleged breach of the Code of Conduct by allegedly ignoring the policy regarding the election of a Chair/Vice Chair	PSOW did not investigate - the act complained of was the action of the Council not an individual. PSOW willing to consider whether it is a service complaint		

2022/02713	Town 1	D	Public	Alleged in appropriate posts on social media including use of bad language.	PSOW did not investigate. Swearing in the FB post was not directed at any specific person & was an attempt to raise awareness of a community issue. Post was therefore protected political expression		
2022/04701	Community 2	E	Public	Alleged bullying at a meeting towards a member of the public.	PSOW did not investigate - because complaint duplicates another complaint about the same Councillor.		
2022/05038	County	F	Public	Alleged interference with the planning process and putting pressure on the Planning Officer to refuse an application and making false statements	PSOW did not investigate - complaint is unlikely to amount to a breach of the Code. The councillor is entitled to have a view on the application, no evidence they would benefit from this view. No evidence to suggest the comment put any pressure on the Planning Officer.		
2022/04846	County	B	Public	Complainant alleged no formal response was received from any Members to an e mail requesting help. They also alleged the Member reported on social media that Members had been advised by the Legal Team not to respond and Members should not be taking instructions from the Legal Department.	PSOW did not investigate - the evidence is not suggestive of a breach of the Code.		
2022/04748	Community 2	E	Public	Alleged bullying at a meeting towards a member of the public.	PSOW did not investigate - evidence suggested poor behaviour and rudeness towards a member of the public during the meeting. (see complaint reference 2022/04701)		

2022/05046	Community 2	E	Public	It was alleged that when the complainant was invited to speak at the Council meeting, the Member shouted at the complainant and spoke to them in a "disgusting and degrading" manner and made accusations about them in the meeting and acted like a "terrorising bully"	PSOW did not investigate - the alleged remarks can reasonably be said to fall within the realms of freedom of expression, and whilst they may have been unpleasant and may have caused offence to the complainant and others, the evidence does not suggest language or behaviour which is likely to amount to a breach of the Code or to lead to a sanction being imposed.(see complaints 2022/04701 and 2022/04701)		
2022/05644	Town 2	F	Councillor	Self referral - Councillor may have brought his Office or Authority into disrepute as he had received a conditional discharge relating to a public order offence	PSOW did not investigate. At the time of the conduct complained of the member was not acting as a Councillor but as a private individual. While the Code of Conduct applies at all time in respect of whether the member has brought the Council, or the office of member, into disrepute, there is no evidence to suggest that the incident is in any way related to Council business.		
2022/06095	Comm 1	G	Public	It was alleged that the Member broke the code of practice by organising support for a planning application. Evidence was provided that the Member posted on social media their intention to have the planning application called in and the reasons that people should focus on if they intended to make objections	PSOW did not investigate. Complaint unlikely to amount to a breach of the Code. Members are elected to represent their constituents and therefore, they can raise concerns which may affect the area they were elected to represent. No evidence has been presented to suggest the Member had a personal interest or a prejudicial interest. The evidence presented does not indicate that the Member arranged support for or against the application rather that they used social media to respond to queries and to advise constituents on how they could submit any objections which they are entitled to do. Any concerns about the decision taken should be made through the planning process.		

2022/05508	Town 2	H	Public	It was alleged that the Member breached the Code of Conduct by entering into a contractual agreement, without the permission of the Council. It was alleged that this incurred unauthorised expenditure to the Council.	PSOW did not investigate. Entering into a contract without the knowledge of the Council and incurring costs to the Council, if proven, may be suggestive of a breach of the Code of Conduct. However, cost was small and no evidence that the Member sought to personally gain from their actions.		
2022/07521	Town 2	H	Public	It was alleged that the Member assisted in providing a contract, after obtaining quotes as part of their role on a Working Group. It was alleged that the Member is in a relationship with a person who works at the company, therefore the Member has misused public funds for the benefit of their partner.	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence has not been provided to substantiate key elements of the complaint e.g there was no proof that the councillor and company employee were in a relationship or that he benefitted from her actions.		
2022/08386	Town 3	I	Public	It was alleged that the Member is recording calls and will ultimately use them to expose the behaviour of others. The complainant said the member also recorded a personal call between them when they argued over the behaviour of the Member's dog.	PSOW did not investigate - At the time it is alleged the Member recorded the call with the complainant they were not acting as a Councillor but as a private individual. The PSOW was of the view that the code did not apply and this was a personal discussion about a personal matter. The complainant had indicated that the member has shared recordings they have taken when at Council meetings but no evidence was provided to support this. No evidence was provided to suggest that any recordings have been made for anything other than personal use. Further it is likely that the information is already in the public domain.		

2022/08536	Town 3	J	Public	It is alleged that the Member has brought the Council into disrepute and breached Section 6(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct by appearing in Court over several offences.	Under investigation		
2023/00532	Community 1	B	Councillor	Breach of the Code relating to declarations of interest and not declaring a personal and prejudicial interest on a planning application.	Under Investigation		

PSOW Reference	Type of Council	Councillor	Complainant	Alleged breach	Outcome by stage		
					Gatekeeper	Investigation	Hearing
2023/00482	County	A	Public	It was alleged that the Member called the First Minister "Führer" on Facebook and this was a slur comparing the Labour party with the Nazi party. It is alleged that the Member's claim that he simply used the German word for leader was not credible.	PSOW did not investigate. The Member clearly identified himself on Facebook as a Councillor therefore the PSOW was satisfied that the Code of Conduct was engaged. The language used by the Member, calling the First Minister "Führer", is offensive and not language that the Ombudsman would condone. Given the context, the explanation that it was a simple translation of the word "leader" lacks credibility. It is likely that the language used is suggestive of a breach of paragraph 4(b) of the Code of Conduct. An investigation into this matter would not be in the public interest. It is not uncommon for elected members to say things about political opponents which others may consider to be rude or offensive. However, it is not the purpose of the Code to inhibit free speech and the robust expression of political differences.		
2023/02636	Town 1	C	Public	It was alleged that the Member was in breach of the requirement not to bully or harass any person by engaging in intimidating behaviour towards a staff member, when they questioned them on whether minutes that had been prepared, accurately reflected a Council meeting and in a separate incident at a meeting where he told them they were not to be trusted.	When assessing matters concerning Council Officers, it is necessary to consider if the allegations are supported by evidence that a member has gone beyond what might be regarded as reasonable challenge. The PSOW assessed the comments the Member is alleged to have made when questioning the meeting minutes and was not persuaded that what the Member is alleged to have said could be considered to have passed the threshold of reasonable challenge. Whilst the Member has made comments which could be considered offensive or rude to the staff member, they were not so serious that, even if a breach of the Code were proven, a sanction would be a proportionate interference with the Member's right to freedom of expression. The Complainant also alleged that the Member told the staff member that she was not to be trusted. The Ombudsman's Guidance to members on the Code states that harassment is repeated behaviour which upsets or annoys people. Bullying can be characterised as offensive, intimidating, malicious, insulting or humiliating behaviour, that may happen once or be part of a pattern of behaviour. Having considered the information provided, the PSOW not persuaded the Member's comment was so serious that it would be likely to amount to a breach of the Code of Conduct.		
2023/01712	County	D	Councillor	It was alleged that the Member behaved inappropriately during Council meetings, by making inappropriate gestures and shouting.	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence was not provided to substantiate the complaint. The conduct complained about does not meet the first stage of the test, as set out above, therefore, there is no need to consider the second stage of the test.		

2023/02892	Community 2	E	Councillor	<p>It was alleged that the Member made disrespectful comments towards a member of the public in response to a speech made by the member of the public during a Community Council meeting. It was also alleged that the Member was corrupt, that they were a member of a clique of councillors who voted for each other and did not allow others to put suggestions forward. The Complainant said that they felt unsupported by the Community Council and that nothing was achieved by the Community Council because of the behaviour of the <u>clique of councillors</u>.</p>	<p>PSOW did not investigate. The matters complained about were unlikely to amount to a breach of the Code. It was alleged that the Member accused the member of the public of “waffling about nature” and suggested that they and others who supported them had brought the situation upon themselves. Whilst the Complainant may have been offended by the Member’s comments, the PSOW did not consider that the Member’s comments were sufficiently offensive, intimidating or insulting to amount to a breach of the Code.</p> <p>In relation to the allegation of corruption, no evidence was provided to substantiate the complaint.</p>		
2023/03339	County	D	Public	<p>It was alleged that the Member failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in a planning application that was considered by the Authority’s Planning Committee in June 2023, and that they made inappropriate comments during the Planning Committee’s consideration of the matter.</p>	<p>PSOW did not investigate.(1) The Complainant said that the Member was friends with the Director of the housing development company (“the Director”), who had submitted the planning application and that their friendship was public knowledge. A series of photographs and screenshots provided in support of the complaint showed that the Member had posted their thanks to the housing development company for its support on various local initiatives and events on more than one occasion. The Director was not named in any of the posts, and the PSOW not persuaded that they demonstrated a close personal relationship between the Member and the Director. The Complainant said that the Member had assisted the Director in marketing homes on behalf of the housing development company. However, the evidence provided in support of the complaint demonstrated that the Member had shared information about a housing scheme by a property management company. The PSOW did not consider that they demonstrated a close personal association between the Member and the Director as it is not uncommon for elected members to share information that may be of interest to their electorate on their social media pages. (2) the PSOW saw no evidence to suggest that it was inappropriate for the Member to second the proposal to approve the planning application. When speaking about the application, the Member referenced the Planning Officer’s report and recommendation to approve the application and had considered the objections received from members of the community. It therefore appears that the Member appropriately considered the information available before reaching a decision to vote in favour of the application.</p>		