

# **STANDARDS AND ADJUDICATION COMMITTEE**

<b>DATE</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> February 2025
<b>REPORT OF</b>	Monitoring Officer
<b>SUBJECT</b>	Consultation - Strengthening the standards and conduct framework for local authorities in England
<b>STATUS</b>	Open

## **CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS**

Good governance arrangements and ethical standards contribute directly to the achievement of the Council's strategic aims.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has invited responses to its consultation seeking views on proposals to introduce measures to strengthen the standards and conduct regime for local authorities in England. The purpose of this report is to invite the Committee to consider whether it wishes to respond to the consultation exercise.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Standards and Adjudication Committee:

- (1) provides views on an appropriate response to the consultation being carried out by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.
- (2) delegates authority to the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chair of this Committee, to prepare the final consultation response to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

## **REASONS FOR DECISION**

Any agreed response would be aimed at improving the current standards arrangements introduced as part of the Localism Act 2011.

### **1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES**

- 1.1 The Council's local standards arrangements, as required by the Localism Act 2011, came into effect on 1st July, 2012.
- 1.2 These arrangements were last reviewed and updated as a result of recommendations made by the Committee on Standards in Public Life as part of its report in January 2019. This result in a revised Members' Code of Conduct being adopted by Council on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2019.

- 1.3 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government announced a consultation on the standards and conduct regime for local authorities in England on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2024. The consultation is due to close on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2025.
- 1.4 The consultation seeks views on introducing measures to strengthen the standards and conduct regime in England and ensure consistency of approach amongst councils investigating serious breaches of their member codes of conduct, including the introduction of the power of suspension.
- 1.5 Specific proposals being consulted upon for legislative change include:
- the introduction of a mandatory minimum code of conduct for local authorities in England
  - a requirement that all principal authorities convene formal standards committees to make decisions on code of conduct breaches, and publish the outcomes of all formal investigations
  - the introduction of the power for all local authorities (including combined authorities) to suspend councillors or mayors found in serious breach of their code of conduct and, as appropriate, interim suspension for the most serious and complex cases that may involve police investigations
  - a new category of disqualification for gross misconduct and those subject to a sanction of suspension more than once in a 5-year period
  - a role for a national body to deal with appeals.
- 1.6 In addition, the consultation seeks views on how to empower victims affected by councillor misconduct to come forward and what additional support would be appropriate to consider.
- 1.7 The consultation document is attached at Appendix 1 to this report and sets out the scope of the consultation and a list of consultation questions.

## **2. RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES**

There is a risk that the current local standards arrangements require improvement, particularly as a result of legislative restrictions that are in place. This consultation provides an opportunity for the Council to comment on any barriers that are in place with a view to making improvements to the local standards arrangements to ensure the highest ethical standards of Members of North East Lincolnshire Council, as well as Members of Town and Parish Councils in the Borough.

## **3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Not applicable.

#### **4. REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS**

Setting high ethical standards is an important building block for councils in developing their community leadership role and achieving the Council's objectives. Robust standards arrangements are needed to safeguard local democracy, maintain high standards of conduct, and to protect ethical practice in local government.

#### **5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

There are no direct financial considerations arising from the proposal in this report.

#### **6. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications for children and young people arising from the proposal in this report.

#### **7. CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct climate change and environmental implications arising from the proposal in this report.

#### **8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications arising from the proposal in this report.

#### **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

As set out in the main body of the report.

#### **10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

There are no human resources implications arising from the proposal in this report.

#### **11. WARD IMPLICATIONS**

All wards are affected.

#### **12. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None.

#### **13. CONTACT OFFICER(S)**

Eve Richardson Smith – Deputy Monitoring Officer  
Email: eve.richardson-smith@nelincs.gov.uk

**SIMON JONES  
MONITORING OFFICER  
AND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR LAW AND GOVERNANCE**

## **APPENDIX**

### **Open consultation - Strengthening the standards and conduct framework for local authorities in England**

**Published 18 December 2024**

## **1. Scope of this consultation**

### **Topic of this consultation**

This consultation seeks views on introducing a mandatory minimum code of conduct for local authorities in England, and measures to strengthen the standards and conduct regime in England to ensure consistency of approach amongst councils investigating serious breaches of their member codes of conduct, including the introduction of the power of suspension.

### **Scope of this consultation**

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is consulting on introducing strengthened sanctions for local authority code of conduct breaches in England.

This includes all 'relevant authorities' as defined by Section 27(6) of the Localism Act 2011, which includes:

- a county council
- a unitary authority
- London borough councils
- a district council
- the Greater London Authority
- the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
- the Common Council of the City of London in its capacity as a local authority or police authority
- the Council of the Isles of Scilly
- parish councils
- a fire and rescue authority in England constituted by a scheme under section 2 of the Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004 or a scheme to which section 4 of that Act applies,
- a joint authority established by Part 4 of the Local Government Act 1985, an economic prosperity board established under section 88 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009
- a combined authority established under section 103 of that Act,
- a combined county authority established under section 9(1) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023
- the Broads Authority
- a National Park authority in England established under section 63 of the Environment Act 1995

It does not cover:

- police and crime commissioners
- internal drainage boards
- any other local authority not otherwise defined as a 'relevant authority' above

All references to 'members' refer to elected members, mayors, co-opted and appointed members of each of the 'relevant authorities' defined above.

## **Geographical scope**

The questions in this consultation paper apply to all relevant local authorities in England as defined above.

They generally do not apply to authorities in Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland, except in relation to Police and Crime Panels in Wales.

## **Impact assessment**

We will produce a full Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) assessment, and all necessary impact assessments, as the policy proposals develop further following this consultation.

## **Basic information**

This is an open consultation. We particularly seek the views of individual members of the public; prospective and current elected members/representatives; all relevant local authorities defined above; and those bodies that represent the interests of local authority members/representatives at all levels.

## **Body responsible for the consultation**

The Local Government Capacity and Improvement Division of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government is responsible for conducting this consultation.

## **Duration**

This consultation will last for 10 weeks from 18 December 2024. This consultation closes at 11:59pm on 26 February 2025.

## **Enquiries**

For any enquiries about the consultation please contact: [LGstandardsreform@communities.gov.uk](mailto:LGstandardsreform@communities.gov.uk)

## **How to respond**

You can only respond to this call for evidence through our online consultation platform, [Citizen Space](#).

## 2. Ministerial foreword

The government is determined to fix the foundations of local government so councils can sustainably provide decent public services and shape local places, and so elected representatives can be fully accountable to the public they serve. Doing so is critical to national renewal, our missions, and our plans to push power out of Westminster and into the hands of local people with skin in the game.

At the core of this agenda is a plan to make local government across England fit, legal, and decent – so that councils have the backing from central government to deliver the high standards and strong financial management that they strive for, without needless micromanagement of day-to-day local decision-making. This plan includes:

- fixing our broken audit system
- improving oversight and accountability
- giving councils genuine freedoms to work for, and deliver in the best interests of, their communities
- improving the standards and conduct regime

This consultation is focused on the proposed reforms to the standards and conduct regime that will contribute to making sure England is covered by effective local and strategic authorities that are well-governed, with high standards met and maintained. It is an honour and a privilege to be elected as a member and with it comes an individual and collective responsibility to consistently demonstrate and promote the highest standards of conduct and public service.

Members take decisions affecting critical local services such as social care, education, housing, planning, licensing, and waste collection. With greater devolution, local authorities will increasingly be taking decisions to shape local transport, skills, employment support, and growth. Decisions that are the responsibility of members impact virtually every citizen's life at some level, and the electorate has a right to expect that it can trust its local elected members to uphold the highest ethical standards and act in the best interests of the communities they serve.

I strongly believe that the vast majority of local elected members maintain high standards of conduct and that they are driven by duty and service. I believe that people stand for elected office in their local communities with the best intentions to act in the interests of those communities, bringing an energy and commitment to working collaboratively, creatively, and respectfully.

Members, officers, reporters and members of public are entitled to support and participate in the local democratic process in the confidence that high standards are maintained. This government wants to celebrate the positive power of public service and, in doing so, we want to give individual authorities appropriate and proportionate means to deal with misconduct effectively and decisively when it does occur. We

also want to ensure that anyone can rightly feel confident about raising an issue under the code of conduct whether it impacts them personally and/or is a code of conduct breach that brings the reputation of the council into disrepute.

With approximately 120,000 councillors in England across all types and tiers of local government, we know there are rare instances of misconduct. Robust political debate is part of our democratic system, but we know from local councils that there are examples of bullying, harassment or other misconduct, when from even a very small minority of members can have a seriously destabilising effect, potentially bringing a council into disrepute and distracting from the critical business of delivering for residents.

This government is committed to working with local and regional government to establish partnerships built on mutual respect, genuine collaboration and meaningful engagement. Our ambition is to create a rigorous standards and conduct framework that will actively contribute to ensuring that local government throughout the country is fit, legal, and decent. With this in mind, this consultation seeks your views on a range of proposals to give local leaders the tools they need to establish and maintain a strong and ethical public service and democratic culture, and the people they serve the confidence that local democracy works for them.

Jim McMahon OBE MP  
Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution

### **3. Background: Standards and Conduct framework and sanctions arrangements**

The [Localism Act 2011](#)<sup>[footnote 1]</sup> established the current standards and conduct framework for local authorities.

The current regime requires every local authority to adopt a code of conduct, the contents of which must as a minimum be consistent with the 7 [‘Nolan’ principles of standards in public life](#) (selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership), and set out rules on requiring members to register and disclose pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests. Beyond these requirements, it is for individual councils to set their own local code. The Local Government Association (LGA) published an [updated model code of conduct and guidance](#) in 2021, which councils can choose whether to adopt or not.

Every authority must also have in place arrangements under which it can investigate allegations of breaches of its code of conduct and must consult at least one independent person before coming to decisions. These decisions are normally taken in one of two ways depending on an authority’s specific arrangements. The decision can be made by full council following advice from their standards committee (or equivalent). Alternatively, the decision can be made by the standards committee if they have been given the power to do so. Although a standards committee may contain unelected independent members and co-opted members, only principal councils’ elected members may vote in a decision-making standards committee.

There is no provision in current legislation for a sanction to suspend a councillor found to have breached the code of conduct. Sanctions for member code of conduct breaches are currently limited to less robust measures than suspension, such as barring members from Cabinet, Committee, or representative roles, a requirement to issue an apology or undergo code of conduct training, or public criticism. Local authorities are also unable to withhold allowances from members who commit serious breaches of their code of conduct, and there is no explicit provision in legislation for councils to impose premises bans or facilities withdrawals where they consider that it might be beneficial to do so.

The government considers that the current local authority standards and conduct regime is in certain key aspects ineffectual, inconsistently applied, and lacking in adequate powers to effectively sanction members found in serious breach of their codes of conduct.

## 4. Who we would like to hear from

Responses are invited from local authority elected members and officers from all types and tiers of authorities, and local authority sector representative organisations. We are also particularly keen to hear from those members of the public who have point of view based on their interest in accessing local democracy in their area or standing as a candidate for local government at any tier to represent their local community at some future point.

Please be assured that all responses to this consultation are anonymous, and no information will be disclosed in any future published response to the consultation, or reporting of the consultation results, that will compromise that anonymity.

### Question 1

Please tick all that apply - are you responding to this consultation as:

a) an elected member – if so please indicate which local authority type(s) you serve on

- Town or Parish Council
- District or Borough Council
- Unitary Authority
- County Council
- Combined Authority / Combined County Authority
- Fire and Rescue Authority
- Police and Crime Panel
- Other local authority type - please state

b) a council officer – if so please indicate which local authority type

- Town or Parish Council
- District or Borough Council
- Unitary Authority
- County Council
- Combined Authority / Combined County Authority
- Fire and Rescue Authority
- Police and Crime Panel
- Other local authority type - please state

c) a council body – if so please indicate which local authority type



- Town or Parish Council
- District or Borough Council
- Unitary Authority
- County Council
- Combined Authority / Combined County Authority
- Fire and Rescue Authority
- Police and Crime Panel
- Other local authority type - please state

d) a member of the public

e) a local government sector body – please state

## 5. Strengthening the Standards and Conduct framework

### a) Mandatory minimum prescribed code of conduct

The government proposes to legislate for the introduction of a mandatory minimum code of conduct which would seek to ensure a higher minimum standard of consistency in setting out the behaviours expected of elected members. The government will likely set out the mandatory code in regulations to allow flexibility to review and amend in future, this will also provide the opportunity for further consultation on the detail.

Codes of conduct play an important role in prescribing and maintaining high standards of public service, integrity, transparency, and accountability. At their best, they establish clear guidelines for behaviour and expectations that members always act ethically in the public's best interest. Currently, there is significant variation between adopted codes, ranging from those who choose to adopt the LGA's full model code to those who simply conform with the minimum requirement of restating the Nolan principles.

A prescribed model code which covers important issues such as discrimination, bullying, and harassment, social media use, public conduct when claiming to represent the council, and use of authority resources could help to uphold consistently high standards of public service in councils across the country and convey the privileged position of public office. It could also provide clarity for the public on the consistent baseline of ethical behaviour they have a right to expect. We would be interested in understanding whether councils consider there should be flexibility to add to the prescribed code to reflect individual authorities' circumstances. They would not be able to amend the mandatory provisions.

### Question 2

Do you think the government should prescribe a mandatory minimum code of conduct for local authorities in England?

- Yes
- No
- If no, why not? [Free text box]

**Question 3**

If yes, do you agree there should be scope for local authorities to add to a mandatory minimum code of conduct to reflect specific local challenges?

- Yes – it is important that local authorities have flexibility to add to a prescribed code
- No – a prescribed code should be uniform across the country
- Unsure

**Question 4**

Do you think the government should set out a code of conduct requirement for members to cooperate with investigations into code breaches?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**b) Standards Committees**

Currently, there is no requirement for local authorities to constitute a formal standards committee. The only legal requirement is for local authorities to have in place 'arrangements' to investigate and make decisions on allegations of misconduct.

The government believes that all principal authorities should be required to convene a standards committee. Formal standards committees would support consistency in the handling of misconduct allegations, applying the same standards and procedures to all cases and providing a formal route to swiftly identify and address vexatious complainants. Furthermore, having a formal standards committee in place could support the development of expertise in handling allegations of misconduct, leading to more informed decision-making. Removing the scope for less formal and more ad hoc arrangements would also enhance transparency and demonstrate to the public that standards and conduct issues will always be dealt with in a structured and consistent way.

This section of the consultation seeks views on two specific proposals to enhance the fairness and objectivity of the standards committee process. Firstly, it considers whether standards committee membership would be required to include at least one Independent Person, as well as (where applicable) at least one co-opted member from a parish or town council. Secondly, it seeks views on whether standards committees should be chaired by the Independent Person.

**Question 5**

Does your local authority currently maintain a standards committee?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

**Question 6**

Should all principal authorities be required to form a standards committee?

- Yes
- No

- Any further comments [free text box]

#### **Question 7**

In most principal authorities, code of conduct complaints are typically submitted in the first instance to the local authority Monitoring Officer to triage, before referring a case for full investigation. Should all alleged code of conduct breaches which are referred for investigation be heard by the relevant principal authority's standards committee?

- Yes, decisions should only be heard by standards committees
- No, local authorities should have discretion to allow decisions to be taken by full council
- Unsure
- 

#### **Question 8**

Do you agree that the Independent Person and co-opted members should be given voting rights?

- Yes – this is important for ensuring objectivity
- No – only elected members of the council in question should have voting rights
- Unsure

#### **Question 9**

Should standards committees be chaired by the Independent Person?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

#### **Question 10**

If you have further views on ensuring fairness and objectivity and reducing incidences of vexatious complaints, please use the free text box below.

[Free text box]

### **c) Publishing investigation outcomes**

To enhance transparency, local authorities should, subject to data protection obligations, be required to publish a summary of code of conduct allegations, and any investigations and decisions. This will be accompanied with strong mechanisms to protect victims' identity to ensure complainants are not dissuaded from coming forward for fear of being identified,

There may be a range of views on this, as publishing the outcome of an investigation that proves there is no case to answer could still be considered damaging to the reputation of the individuals concerned, or it could be considered as helpful in exposing instances of petty and vexatious complaints.

#### **Question 11**

Should local authorities be required to publish annually a list of allegations of code of conduct breaches, and any investigation outcomes?

- Yes - the public should have full access to all allegations and investigation outcomes

- No - only cases in which a member is found guilty of wrongdoing should be published
- Other views – text box

#### **d) Requiring the completion of investigations if a member stands down**

In circumstances where a member stands down during a live code of conduct investigation, councils should be required to conclude that investigation and publish the findings. The government is proposing this measure to ensure that, whilst the member in question will no longer be in office and therefore subject to any council sanction, for the purposes of accountability and transparency there will still be full record of any code of conduct breaches during their term of office.

##### **Question 12**

Should investigations into the conduct of members who stand down before a decision continue to their conclusion, and the findings be published?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

#### **e) Empowering individuals affected by councillor misconduct to come forward**

The government appreciates that it can often be difficult for those who experience misconduct on the part of elected members, such as bullying and harassment, to feel that it is safe and worthwhile to come forward and raise their concerns. If individuals believe there is a likelihood that their complaint will not be addressed or handled appropriately, the risk is that victims will not feel empowered to come forward, meaning misconduct continues without action. We recognise that standing up to instances of misconduct takes an emotional toll, particularly in unacceptable situations where the complaints processes are protracted and do not result in meaningful action. We are committed to ensuring that those affected by misconduct are supported in the right way and feel empowered to come forward. This section seeks feedback from local authorities with experience of overseeing council complaints procedures, or sector bodies and individuals with views on how this might be carried out most effectively. We are also keen to hear from those who work, or have worked, in local government, and who have either witnessed, or been the victim of, member misconduct.

##### **Question 13**

If responding as a local authority, what is the average number of complaints against elected members that you receive over a 12-month period?

[Number box]

##### **Question 13a**

For the above, where possible, please provide a breakdown for complaints made by officers, other elected members, the public, or any other source:

- Complaints made by officers [Number box]
- Complaints made by other elected members [Number box]
- Complaints made by the public [Number box]
- Complaints made by any other source [Number box]

#### Question 14

If you currently work, or have worked, within a local authority, have you ever been the victim of (or witnessed) an instance of misconduct by an elected member and felt that you could not come forward? Please give reasons if you feel comfortable doing so.

- Yes
- No
- [Free text box]

#### Question 15

If you are an elected member, have you ever been subject to a code of conduct complaint? If so, did you feel you received appropriate support to engage with the investigation?

- Yes
- No
- [Free text box]

#### Question 16

If you did come forward as a victim or witness, what support did you receive, and from whom? Is there additional support you would have liked to receive?  
[Free text box]

#### Question 17

In your view, what measures would help to ensure that people who are victims of, or witness, serious councillor misconduct feel comfortable coming forward and raising a complaint?  
[Free text box]

## 6. Introducing the power of suspension with related safeguards

The government believes that local authorities should have the power to suspend councillors for serious code of conduct breaches for a maximum of 6 months, with the option to withhold allowances and institute premises and facilities bans where deemed appropriate. This section of the consultation explores these proposed provisions in greater detail.

While the law disqualifies certain people from being, or standing for election as, a councillor (e.g. on the grounds of bankruptcy, or receipt of a custodial sentence of 3 months or more, or it subject to the notification requirements of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 - meaning on the sex offenders register) councillors cannot currently be suspended or disqualified for breaching their code of conduct.

Feedback from the local government sector in the years since the removal of the power to suspend councillors has indicated that the current lack of meaningful sanctions means local authorities have no effective way of dealing with more serious examples of member misconduct.

The most severe sanctions currently used, such as formally censuring members, removing them from committees or representative roles, and requiring them to undergo training, may prove ineffective in the cases of more serious and disruptive misconduct. This may particularly be the case when it comes to tackling repeat offenders.

The government recognises that it is only a small minority of members who behave badly, but the misconduct of this small minority can have a disproportionately negative impact on the smooth running of councils. We also appreciate the frustration members of the public and councillors can feel both in the inability to deal decisively with cases of misconduct, and the fact that offending members can continue to draw allowances.

#### **Question 18**

Do you think local authorities should be given the power to suspend elected members for serious code of conduct breaches?

- Yes – authorities should be given the power to suspend members
- No – authorities should not be given the power to suspend members
- Unsure

#### **Question 19**

Do you think that it is appropriate for a standards committee to have the power to suspend members, or should this be the role of an independent body?

- Yes - the decision to suspend for serious code of conduct breaches should be for the standards committee
- No - a decision to suspend should be referred to an independent body
- Unsure
- [Free text box]

#### **Question 20**

Where it is deemed that suspension is an appropriate response to a code of conduct breach, should local authorities be required to nominate an alternative point of contact for constituents during their absence?

- Yes – councils should be required to ensure that constituents have an alternative point of contact during a councillor's suspension
- No – it should be for individual councils to determine their own arrangements for managing constituents' representation during a period of councillor suspension
- Unsure

### **a) The length of suspension**

The Committee on Standards in Public Life recommended in their 2019 Local Government Ethical Standards<sup>[\[footnote 3\]](#)</sup> (CSPL) report that the maximum length of suspension, without allowances, should be 6 months and the government agrees

with this approach. The intent of this proposal would be that non-attendance at council meetings during a period of suspension would be disregarded for the purposes of section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, which states that a councillor ceases to be a member of the local authority if they fail to attend council meetings for 6 consecutive months.

The government believes that suspension for the full 6 months should be reserved for only the most serious breaches of the code of conduct, and considers that there should be no minimum length of suspension to facilitate the proportionate application of this strengthened sanction.

#### **Question 21**

If the government reintroduced the power of suspension do you think there should be a maximum length of suspension?

- Yes – the government should set a maximum length of suspension of 6 months
- Yes – however the government should set a different maximum length (in months) [Number box]
- No – I do not think the government should set a maximum length of suspension
- Unsure

#### **Question 22**

If yes, how frequently do you consider councils would be likely to make use of the maximum length of suspension?

- Infrequently – likely to be applied only to the most egregious code of conduct breaches
- Frequently – likely to be applied in most cases, with some exceptions for less serious breaches
- Almost always – likely to be the default length of suspension for code of conduct breaches
- Unsure

### **b) Withholding allowances and premises and facilities bans**

Giving councils the discretion to withhold allowances from members who have been suspended for serious code of conduct breaches in cases where they feel it is appropriate to do so could act as a further deterrent against unethical behaviour. Holding councillors financially accountable during suspensions also reflects a commitment to ethical governance, the highest standards of public service, and value for money for local residents.

Granting local authorities the power in legislation to ban suspended councillors from local authority premises and from using council equipment and facilities could be beneficial in cases of behavioural or financial misconduct, ensuring that suspended councillors do not misuse resources or continue egregious behaviour. Additionally, it would demonstrate that allegations of serious misconduct are handled appropriately, preserving trust in public service and responsible stewardship of public assets. These measures may not always be appropriate and should not be tied to the sanction of suspension by default. The government also recognises that there may



be instances in which one or both of these sanctions is appropriate but suspension is not. It is therefore proposed that both the power to withhold allowances and premises and facilities bans represent standalone sanctions in their own right.

#### **Question 23**

Should local authorities have the power to withhold allowances from suspended councillors in cases where they deem it appropriate?

- Yes – councils should have the option to withhold allowances from suspended councillors
- No – suspended councillors should continue to receive allowances
- Unsure

#### **Question 24**

Do you think it should be put beyond doubt that local authorities have the power to ban suspended councillors from council premises and to withdraw the use of council facilities in cases where they deem it appropriate?

- Yes – premises and facilities bans are an important tool in tackling serious conduct issues
- No – suspended councillors should still be able to use council premises and facilities
- Unsure

#### **Question 25**

Do you agree that the power to withhold members' allowances and to implement premises and facilities bans should also be standalone sanctions in their own right?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

### **c) Interim suspension**

Some investigations into serious code of conduct breaches may be complex and take time to conclude, and there may be circumstances when the misconduct that has led to the allegation is subsequently referred to the police to investigate. In such cases, the government proposes that there should be an additional power to impose interim suspensions whilst and until a serious or complex case under investigation is resolved.

A member subject to an interim suspension would not be permitted to participate in any council business or meetings, with an option to include a premises and facilities ban.

We consider that members should continue to receive allowances whilst on interim suspension and until an investigation proves beyond doubt that a serious code of conduct breach has occurred or a criminal investigation concludes. The decision to impose an interim suspension would not represent a pre-judgement of the validity of an allegation.



We suggest that:

- Interim suspensions should initially be for up to a maximum of 3 months. After the expiry of an initial interim suspension period, the relevant council's standards committee should review the case to decide whether it is in the public interest to extend.
- As appropriate, the period of time spent on interim suspension may be deducted from the period of suspension a standards committee imposes.

#### **Question 26**

Do you think the power to suspend councillors on an interim basis pending the outcome of an investigation would be an appropriate measure?

- Yes, powers to suspend on an interim basis would be necessary
- No, interim suspension would not be necessary
- Any further comments [free text box]

#### **Question 27**

Do you agree that local authorities should have the power to impose premises and facilities bans on councillors who are suspended on an interim basis?

- Yes - the option to institute premises and facilities bans whilst serious misconduct cases are investigated is important
- No - members whose investigations are ongoing should retain access to council premises and facilities
- Unsure

#### **Question 28**

Do you think councils should be able to impose an interim suspension for any period of time they deem fit?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

#### **Question 29**

Do you agree that an interim suspension should initially be for up to a maximum of 3 months, and then subject to review?

- Yes
- No
- Any further comments [free text box]

#### **Question 30**

If following a 3-month review of an interim suspension, a standards committee decided to extend, do you think there should be safeguards to ensure a period of interim extension is not allowed to run on unchecked?

- Yes – there should be safeguards
- No – councils will know the details of individual cases and should be trusted to act responsibly

#### **Question 30a**

If you answered yes to above question, what safeguards do you think might be needed to ensure that unlimited suspension is not misused?

[Free text box]

## **d) Disqualification for multiple breaches and gross misconduct**

When councillors repeatedly breach codes of conduct, it undermines the integrity of the council and erodes public confidence. To curb the risk of repeat offending and continued misconduct once councillors return from a suspension, the government considers that it may be beneficial to introduce disqualification for a period of 5 years for those members for whom the sanction of suspension is invoked on more than one occasion within a 5-year period.

This measure underlines the government's view that the sanction of suspension should only be used in the most serious code of conduct breaches, because in effect a decision to suspend more than once in a 5-year period would be a decision to disqualify an elected member. However, we consider this measure would enable councils to signal in the strongest terms that repeated instances of misconduct will not be tolerated and would act as a strong deterrent against the worst kind of behaviours becoming embedded.

Currently a person is disqualified if they have been convicted of any offence and have received a sentence of imprisonment (suspended or not) for a period of 3 months or more (without the option of a fine) in the 5-year period before the relevant election. Disqualification also covers sexual offences, even if they do not result in a custodial or suspended sentence.

### **Question 31**

Do you think councillors should be disqualified if subject to suspension more than once?

- Yes – twice within a 5-year period should result in disqualification for 5 years
- Yes – but for a different length of time and/or within a different timeframe (in years) [Number boxes]
- No - the power to suspend members whenever they breach codes of conduct is sufficient
- Any other comments [free text box]

### **Question 32**

Is there a case for immediate disqualification for gross misconduct, for example in instances of theft or physical violence impacting the safety of other members and/or officers, provided there has been an investigation of the incident and the member has had a chance to respond before a decision is made?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- [Free text box]

## **e) Appeals**

The government proposes that:

- A right of appeal be introduced for any member subject to a decision to suspend them.

- Members should only be able to appeal any given decision to suspend them once.
- An appeal should be invoked within 5 working days of the notification of suspension; and
- Following receipt of a request for appeal, arrangements should be made to conduct the appeal hearing within 28 working days.

The government believes that were the sanction of suspension to be introduced (and potentially disqualification if a decision to suspend occurs a second time within a 5-year period) it would be essential for such a punitive measure to be underpinned by a fair appeals process.

A right of appeal would allow members to challenge decisions that they believe are unjust or disproportionate and provides a safeguard to ensure that the sanction of suspension is applied fairly and consistently.

We consider that it would be appropriate to either create a national body, or to vest the appeals function in an existing appropriate national body, and views on the merits of that are sought at questions 38 and 39 below. Firstly, the following questions test opinion on the principle of providing a mechanism for appeal.

### **Question 33**

Should members have the right to appeal a decision to suspend them?

- Yes - it is right that any member issued with a sanction of suspension can appeal the decision
- No – a council's decision following consideration of an investigation should be final
- Unsure

### **Question 34**

Should suspended members have to make their appeal within a set timeframe?

- Yes – within 5 days of the decision is appropriate to ensure an efficient process
- Yes – but within a different length of time (in days) [Number box]
- No – there should be no time limit for appealing a decision

The government is also keen to explore if a right of appeal should be provided, either in relation to whether a complaint proceeds to full investigation and consideration by the standards committee, or where a claimant is dissatisfied with the determination of the standards committee.

### **Question 35**

Do you consider that a complainant should have a right of appeal when a decision is taken not to investigate their complaint?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Question 36**

Do you consider that a complainant should have a right of appeal when an allegation of misconduct is not upheld?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Question 37**

If you answered yes to either of the previous two questions, please use the free text box below to share views on what you think is the most suitable route of appeal for either or both situations.

[Free text box]

**f) Potential for a national appeals body**

There is a need to consider whether appeals panels should be in-house within local authorities, or whether it is right that this responsibility sits with an independent national body. Whereas an in-house appeals process would potentially enable quicker resolutions by virtue of a smaller caseload, empowering a national body to oversee appeals from suspended members and complainants could reinforce transparency and impartiality and help to ensure consistency of decision-making throughout England, setting precedents for the types of cases that are heard.

**Question 38**

Do you think there is a need for an external national body to hear appeals?

- Yes – an external appeals body would help to uphold impartiality
- No – appeals cases should be heard by an internal panel
- Any further comments [free text box]

**Question 39**

If you think there is a need for an external national appeals body, do you think it should:

- Be limited to hearing elected member appeals
- Be limited to hearing claimant appeals
- Both of the above should be in scope
- Please explain your answer [free text box]

**7. Public Sector Equality Duty****Question 40**

In your view, would the proposed reforms to the local government standards and conduct framework particularly benefit or disadvantage individuals with protected characteristics, for example those with disabilities or caring responsibilities?

Please tick an option below:

- it would benefit individuals with protected characteristics
- it would disadvantage individuals with protected characteristics
- neither

Please use the text box below to make any further comment on this question.

[Free text box]

