Minutes

Standards Committee Assessment Sub-Committee Tuesday, 27 July 2010 Meeting held at Civic Centre, HIgh Street, Uxbridge



Published on:

Come into effect on: Immediately (or call-in date)

Members Present:

Malcolm Ellis (Chairman)
Councillor John Hensley
Councillor Josephine Barrett
Councillor Anita MacDonald

Officers Present:

Raj Alagh, Monitoring Officer/Head of Legal Services Lloyd White, Head of Democratic Services Nav Johal, Democratic Services Officer

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologises for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in matters coming before this meeting.

3. CONFIRMATION THAT ITEMS WILL BE DEALT WITH IN PRIVATE

Exclusion of the press and public: It was confirmed that the business of the meeting would be conducted in private.

4. ASSESSMENT OF COMPLAINT

The Sub-Committee met to consider an allegation made by Mr Peter Silverman, that Councillor Jonathon Bianco had contravened one or more provisions of the Members' Code of Conduct ["the Code"] which he had undertaken in writing to observe.

The Members of the Sub-Committee satisfied themselves that if proven, the allegation would constitute a breach of paragraph 5 of the Code which imposes an obligation on a Member not to conduct himself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing his office or authority into disrepute but not paragraph 3[1] which imposes an obligation on a Member to treat others with respect.

The Members of the Sub-Committee were required to consider which of the three options, as set out in paragraph 3.6 of the Rules, should be pursued. They decided, by a majority (with Councillor MacDonald dissenting), that no action should be taken in respect of the allegation for the following reasons. Firstly, there was no information to suggest that Councillor Bianco had made a deliberate false statement when responding to the question concerning the Council's investments in Icelandic Banks. Secondly, a failure to respond to Mr Silverman's two separate e-mails, even if proven, was not capable of constituting a breach of the Code.

A full written summary of the decision is available to the public.