

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 APRIL 2011

Present: **Councillors:** Mrs Gibson, Mrs Hinder, Marchant,
Mrs Robertson and Vizzard

Independent Members: Mrs Phillips (Chairman),
Ms Hunt, Mr Powis and Mr Wright

Parish Council Representatives: Councillors Butcher
and Mrs Riden

Also Present: **Councillor Garland**

72. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Parvin, Stead, Mrs Stockell and Younger.

73. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that Councillor Mrs Gibson was substituting for Councillor Mrs Stockell.

74. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

It was noted that Councillor Garland, the Leader of the Council, had been invited to address the meeting.

75. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

76. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

There were no disclosures of lobbying at this stage.

77. EXEMPT ITEMS

RESOLVED: That the items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

78. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 FEBRUARY 2011

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2011 be approved as a correct record and signed.

79. ADDRESS BY COUNCILLOR CHRIS GARLAND - LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

At the invitation of the Committee, Councillor Garland, the Leader of the Council, attended the meeting to discuss his views on the proposals contained in the Localism Bill in relation to the ethical standards regime and how a local Standards Committee, if there was to be such a thing, would operate under the new arrangements for regulating the standards of conduct for Members and Co-opted Members. He commented that:-

- It was his understanding that Eric Pickles, the Communities Secretary, had moved to abolish the Standards Board regime being of the view that in future Councillors should expect to be judged by the electorate on their conduct/performance and not by a Standards Committee of a local authority.
- Clearly there was a view amongst Members that the Standards Committee had done a lot of good work since it was established, but there was a need for change. He subscribed to that view, but believed that caution was required in bringing about the changes.
- The public needed to be reassured that there was some degree of outside scrutiny of the behaviour and performance of Councillors. Maidstone had been fortunate in that there had been very few instances where Members had deviated from the standards of behaviour that the public expected from them. However, there was concern that sometimes there were complaints that could be dealt with in a less formal and less costly manner and sometimes the Standards Committee was obliged to investigate the conduct of a Councillor when, it could be argued, the matter might more appropriately be dealt with elsewhere; for example, by the electorate at the end of his/her term of office.
- It was anticipated that the Localism Bill would receive Royal Assent in late 2011 and the existing ethical standards arrangements would continue to function until a fixed date which was likely to be some two months later. In terms of what, if anything, would replace the current standards regime, his view was that there would need to be a Code of Conduct to guide Members and a small group of, say, three Independent Members should be established to meet as and when required to monitor compliance with the Code and deal with complaints of extreme misconduct. Complaints of a less serious nature could be dealt with by Group Leaders.
- In terms of the other functions currently undertaken by the Standards Committee, he felt that any replacement body should confine itself to Code of Conduct issues.

During the ensuing discussion, reference was made to:-

- The likely public reaction to the anticipated abolition of the requirement to have a Code of Conduct and the need to reassure the public that the Borough Council would have robust arrangements in place next year to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by Members and Co-opted Members.
- The need for some sort of locally agreed Code of Conduct to guide Members, but this should be less complex than the current Code.

- The need for a protocol for dealing with complaints of Member misconduct quickly and cost effectively, but with a “lighter touch”, and the arguments for and against involving elected Members in the process.
- The merits of establishing a small, non-statutory Committee of Independent Members to monitor compliance with the Code and to look into complaints of Member misconduct as and when required.
- The implications for Parish Councils, particularly in terms of whether to adopt a voluntary Code of Conduct and, if so, its contents; monitoring compliance with the Code; training; dealing with complaints of Member misconduct; and the need to indemnify Members against the costs of action about breaches of the Code.
- The training which would be required by Members on any locally agreed voluntary Code of Conduct given that it was likely to be simpler and that what constituted a criminal offence under the new arrangements (for example, failure to register or declare an interest) would be clearly defined.
- The process for implementing the provisions of the Localism Bill, including the transitional arrangements.
- How the functions of the Standards Committee otherwise than in relation to the Code of Conduct for Members would be dealt with.
- Whether or not the Borough Council should seek to impose any regulatory function over Parish Councils.

The Committee thanked the Leader for an interesting discussion.

80. LOCALISM BILL - UPDATE

The Committee gave further consideration to the implications of the provisions of the Localism Bill in so far as they related to the standards regime. It was noted that:-

- The Chairman and the Head of Legal Services had attended a meeting of the Maidstone Area Committee of the Kent Association of Local Councils which had expressed an interest in a joint Code of Conduct for Parishes and the Borough Council.
- The Independent Members who had attended the meeting of the Liaison Group of Kent and Medway Independent Standards Committee Members on 22 February 2011 had reported that their Councils were interested in/would consider supporting a new standards regime and there was a general consensus for Committees to be retained, the exact role of which to be defined once the legislation was in place. The Group had debated whether there should be a strategic plan for Kent and the Independent Members were asked to put a number of questions to their Councils: was there a need for a Code of Conduct; was there a need for Standards Committees and, if so, should Independent Members be involved; and how could the public be made more aware/re-assured of ethical standards in local government?
- In general, therefore, there appeared to be growing interest in maintaining a Code of Conduct with a non-statutory Committee to advise on the Code and sanctions and provide training.

- Thanet had suggested lobbying for the continuation of full voting rights for Independent Members on any voluntary Standards Committees which might be established.

On this latter point, the Committee was mindful that under the new arrangements, Co-opted Independent Members would only have voting rights if acting in an advisory capacity. However, the only decision likely to have to be made would be whether to investigate a complaint of Member misconduct and there would be no statutory sanctions available in any event to take against an offending Member.

RESOLVED: That the position be noted and that no action be taken on the suggestion that representations be made calling for the continuation of full voting rights for Co-opted Independent Members.

Note: Mr Wright stated that he had been lobbied regarding the continuation of full voting rights for Independent Members.

81. FORWARD PLAN 2010/2012

The Committee considered the position with regard to the activities set out in the Forward Plan 2010/12. It was noted, inter alia, that the Training Officer had provided a short report evaluating feedback about the training provided for Borough and Parish Councillors and Parish Clerks on the Code of Conduct. The report showed that the sessions had been well attended and well received.

RESOLVED: That the position with regard to the activities set out in the Standards Committee Forward Plan 2010/12 be noted.

82. ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL 2010/11

The Committee considered its draft Annual Report to the Council. The Committee agreed the Report for submission to the Council subject to minor amendments.

A copy of the amended version of the Annual Report is attached as an Appendix to these Minutes.

RESOLVED to RECOMMEND to the COUNCIL: That the Standards Committee's Annual Report to Council 2010/11, a copy of which is attached as an Appendix to these Minutes, be noted.

83. REFERENCE FROM CABINET - FUTURE ROLE OF THE STRATEGIC HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Committee was asked to evaluate the amendment of the Constitution as a consequence of a proposal to disband the Strategic Housing Advisory Committee and create a new body to be called the "Housing Consultative Board" to advise the Cabinet and Cabinet Members on housing matters. It was noted that, in the light of major changes to housing statute and policy proposed by central government, it was considered that there was merit in having a body to advise the Cabinet and Cabinet Members on

matters relating to housing. However, it was also felt important to differentiate this body from the role of the Strategic Housing Advisory Committee, which was in effect to monitor the progress of the promises made prior to the housing stock transfer.

The Committee supported the proposed amendment of the Constitution as a process would be put in place which would enable decisions to be taken efficiently and effectively and which would create a powerful and effective means of holding decision makers to public account.

RESOLVED to RECOMMEND to the COUNCIL: That it be noted that, in accordance with Article 15.02 (a) of the Constitution, the Standards Committee has evaluated the amendment of the Constitution as a consequence of the proposal to disband the Strategic Housing Advisory Committee and create a new body to be called the "Housing Consultative Board", and believes that its implementation will help to ensure that the aims and principles of the Constitution are given full effect by putting in place a process which will enable decisions to be taken efficiently and effectively, and which creates a powerful and effective means of holding decision makers to public account.

84. REFERENCE FROM CABINET - EXECUTIVE PROCEDURE RULES - PETITIONS

The Committee was asked to evaluate suggested amendments to the Executive Procedure Rules relating to petitions to remove the age limit on who can sign a petition or present a petition to the Cabinet or a Cabinet Member. It was noted that at the Council meeting on 22 September 2010, it was agreed that the Council's Petition Scheme should be amended so that there is no age limit on who can sign a petition or present a petition to Council. The amendment made by the Council to the Council Procedure Rules did not change the rules for the presentation of petitions to the Cabinet which are dealt with separately in the Executive Procedure Rules. On being made aware of this anomaly the Cabinet determined that the changes should be made in order to have consistency across the Council.

The Committee supported the proposed amendments to the Executive Procedure Rules within the Constitution believing that their implementation would create an effective means of holding decision makers to public account.

RESOLVED to RECOMMEND to the COUNCIL: That it be noted that, in accordance with Article 15.02 (a) of the Constitution, the Standards Committee has evaluated the proposed amendments to the Executive Procedure Rules within the Constitution and believes that their implementation will help to ensure that the aims and principles of the Constitution are given full effect by creating an effective means of holding decision makers to public account.

85. REFERENCE FROM THE AUDIT COMMITTEE - ELECTRONIC TENDERING - AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES

The Committee was asked to evaluate suggested amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules within the Constitution arising from the purchase of an electronic tendering system. It was noted that the proposed amendments related to the deletion of the specific reference to an email address as the new system was web-based and that it was the intention to use the new system for the submission of tenders in respect of contracts in excess of £75,000.

The Committee supported the proposed amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules within the Constitution as any decision not to make the amendments would prevent tenders being submitted using the new system, and thus hinder the efficient and effective taking of decisions.

RESOLVED to RECOMMEND to the COUNCIL: That it be noted that, in accordance with Article 15.02 (a) of the Constitution, the Standards Committee has evaluated the proposed amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules within the Constitution and believes that their implementation will help to ensure that the aims and principles of the Constitution are given full effect, as any decision not to make the amendments would prevent tenders being submitted using the new electronic tendering system, and thus would hinder the efficient and effective taking of decisions.

86. APPLICATIONS FOR DISPENSATIONS

There were no applications for dispensations.

87. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that since this was the last meeting of the Standards Committee before the elections in May, she would like to take the opportunity to thank all Members and Co-opted Members of the Committee for their hard work and support throughout the year, and to express her thanks in particular to Councillor Marchant, a long-standing Member of the Committee, who would not be standing for re-election.

88. DURATION OF MEETING

2.00 p.m. to 3.40 p.m.