

<b>Subject:</b>	Standards Update	<b>Status:</b>	For Publication
<b>Report to:</b>	Council	<b>Date:</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> December 2012
<b>Report of:</b>	Director of Business	<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Customers, Legal and Licensing
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Forward Plan <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>General Exception</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Special Urgency</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Equality Impact Assessment:</b>	Required:	Yes/No	Attached: Yes/No
<b>Biodiversity Impact Assessment</b>	Required:	Yes/No	Attached: Yes/No
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Stuart Sugarman	<b>Telephone:</b>	01706 252447
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:stUARTSUGARMAN@rossendalebc.gov.uk">stUARTSUGARMAN@rossendalebc.gov.uk</a>		

<b>1.</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION(S)</b>
1.1	That Members note the outcome of the Standard Panel hearing on 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2012.

## 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 2.1 Following the Standards Panel Hearing Panel on 27th September 2012 in respect of complaint number Z.46/1/37, the Panel determined that Councillor Neal had breached paragraph 3(5) of the Council's old Code of Conduct (now paragraph 11(6) in the current code – bringing your office or authority into disrepute).

The Standards Panel's reasons for this decision were:

- There was a sufficient link between Councillor Neal's role as a trustee on Whitworth Elderly Care Trust and his role as an elected member on Rossendale Borough Council and that it could be reasonably perceived that he was acting in his public role as a councillor.
- Expenses were claimed from the Trust without prior authorisation and which were not the responsibility of the Trust to pay.
- Expenses were claimed from a charitable organisation with a limited budget and concerns were expressed at the length of time it had taken Councillor Neal to repay the funds to the Trust.

The Panel determined that the following sanctions would apply:-

- A letter of censure would be sent by the Monitoring Officer to Councillor Neal.
- Councillor Neal would be asked to attend a training session with the Monitoring Officer.
- A report would be taken to the next meeting of full Council.

The Panel noted that though this sanction could not be enforced, they requested that Councillor Neal apologise to the Trust in writing.

## 3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 3.1 The matters discussed in this report impact directly on the following corporate priorities:
- **A clean and green Rossendale** – creating a better environment for all.
  - **A healthy and successful Rossendale** – supporting vibrant communities and a strong economy.
  - **Responsive and value for money local services** – responding to and meeting the different needs of customers and improving the cost effectiveness of services.

**4. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no specific risk issues for members to consider arising from this report.

**5. BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS**

5.1 The Council adopted a new Code of Conduct on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2012 (as required by the Localism Act 2011 and this hearing was determined under the new Code.

**COMMENTS FROM STATUTORY OFFICERS:**

**6. SECTION 151 OFFICER**

6.1 Financial matters are noted within the report. There are no implications for the Council finances.

**7. MONITORING OFFICER**

7.1 Included within the report.

**8. HEAD OF PEOPLE AND POLICY (ON BEHALF OF THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE)**

8.1 No Human resources implications arising from the report.

**9. CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT**

9.1 None.

**10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 That members note the outcome of a recent Standards Panel Hearing.

Background Papers	
Document	Place of Inspection
Code of Conduct adopted 11 <sup>th</sup> July 2012.	Constitution