

1) Cllr who failed to declare interest at a council meeting in relation to a proposed catering facility within her ward.

The personal interest arose because she had a close association with an unnamed person who was to have been the operator of the facility. Cllr was alleged “to have closer personal ties when they stood together in the same ward” and to have also invited the person concerned “as her personal guest to a Mayoral event”.

The Council’s Audit and Standards Committee noted that Cllr felt that she did not have a close association with the person concerned, but the Committee agreed with the investigator that the question of a close association had to be decided in line with how the matter would be perceived by a reasonable member of the public.

The Committee noted that Cllr did not intend to breach the code, so the breach was therefore down to “some measure of carelessness, rather than deliberate calculation”. To show the seriousness of the matter the Committee recommended that Councillor’s political group remove her as a member of the tourism and leisure committee until it is discontinued in the new municipal year. Cllr subsequently resigned.

2) An investigation found councillor had responded disrespectfully to a member of the public who had been repeatedly emailing him demanding answers over damaged roads in his ward.

After initial correspondence, the council leader ignored C’s repeated emails for three months accusing him of ranting and raving adding: “...when I look at the long list of responses to policy queries I have to make, drafting a response to you remains firmly at the bottom of my list.”

Investigating officer for the council, found the email breached Council’s code of conduct, a report concluded.

“Through failing to respond and answer questions of concern, Cllr has failed to treat this member of the public with respect, “describing C as a “polite gentleman”.

C sent eight unanswered emails between July 29 – October 29, asking Mr Cllr ‘Are you still alive?’ and in another adding “The silence is deafening!”

Cllr believes it was a politically motivated attack.

3) A councillor who engaged in a “bullying and intimidatory pattern of behaviour” breached his council’s code of conduct, a committee has found

Cllr made repeated threats via email and in person to other members of council, a joint standards committee hearings sub-committee was told.

The panel agreed with a report by independent investigator, which found that Cllr twice broke the council’s code of conduct, primarily due to his interactions with the council clerk, who later resigned, and council chairman.

Cllr had acted in “a very bullying and intimidatory way” which was “excessive and unreasonable and goes far beyond the normal expectation of what can be permitted within council debates”.

The sanction imposed was to remove Cllr from any town council panels or sub-committees he is on for six months, and from any outside bodies he has been appointed to by the council for the same period.

The town council must also undertake six-monthly reviews of its governance framework to “support its employees and mitigate against inappropriate behaviour and correspondence from Cllr.”

4) A Town councillor is facing a standards hearing over allegedly offensive and disrespectful comments made about the late Queen's Platinum Jubilee.

Cllr is accused of describing one local Facebook community group as ‘a***holes’ and suggesting another group wanted a ‘flag-shagging orgy’ in town centre.

Council standards committee report says Cllr alleged comments arose amid criticisms from some people that the town council's jubilee celebrations in June were not enough.

Investigation concluded Cllr was acting in her capacity as a town councillor in making comments. Social media is fundamentally about sharing content and making conversations. It is also very transparent and can be seen by many people.

“An inappropriate post can amount to a breach of the code. In my view, the phrase ‘moaning Minnies’ is mild and does not breach the code. However, I do consider the pigeon and chessboard meme (image) and the phrases ‘stupid people’, ‘a***holes’ and ‘flag shagging’ are offensive and disrespectful, and amount to a breach.

“Their use falls short of the high standards of behaviour expected of councillors, even if in response to provocative comments and language from others. My finding is that there is sufficient evidence of a failure to comply with the code of conduct.”

The standards committee were to consider the matter further.

5) A councillor was censured for tweeting a doctored picture of Jeremy Corbyn at the scene of a terror attack which prompted a lawsuit.

A Standards Hearing Committee found Cllr partly breached its Code of Conduct over the tweet sent in November 2021 which sparked around 500 complaints. Committee chair Cllr said the tweet depicting the former Labour leader holding a wreath at the scene of Liverpool taxi bombing was totally unacceptable.

Cllr accepted the committee's findings and apologised for mistakenly posting the picture as satire, vowing it was a one off that would not be repeated. The committee found Cllr had breached the Code by failing to treat others with respect and bringing his office into disrepute.

The committee heard the picture was posted to Facebook and Twitter, in the latter case on an account explicitly stating he was a local councillor.

Cllr agreed to pay substantial damages to Jeremy Corbyn following the tweet.

6) Councillor who suggested an alleged rape victim was likely to have been a prostitute has escaped punishment.

Council decided not to sanction Cllr after receiving 18 complaints against him over his comments on social media on New Year's Eve

Cllr had replied [to a tweet from a news outlet about the alleged rape](#). In his reply, which he later deleted, he wrote: "More likely that it's a punter that didn't pay."

A council report seen by the [Local Democracy Reporting Service](#) argued that Cllr, who now sits as an independent, was not acting in his capacity as a councillor when he made the comment.

The matter was brought to Council for investigation after 18 complaints. In the document, an independent investigator said they were "agonised" about their conclusion but said that the matter would be better dealt with by his political party as cllr was not speaking as a councillor.

The investigator said: "Whatever our views of Councillor's tweet, he did make this disclaimer on his profile [that his views are personal] and made no specific reference to the council on the *News Shopper* site."

MO decided there was no breach of the council's code of conduct, meaning no further investigation would take place.