

## Standards Assessment Sub-Committee

---

### MINUTES OF THE STANDARDS ASSESSMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 15 DECEMBER 2020 AT ONLINE MEETING.

#### **Present:**

Cllr Ruth Hopkinson (Chairman), Cllr Ernie Clark (Vice-Chairman),  
Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Fred Westmoreland and Mr Richard Baxter (non-voting)

#### **Also Present:**

Complainant COC131319, Subject Member COC131319, Liz Sirman (Subject  
Member COC132107, Simon Jackson (Subject Member COC132109), Tony Drew  
(Independent Person), Frank Cain (Head of Legal Services), Kieran Elliott (Senior  
Democratic Services Officer)

---

#### 47 **Apologies**

There were no apologies.

#### 48 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2020 were presented for  
consideration, and it was,

#### **Resolved:**

**To approve and sign the minutes as a true and correct record.**

#### 49 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations.

#### 50 **Meeting Procedure and Assessment Criteria**

The meeting procedure and assessment criteria for the meeting were noted.

#### 51 **Exclusion of the Public**

It was,

#### **Resolved:**

**To agree that in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local  
Government Act 1972 to exclude the public from the meeting for the  
business specified in Minute Numbers 52-58, because it is likely that if  
members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them**

**of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information to the public.**

*Paragraph 1 - information relating to an individual*

52 **Assessment of Complaint: COC131319**

In considering complaint COC131319 the Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the member was and remains a member of the relevant Council, and that a copy of the relevant Code of Conduct was provided for the assessment.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. Further, if it was felt it would be a breach, whether it was still appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer. The Sub-Committee also received verbal statements from the Complainant and Subject Member at the meeting.

After discussion, it was,

**Resolved:**

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to refer the complaint for investigation.**

53 **Assessment of Complaint: COC132107**

**Preamble**

A complaint was received from Richard Maurin-Powell (The Complainant) regarding the conduct of Councillor Liz Sirman (The Subject Member) of Salisbury City Council.

It was alleged the Subject Member had breached the Code of Conduct by not promoting or supporting high standards of conduct, failed to be accountable for their decisions and failed to be as open as possible for those decisions, in relation to an informal meeting with Members and Officers of Wiltshire Council by, it was alleged, improperly misrepresenting the policy position of Salisbury City Council in respect of an experimental Traffic Order known as "The People Friendly Salisbury Traffic Scheme" (the scheme).

**Assessment**

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the Subject Member was and remains a

member of Salisbury Council, that a copy of the relevant Code of Conduct was provided for the assessment, and that they were acting in their capacity as a Member during the various alleged actions.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. If the Sub-Committee concluded that the alleged behaviour would amount to a breach, then it would have to go on to decide whether it was appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer.

The Sub-Committee also considered a verbal statement from the Subject Member provided at the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting. The Complainant was not in attendance.

### Conclusion

The complaint involved a meeting of the Subject Member, who had been newly installed as Leader of Salisbury City Council, and senior Members and officers of Wiltshire Council. The new Deputy Leader of the City Council was also present and was subject to a related complaint of COC132109.

The 'People Friendly Streets' scheme had been enacted by Wiltshire Council, and shortly after the meeting referenced above Wiltshire Council indefinitely suspended the scheme, with media reports referenced by the Complainant stating that city councillors refused to confirm support for the scheme.

The Complainant was not present at the meeting in question but alleges that the Subject Member misrepresented the policy position of the City Council in respect of the scheme and acted dishonestly in not inviting other members to the meeting.

The Subject Member states that she had been invited to the meeting by Wiltshire Council and had not arranged the invitations and that she was clear at all times that any views she expressed were her personal ones and not those of the City Council, which had not resolved officially on the specific scheme. She further states that at the conclusion of that meeting she was told the matter would be further discussed and was not informed of the decision by Wiltshire Council to suspend the scheme in advance of the announcement.

### Decision

The decision to implement and suspend the 'People Friendly Streets' scheme was undertaken by Wiltshire Council. From the accounts it was clear that the scheme had generated much attention and comment as a political issue within the city and the City Council.

The Sub-Committee did not consider that there was sufficient evidence to justify an investigation into the allegations. The Subject Member had provided an

explanation of the events in question and her involvement, and there was insufficient information in the complaint beyond supposition to determine that the allegations, if proved, would amount to a breach.

The Sub-Committee did not consider that other points around not informing the City Council of the meeting if proven, were capable of breaching the Code of Conduct.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee resolved to take no further action in respect of the complaint.

Therefore, it was,

**Resolved:**

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to take no further action in respect of the complaint.**

54 **Assessment of Complaint: COC132109**

Preamble

A complaint was received from Richard Maurin-Powell (The Complainant) regarding the conduct of Councillor Simon Jackson (The Subject Member) of Salisbury City Council.

It was alleged the Subject Member had breached the Code of Conduct by not promoting or supporting high standards of conduct, failed to be accountable for their decisions and failed to be as open as possible for those decisions, in relation to an informal meeting with Members and Officers of Wiltshire Council by, it was alleged, improperly misrepresenting the policy position of Salisbury City Council in respect of an experimental Traffic Order known as “The People Friendly Salisbury Traffic Scheme” (the scheme).

Assessment

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the Subject Member was and remains a member of Salisbury Council, that a copy of the relevant Code of Conduct was provided for the assessment, and that they were acting in their capacity as a Member during the various alleged actions.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. If the Sub-Committee concluded that the alleged behaviour would amount to a breach, then it would have to go on to decide whether it was appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer.

The Sub-Committee also considered a verbal statement from the Subject Member provided at the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting. The Complainant was not in attendance.

### Conclusion

The complaint involved a meeting of the Subject Member, who had been newly installed as Deputy Leader of Salisbury City Council, and senior Members and officers of Wiltshire Council. The new Leader of the City Council was also present and was subject to a related complaint of COC132107.

The 'People Friendly Streets' scheme had been enacted by Wiltshire Council, and shortly after the meeting referenced above Wiltshire Council indefinitely suspended the scheme, with media reports referenced by the Complainant stating that city councillors refused to confirm support for the scheme.

The Complainant was not present at the meeting in question but alleges that the Subject Member misrepresented the policy position of the City Council in respect of the scheme and acted dishonestly in not inviting other members to the meeting.

The Subject Member states that he clarified several times at that meeting that he could not speak for the City Council as the matter had not been specifically tabled or debated by them. He states that those present from Wiltshire Council stated they would discuss the matter further and come back to those who had attended the meeting, but that a statement on the suspension of the scheme was later made.

### Decision

The decision to implement and suspend the 'People Friendly Streets' scheme was undertaken by Wiltshire Council. From the accounts it was clear that the scheme had generated much attention and comment as a political issue within the city and the City Council.

The Sub-Committee did not consider that there was sufficient evidence to justify an investigation into the allegations. The Subject Member had provided an explanation of the events in question and her involvement, and there was insufficient information in the complaint beyond supposition to determine that the allegations, if proved, would amount to a breach.

The Sub-Committee did not consider that other points around not informing the City Council of the meeting if proven, were capable of breaching the Code of Conduct.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee resolved to take no further action in respect of the complaint.

Therefore, it was,

**Resolved:**

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to take no further action in respect of the complaint.**

55 **Assessment of Complaint: COC131113**

Preamble

A complaint was received from Mel Rolph (The Complainant) regarding the conduct of Councillor Pat Aves (The Subject Member) of Melksham Town Council.

It was alleged the Subject Member had breached the Code of Conduct by failing to have regard to the Nolan principles, specifically integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership, and failed to be open as possible about his decisions and actions, and failed to give reasons for those decisions and actions.

This was alleged in respect of the suspension several officers working for the Town Council.

Assessment

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the Subject Member was and remains a member of Melksham Town Council, that a copy of the relevant Code of Conduct was provided for the assessment, and that they were acting in their capacity as a Member during the various alleged actions.

It had also been identified that the complaint had been submitted out of time according to Wiltshire Council procedures for dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints. The Sub-Committee confirmed that as the delay had not been the fault of the Complainant, they considered that it was appropriate for the complaint to be accepted and therefore could be assessed.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. If the Sub-Committee concluded that the alleged behaviour would amount to a breach, then it would have to go on to decide whether it was appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer.

The Sub-Committee also considered a written statement from the Complainant provided at the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting on 15 December 2020. Neither party was in attendance.

### Discussion

The complaint was linked with complaints COC131238, COC131239 and COC131240 involving other Members of the Town Council arising from the same set of circumstances and made by the Complainant. It was also linked with complaints COC130429, COC130430, COC130432 and COC130433 arising from the same circumstances against the same members. It is also linked with COC131452, in the fact that that complaint is from an elected member of the town Council alleging that the Subject Member of that complaint (who is one of the four complaints in both the above sets of complaints) did not act in accordance with the Town's standing orders and Financial regulations in respect of the same set of circumstances.

The complaint involved a series of actions of four Members, including the Subject Member, which it was alleged were not in accordance with council procedures, resulting in the unlawful suspension of two officers of the Town Council, and in so doing and through other actions around the decision, breached the Code by not promoting or maintaining high standards of conduct.

The Subject Member contends that they acted in accordance with procedure following advice during a difficult situation.

The Sub-Committee noted that the Complaint involved allegations of breaches of the standing orders of the Town Council. It noted that whilst a breach of those standing orders was not in of itself a breach of a Code of Conduct, it had to consider if the specific allegations of breaches of those orders could, if proven, rise to the level of such a breach under the general principle of not promoting high standards of conduct.

### Conclusion

The Sub-Committee was not persuaded on the basis of the submissions that the alleged behaviour, and alleged breaches of standing orders, in this instance, if proven, were capable of rising to the level of a breach of the Code of Conduct. Several references had been made to whistleblowing and other matters, but the Sub-Committee did not consider those processes to be relevant to determination of this Code of Conduct matter.

In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that the thrust of the complaint was the employment decisions taken and the effect on staff. If there were errors or unlawful actions taken by the Town Council by virtue of an individual Member's actions, the grievance and Employment Tribunal processes was the appropriate place for the lawfulness of those decisions by the Town Council to be explored and determined, rather than the Code of Conduct procedure which can only determine issues of standards in respect of individual members behaviour.

It was therefore resolved to take no further action in respect of the complaint, and the Sub-Committee did not consider any of the other related complaints

against other Members raised particular issues or allegations which would result in a different determination.

Accordingly, it was,

**Resolved:**

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to take no further action in respect of the complaint.**

56 **Assessment of Complaint: COC131238**

Preamble

A complaint was received from Mel Rolph (The Complainant) regarding the conduct of Councillor Geoff Mitcham (The Subject Member) of Melksham Town Council.

It was alleged the Subject Member had breached the Code of Conduct by failing to have regard to the Nolan principles, specifically integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership, and failed to be open as possible about his decisions and actions, and failed to give reasons for those decisions and actions.

This was alleged in respect of the suspension several officers working for the Town Council.

Assessment

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the Subject Member was and remains a member of Melksham Town Council, that a copy of the relevant Code of Conduct was provided for the assessment, and that they were acting in their capacity as a Member during the various alleged actions.

It had also been identified that the complaint had been submitted out of time according to Wiltshire Council procedures for dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints. The Sub-Committee confirmed that as the delay had not been the fault of the Complainant, they considered that it was appropriate for the complaint to be accepted and therefore could be assessed.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. If the Sub-Committee concluded that the alleged behaviour would amount to a breach, then it would have to go on to decide whether it was appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.



In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer.

The Sub-Committee also considered a written statement from both the Complainant and the Subject Member provided at the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting on 15 December 2020. Neither party was in attendance.

#### Discussion

The complaint was linked with complaints COC131113, COC131239 and COC131240 involving other Members of the Town Council arising from the same set of circumstances and made by the Complainant. It was also linked with complaints COC130429, COC130430, COC130432 and COC130433 arising from the same circumstances against the same members. It is also linked with COC131452, in the fact that that complaint is from an elected member of the town Council alleging that the Subject Member of that complaint (who is one of the four complaints in both the above sets of complaints) did not act in accordance with the Town's standing orders and Financial regulations in respect of the same set of circumstances.

The complaint involved a series of actions of four Members, including the Subject Member, which it was alleged were not in accordance with council procedures, resulting in the unlawful suspension of two officers of the Town Council, and in so doing and through other actions around the decision, breached the Code by not promoting or maintaining high standards of conduct.

The Subject Member contends that they acted in accordance with procedure following advice during a difficult situation.

The Sub-Committee noted that the Complaint involved allegations of breaches of the standing orders of the Town Council. It noted that whilst a breach of those standing orders was not in of itself a breach of a Code of Conduct, it had to consider if the specific allegations of breaches of those orders could, if proven, rise to the level of such a breach under the general principle of not promoting high standards of conduct.

#### Conclusion

The Sub-Committee was not persuaded on the basis of the submissions that the alleged behaviour, and alleged breaches of standing orders, in this instance, if proven, were capable of rising to the level of a breach of the Code of Conduct. Several references had been made to whistleblowing and other matters, but the Sub-Committee did not consider those processes to be relevant to determination of this Code of Conduct matter.

In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that the thrust of the complaint was the employment decisions taken and the effect on staff. If there were errors or unlawful actions taken by the Town Council by virtue of an individual Member's actions, the grievance and Employment Tribunal processes was the appropriate place for the lawfulness of those decisions by the Town Council to be explored

and determined, rather than the Code of Conduct procedure which can only determine issues of standards in respect of individual members behaviour.

It was therefore resolved to take no further action in respect of the complaint, and the Sub-Committee did not consider any of the other related complaints against other Members raised particular issues or allegations which would result in a different determination.

Accordingly, it was,

**Resolved:**

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to take no further action in respect of the complaint.**

57 **Assessment of Complaint: COC131239**

Preamble

A complaint was received from Mel Rolph (The Complainant) regarding the conduct of Councillor Vanessa Fiorelli (The Subject Member) of Melksham Town Council.

It was alleged the Subject Member had breached the Code of Conduct by failing to have regard to the Nolan principles, specifically integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership, and failed to be open as possible about his decisions and actions, and failed to give reasons for those decisions and actions.

This was alleged in respect of the suspension several officers working for the Town Council.

Assessment

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the Subject Member was and remains a member of Melksham Town Council, that a copy of the relevant Code of Conduct was provided for the assessment, and that they were acting in their capacity as a Member during the various alleged actions.

It had also been identified that the complaint had been submitted out of time according to Wiltshire Council procedures for dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints. The Sub-Committee confirmed that as the delay had not been the fault of the Complainant, they considered that it was appropriate for the complaint to be accepted and therefore could be assessed.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. If the Sub-Committee concluded that the alleged behaviour would amount to a breach,

then it would have to go on to decide whether it was appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer.

The Sub-Committee also considered a written statement from both the Complainant and the Subject Member provided at the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting on 15 December 2020. Neither party was in attendance.

### Discussion

The complaint was linked with complaints COC131113, COC131238 and COC131240 involving other Members of the Town Council arising from the same set of circumstances and made by the Complainant. It was also linked with complaints COC130429, COC130430, COC130432 and COC130433 arising from the same circumstances against the same members. It is also linked with COC131452, in the fact that that complaint is from an elected member of the town Council alleging that the Subject Member of that complaint (who is one of the four complaints in both the above sets of complaints) did not act in accordance with the Town's standing orders and Financial regulations in respect of the same set of circumstances.

The complaint involved a series of actions of four Members, including the Subject Member, which it was alleged were not in accordance with council procedures, resulting in the unlawful suspension of two officers of the Town Council, and in so doing and through other actions around the decision, breached the Code by not promoting or maintaining high standards of conduct.

The Subject Member contends that they acted in accordance with procedure following advice during a difficult situation, that the allegations and that the complaint does not meet the test for whistleblowing as suggested by the complainant, and the allegations are not substantiated by the submissions.

The Sub-Committee noted that the complaint involved allegations of breaches of the standing orders of the Town Council. It noted that whilst a breach of those standing orders was not in of itself a breach of a Code of Conduct, it had to consider if the specific allegations of breaches of those orders could, if proven, rise to the level of such a breach under the general principle of not promoting high standards of conduct.

### Conclusion

The Sub-Committee was not persuaded, on the basis of the submissions, that the alleged behaviour, and alleged breaches of standing orders, in this instance, if proven, were capable of rising to the level of a breach of the Code of Conduct. Several references had been made to whistleblowing and other matters, but the Sub-Committee did not consider those processes to be relevant to determination of this Code of Conduct matter.

Whilst the political and organisational issues within the Town Council as raised may be causing difficulties for staff and Members and a conciliatory approach from various parties might be beneficial, nothing in the complaint was considered to raise issues that were capable of being a breach of the Code of Conduct.

In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that the thrust of the complaint was the employment decisions taken and the effect on staff. If there were errors or unlawful actions taken by the Town Council by virtue of individual Member's actions, the grievance and Employment Tribunal processes were the appropriate place for those decisions by the Town Council to be explored and determined, rather than the Code of Conduct procedure which can only determine issues of standards in respect of individual members behaviour..

It was therefore resolved to take no further action in respect of the complaint, and Sub-Committee did not consider any of the other related complaints against other Members raised particular issues or allegations which would result in a different determination.

Accordingly, it was,

**Resolved:**

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to take no further action in respect of the complaint.**

58 **Assessment of Complaint: COC131240**

Preamble

A complaint was received from Mel Rolph (The Complainant) regarding the conduct of Councillor Adrienne Westbrook (The Subject Member) of Melksham Town Council.

It was alleged the Subject Member had breached the Code of Conduct by failing to have regard to the Nolan principles, specifically integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership, and failed to be open as possible about his decisions and actions, and failed to give reasons for those decisions and actions.

This was alleged in respect of the suspension several officers working for the Town Council.

Assessment

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that the initial tests of the assessment criteria had been met, including that the Subject Member was and remains a member of Melksham Town Council, that a copy of the relevant Code of

Conduct was provided for the assessment, and that they were acting in their capacity as a Member during the various alleged actions.

It had also been identified that the complaint had been submitted out of time according to Wiltshire Council procedures for dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints. The Sub-Committee confirmed that as the delay had not been the fault of the Complainant, they considered that it was appropriate for the complaint to be accepted and therefore could be assessed.

The Sub-Committee therefore had to decide whether the alleged behaviour would, if proven, amount to a breach of that Code of Conduct. If the Sub-Committee concluded that the alleged behaviour would amount to a breach, then it would have to go on to decide whether it was appropriate under the assessment criteria to refer the matter for investigation.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee took into account the original complaint and supporting information, the response of the Subject Member, and the report of the Monitoring Officer.

The Sub-Committee also considered a written statement from both the Complainant and the Subject Member provided at the Assessment Sub-Committee meeting on 15 December 2020. Neither party was in attendance.

#### Discussion

The complaint was linked with complaints COC131113, COC131238 and COC131239 involving other Members of the Town Council arising from the same set of circumstances and made by the Complainant. It was also linked with complaints COC130429, COC130430, COC130432 and COC130433 arising from the same circumstances against the same members. It is also linked with COC131452, in the fact that that complaint is from an elected member of the town Council alleging that the Subject Member of that complaint (who is one of the four complaints in both the above sets of complaints) did not act in accordance with the Town's standing orders and Financial regulations in respect of the same set of circumstances.

The complaint involved a series of actions of four Members, including the Subject Member, which it was alleged were not in accordance with council procedures, resulting in the unlawful suspension of two officers of the Town Council, and in so doing and through other actions around the decision, breached the Code by not promoting or maintaining high standards of conduct.

The Subject Member contends that they acted in accordance with procedure following advice during a difficult situation, that the allegations and that the complaint does not meet the test for whistleblowing as suggested by the complainant, and the allegations are not substantiated by the submissions.

The Sub-Committee noted that the complaint involved allegations of breaches of the standing orders of the Town Council. It noted that whilst a breach of those standing orders was not in of itself a breach of a Code of Conduct, it had to consider if the specific allegations of breaches of those orders could, if proven,

rise to the level of such a breach under the general principle of not promoting high standards of conduct.

### Conclusion

The Sub-Committee was not persuaded, on the basis of the submissions, that the alleged behaviour, and alleged breaches of standing orders, in this instance, if proven, were capable of rising to the level of a breach of the Code of Conduct. Several references had been made to whistleblowing and other matters, but the Sub-Committee did not consider those processes to be relevant to determination of this Code of Conduct matter.

Whilst the political and organisational issues within the Town Council as raised may be causing difficulties for staff and Members and a conciliatory approach from various parties might be beneficial, nothing in the complaint was considered to raise issues that were capable of being a breach of the Code of Conduct.

In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that the thrust of the complaint was the employment decisions taken and the effect on staff. If there were errors or unlawful actions taken by the Town Council by virtue of individual Member's actions, the grievance and Employment Tribunal processes were the appropriate place for those decisions by the Town Council to be explored and determined, rather than the Code of Conduct procedure which can only determine issues of standards in respect of individual members behaviour..

It was therefore resolved to take no further action in respect of the complaint, and Sub-Committee did not consider any of the other related complaints against other Members raised particular issues or allegations which would result in a different determination.

Accordingly, it was,

### Resolved:

**In accordance with the approved arrangements for resolving standards complaints adopted by Council on 9 July 2019, which came into effect on 1 January 2020 and after hearing from the Independent Person, the Assessment Sub-Committee determined to take no further action in respect of the complaint.**

(Duration of meeting: 12.30 - 1.15 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Kieran Elliott of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718504, e-mail [kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115