

**ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**ASSESSMENT PANEL – 6 FEBRUARY 2019**

**DECISION NOTICE - COMPLAINT 9**  
**STEVEN BASS**

<b>Subject Member</b>	Councillor Richard Bower
<b>Representing</b>	Arun District Council
<b>Assessment Panel Members</b>	Councillor Paul English (Chairman) Councillor Ann Rapnik Councillor Dr James Walsh Councillor Robert Wheal John Thompson – Independent Person

**Summary of Complaint**

The complaint related to the Subject Member's conduct when they were acting as Chairman of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 24 October 2018.

The Complainant alleged that the Subject Member did not champion the needs of residents; listen to the interests of all parties; be accountable for his decisions; contribute to making the decision making processes as open and transparent as possible; value his colleagues; and provide leadership at the meeting.

**How the Code of Conduct applies to this complaint**

As required by the Localism Act 2011, Arun District Council has adopted a Members' Code of Conduct and required each councillor to sign up to this Code. This Code was last reviewed by the District Council on 8 November 2017.

The assessment of this complaint was reviewed against the Members' Code of Conduct for Arun District Councillors. It was confirmed that the Subject Member had made a declaration to comply with the latest version of the Members' Code of Conduct on 30 November 2017.

The membership of the Assessment Panel was selected to avoid any conflict of interest from involvement with the meeting of the Development Control Committee on 24 October 2018 or the Pagham ward.

**The Panel's Decision**

The Complainant had highlighted seven paragraphs within their complaint that they believed demonstrated that there had been a breach of the Members' Code of Conduct by the Subject Member. One paragraph was discounted from the review of the complaint as it related to the administrative arrangements for the meeting and the membership of the Development Control Committee and not the conduct of the

Subject Member. The assessment therefore considered the issues raised under each of the remaining paragraphs identified by the Complainant.

The Panel considered the report of the Investigating Officer and then heard statements from the Complainant as well as from the Subject Member. They also considered a further written statement provided by the Complainant and written witness statements provided by the Subject Member from two members of the Development Control Committee which were circulated at the hearing.

Having reviewed all the evidence presented, the Panel recognised the strength of public feeling in the business before the Development Control Committee on 24 October 2018, demonstrated by the high level of public attendance at the meeting. They acknowledged that this had made this a difficult meeting for the Subject Member to chair and noted from a verbal statement made by him that he had not had to deal with anything similar before. They concluded from all the evidence presented that this had led to a contentious meeting with a public gallery that was very vocal at times.

The Panel's decision on each of the six paragraphs is set out below:

<b>Paragraph 1 – Champion the needs of residents</b>	
<i>Decision</i>	<b>No breach</b>
<i>Reason for the Decision</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having appreciated that the Complainant's comments were based on their personal opinion and observations of the meeting, the Panel found no evidence to support their view of the conduct of the Subject Member at this meeting.</li> <li>2. The Panel found that the Subject Member had a responsibility to champion the needs of residents in the whole of the Arun District in his role as Chairman of the Development Control Committee, not just one particular ward. Further, the Panel accepted that the Subject Member's role, as Chairman of the Committee, was to give advice and guidance to the Development Control Committee to ensure it worked within the obligations of the law.</li> <li>3. The Panel found that the minutes from the meeting on 24 October 2018 confirmed what was considered in the debate on the determined application (P/140/16/OUT) and what proposals were put forward and lost in the consideration of application P/6/17/OUT prior to the adjournment of the meeting. Further, the minutes confirmed that the voting process for both applications followed the rules of the Council's Constitution.</li> <li>4. In making this determination, the Panel found that these minutes had subsequently been agreed as a correct record by the Development Control Committee on 12 December 2018.</li> </ol>

	<p>5. The Panel found that the Subject Member, in his role as Chairman of the Committee, had authority to adjourn the meeting where a disturbance by the public made orderly business impossible under the Council's Constitution and did give a warning to the public gallery that he would take action if they did not cease their interruptions of the meeting. Further, the Subject Member had confirmed that he had needed to raise his voice to make such announcements as the microphone system was not working properly on the day of the meeting.</p> <p>6. On this basis, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had not breached paragraph 2.1(1) of the Members' Code of Conduct.</p>
--	---

<b>Paragraph 5 – Listen to the interests of all parties</b>	
<i>Decision</i>	<b>No breach</b>
<i>Reason for the Decision</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having appreciated that the Complainant's comments were based on their personal opinion and observations of the meeting, the Panel found no evidence to support their view of the conduct of the Subject Member at this meeting.</li> <li>2. The Panel found no evidence that the meeting had been chaired in a manner that was undemocratic.</li> <li>3. The Panel found that the minutes from the meeting on 24 October 2018 confirmed what was considered in the debate on the determined application (P/140/16/OUT) and what proposals were put forward and lost in the consideration of application P/6/17/OUT prior to the adjournment of the meeting. Further, the minutes confirmed that the voting process for both applications followed the rules of the Council's Constitution.</li> <li>4. In making this determination, the Panel found that these minutes had subsequently been agreed as a correct record by the Development Control Committee on 12 December 2018.</li> <li>5. The Panel found that the evidence confirmed that the Subject Member, along with the remainder of the Committee, had been provided with detailed information to inform their deliberations on the business before the meeting before exercising their decision taking responsibility.</li> <li>6. On this basis, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had not breached paragraph 2.1(5) of the Members' Code of Conduct.</li> </ol>

**Paragraph 6 - Be accountable for their decisions and co-operate when scrutinised**

<i>Decision</i>	<b>No breach</b>
<i>Reason for the Decision</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having appreciated that the Complainant's comments were based on their personal opinion and observations of the meeting, the Panel found no evidence to support their view of the conduct of the Subject Member at this meeting.</li> <li>2. Whilst they understood the frustration of the Complainant about information that they felt should have been made available at the meeting about a previous planning application, the Panel found that it was not the Subject Member's individual responsibility, in his role as Chairman, to have identified any further background evidence to be drawn to the Committee's attention at this meeting. All members of the Committee had been provided with the agenda for the meeting in advance and each had a responsibility to make a request to officers that any information omitted from the report should be provided to the meeting; or to request a deferral of the application at the meeting if they felt the omitted information was relevant information for the Committee to consider ahead of their decision taking.</li> <li>3. On this basis, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had not breached paragraph 2.1(6) of the Members' Code of Conduct.</li> </ol>

**Paragraph 7 - Contribute to making their authority's decision making processes as open and transparent as possible**

<i>Decision</i>	<b>Breach in part</b>
<i>Reason for the Decision</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having appreciated that the Complainant's comments were based on their personal opinion and observations of the meeting, the Panel found no evidence to support their view of the conduct of the Subject Member at this meeting in terms of the voting procedure at the meeting.</li> <li>2. The Panel found that the minutes of the meeting on 24 October 2018 confirmed that the voting process on the second planning application followed the rules of the Council's Constitution. These minutes, that were subsequently approved as a correct record on 12 December 2018, also confirmed the basis for the adjournment of the meeting.</li> <li>3. However, the Panel did find that the Subject Member had not followed the Council's Constitution in adjourning the meeting on 24 October 2018. The approved minutes confirmed that the meeting was adjourned as the Committee was unable to make progress. The rules of the Council's Constitution</li> </ol>

	<p>confirm that a motion to adjourn a meeting, unless due to a public disturbance, requires a proposer and seconder to move such a request and for this motion to be put to a vote by the Committee. Based on the wording in the approved minutes, the Subject Member did not have authority to adjourn the meeting as he chose to do on 24 October 2018.</p> <p>4. Whilst the Panel accepted that this had been a difficult meeting for the Subject Member to chair and that he believed he had authority to adjourn the meeting, they found no evidence that he had taken advice before taking the decision to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>5. On this basis, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had breached paragraph 2.1(7) of the Members' Code of Conduct in relation to his conduct in adjourning the meeting.</p>
--	---

<b>Paragraph 9 - Value their colleagues</b>	
<i>Decision</i>	<b>No breach</b>
<i>Reason for the Decision</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having appreciated that the Complainant's comments were based on their personal opinion and observations of the meeting, the Panel found no evidence to support their view of the conduct of the Subject Member at this meeting.</li> <li>2. The Panel noted that the Subject Member had acknowledged that he may have let some irritation show as it was a long meeting. They also noted the statement made by an officer present at the meeting that some members of the public did not respect the requests that the Chairman made, in his role as Chairman, to cease their interruptions at the meeting.</li> <li>3. The Panel found that the Subject Member, in his role as Chairman of the Committee, had authority to adjourn the meeting where a disturbance by the public made orderly business impossible under the Council's Constitution and did give a warning to the public gallery that he would take action if they did not cease their interruptions of the meeting. Further, the Subject Member had confirmed that he had needed to raise his voice to make such announcements as the microphone system was not working properly on the day of the meeting.</li> <li>4. The Panel also accepted that this had been a difficult meeting for the Subject Member to chair and that he had acknowledged that he may have caused offence by a remark made at the meeting by making a public apology at the reconvened meeting on 13 November 2018.</li> <li>5. The Panel found that no complaints had been received from any other member sitting on the Committee that</li> </ol>

	<p>they felt intimidated or offended by the Subject Member's conduct at the meeting.</p> <p>6. On this basis, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had not breached paragraph 2.1(9) of the Members' Code of Conduct.</p>
--	---

<b>Paragraph 11 - Provide leadership</b>	
<i>Decision</i>	<b>No breach</b>
<i>Reason for the Decision</i>	<p>1. The Panel found no evidence to support the Complainant's view that the Subject Member had demonstrated threatening behaviour at the meeting. This finding was based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. no complaints being received to this effect from members sitting on the Committee; and</li> <li>b. the minutes confirming that members of the Committee were able to exercise their right to speak and put forward alternative proposals to the officer recommendation prior to the adjournment.</li> </ul> <p>2. The Panel also confirmed that they would have taken any substantiated allegation of threatening behaviour or bullying very seriously.</p> <p>3. On this basis, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had not breached paragraph 2.1(11) of the Members' Code of Conduct.</p>

<b>Sanctions to be recommended to Arun District Council</b>
<p>Based on their findings from this assessment, the Panel have recommended the following two sanctions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In addition to the arrangements for publication of the decision notice in the Local Assessment Procedure, this should also be provided directly to the Leader of the Conservative Group so they can see the conclusions and findings drawn from the assessment.</li> <li>2. The Subject Member should be provided with a copy of the Committee Procedure Rules from the Council's Constitution for review to ensure he is fully aware of the procedural requirements at meetings of the Development Control Committee. Further, the Subject Member should be asked to provide written confirmation to the Leader of the Conservative Group and the Monitoring Officer of his understanding of these requirements.</li> </ol> <p>Reviewing lessons learnt from comments made by the Complainant, the Panel also believe that clearer information needs to be provided to members of public attending meetings of the Development Control Committee to understand the Council's planning obligations and how the meeting will operate. They therefore recommend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Group Head of Planning be requested to explore the introduction of an information guide that confirms the requirements of the Local Plan for strategic sites and how the planning process for determining planning</li> </ol>

applications works within this by publicising this guide on the Council's website and making it available as a handout at meetings of the Committee.

2. The Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, be requested to explore the introduction of a simple guide that explains how the voting process works at the Development Control Committee and what the expectations are from Members presenting alternative proposals to the officer recommendation about valid planning reasons, for example what considerations there are in proposing reasons for refusal of an application.
3. The Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, be requested to create a notice that covers expectations of the public's conduct at meetings, for example what happens if there is a public disturbance or interruption from the public gallery, so this can be available to view throughout the meeting and not just as part of the Chairman's introduction at the start of the meeting.

#### **Publication of the Decision**

1. Following the review period, the decision of the Panel will be published to Arun District Council's website for a period of 3 months.
2. The Panel's decision will be reported to the next meeting of the Standards Committee.