

## **MEETING**

Date of Meeting	Monday, 7 December 2015
Report Subject	REVIEW OF LOCAL RESOLUTION PROCEDURE
Report Author	Gareth Owens

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1. The Council adopted the Local Resolution Procedure (LRP) on 25 June 2013. Since then 6 cases have been handled under the LRP and whilst this is a small evidence base it is appropriate to review the effectiveness of the procedure 2 years after its adoption.
- 2. The experience from the cases shows that where both parties work in good faith the procedure can swiftly and successfully resolve an issue. The speed at which complaints are handled is important in resolving an issue whilst it is relevant and whilst parties are willing to participate. There is no current mechanism for preventing delay and the committee may wish to add such a mechanism.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

To consider whether to impose a requirement for complaints under the Local Resolution Procedure to be handled with due speed.

## **REPORT DETAILS**

1.00	LOCAL RESOLUTION PROCEDURE
1.01	Council approved the Local Resolution Procedure at its meeting on 25 June 2015. The LRP provides an alternative route for resolving some breaches of the Councillors' Code of Conduct. The following 6 cases have been handled under the procedure.

	Complainant	Comment
	Councillor A	LRP not appropriate. Case closed.
	Councillors B & C	Apology issued and accepted. Case closed.
	Officer	Apology issued and accepted. Case closed.
	Councillor D	Member not willing to offer an apology and
		Monitoring Officer did not uphold cause for
		complaint. Complainant did not want to
		proceed to stage 2. Case closed.
	Councillor E	Partial compliance with "agreed" resolution by
		member subject of the complaint.
1.02	scenario for use of the L not realised their acti immediately. As such the where the Monitoring Off proceeded to stage 2 but	an apology was issued reflected the optimum RP, ie. the councillor subject to the complaint had ons had caused offence and so apologised these cases presented no difficulties. The case ficer did not find the complaint justified could have at the complainant chose not to do so. Again the laws or failings in the process.
1.03	procedure imposes a 12 upper limit on how long to complaint can be upsetting and any outcome (eg. ar fresh. Imposing an upper though it would be possible discretion. Another alternative and the complete in	ase has still not been resolved. Currently the month time limit on bringing a complaint but no they take to resolve. Whilst issues giving rise to a ng, it is clear that complaints are easier to resolve, a apology), has more relevance when the matter is per time limit (eg. 6 months) might be too rigid, ible to allow extension at the Monitoring Officer's ernative might be to give the Monitoring Officer complaints that are not being handled sufficiently
1.04	mediated settlement l	Ited in only partial compliance with the "agreed" by the member complained of. In such clainant retains the right to proceed to the next ne PSOW which should be sufficient remedy.

2.00	RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
2.01	Providing a mechanism to end complaints will help to conserve resources.

3.00	CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED / CARRIED OUT
3.01	Any changes to the Local Resolution Procedure will need to be considered by the Constitution Committee and Council prior to adoption.

4.00	RISK MANAGEMENT
4.01	If a complaint is terminated by the Council the complainant retains the right to complain to the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales (PSOW). The

facts around the failed use of the LRP would be made known to the PSOW who could nevertheless decide to investigate or refer the matter back to the Council.

5.00	APPENDICES
5.01	None

6.00	LIST OF ACCESSIBLE BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS
6.01	Local Resolution Procedure
	Contact Officer: Gareth Owens, Monitoring Officer Telephone: 01352 702344 E-mail: gareth.legal@flintshire.gov.uk

7.00	GLOSSARY OF TERMS
7.01	Public Services Ombudsman for Wales – an independent body appointed to consider, amongst other things, alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct for Members.