

PSOW Reference	Type of Council	Councillor	Complainant	Alleged breach	Outcome by stage		
					Gatekeeper	Investigation	Hearing
2023/00482	County	A	Public	It was alleged that the Member called the First Minister "Führer" on Facebook and this was a slur comparing the Labour party with the Nazi party. It is alleged that the Member's claim that he simply used the German word for leader was not credible.	PSOW did not investigate. The Member clearly identified himself on Facebook as a Councillor therefore the PSOW was satisfied that the Code of Conduct was engaged. The language used by the Member, calling the First Minister "Führer", is offensive and not language that the Ombudsman would condone. Given the context, the explanation that it was a simple translation of the word "leader" lacks credibility. It is likely that the language used is suggestive of a breach of paragraph 4(b) of the Code of Conduct. An investigation into this matter would not be in the public interest. It is not uncommon for elected members to say things about political opponents which others may consider to be rude or offensive. However, it is not the purpose of the Code to inhibit free speech and the robust expression of political differences.		
2023/02636	Town 2	C	Public	It was alleged that the Member was in breach of the requirement not to bully or harass any person by engaging in intimidating behaviour towards a staff member, when they questioned them on whether minutes that had been prepared, accurately reflected a Council meeting and in a separate incident at a meeting where he told them they were not to be trusted.	When assessing matters concerning Council Officers, it is necessary to consider if the allegations are supported by evidence that a member has gone beyond what might be regarded as reasonable challenge. The PSOW assessed the comments the Member is alleged to have made when questioning the meeting minutes and was not persuaded that what the Member is alleged to have said could be considered to have passed the threshold of reasonable challenge. Whilst the Member has made comments which could be considered offensive or rude to the staff member, they were not so serious that, even if a breach of the Code were proven, a sanction would be a proportionate interference with the Member's right to freedom of expression. The Complainant also alleged that the Member told the staff member that she was not to be trusted. The Ombudsman's Guidance to members on the Code states that harassment is repeated behaviour which upsets or annoys people. Bullying can be characterised as offensive, intimidating, malicious, insulting or humiliating behaviour, that may happen once or be part of a pattern of behaviour. Having considered the information provided, the PSOW not persuaded the Member's comment was so serious that it would be likely to amount to a breach of the Code of Conduct.		
2023/01712	County	D	Councillor	It was alleged that the Member behaved inappropriately during Council meetings, by making inappropriate gestures and shouting.	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence was not provided to substantiate the complaint. The conduct complained about does not meet the first stage of the test, as set out above, therefore, there is no need to consider the second stage of the test.		
2023/02892	Community 2	E	Councillor	It was alleged that the Member made disrespectful comments towards a member of the public in response to a speech made by the member of the public during a Community Council meeting. It was also alleged that the Member was corrupt, that they were a member of a clique of councillors who voted for each other and did not allow others to put suggestions forward. The Complainant said that they felt unsupported by the Community Council and that nothing was achieved by the Community Council because of the behaviour of the clique of councillors.	PSOW did not investigate. The matters complained about were unlikely to amount to a breach of the Code. It was alleged that the Member accused the member of the public of "waffling about nature" and suggested that they and others who supported them had brought the situation upon themselves. Whilst the Complainant may have been offended by the Member's comments, the PSOW did not consider that the Member's comments were sufficiently offensive, intimidating or insulting to amount to a breach of the Code. In relation to the allegation of corruption, no evidence was provided to substantiate the complaint.		
2023/03339	County	D	Public	It was alleged that the Member failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in a planning application that was considered by the Authority's Planning Committee in June 2023, and that they made inappropriate comments during the Planning Committee's consideration of the matter.	PSOW did not investigate. (1) The Complainant said that the Member was friends with the Director of the housing development company ("the Director"), who had submitted the planning application and that their friendship was public knowledge. A series of photographs and screenshots provided in support of the complaint showed that the Member had posted their thanks to the housing development company for its support on various local initiatives and events on more than one occasion. The Director was not named in any of the posts, and the PSOW not persuaded that they demonstrated a close personal relationship between the Member and the Director. The Complainant said that the Member had assisted the Director in marketing homes on behalf of the housing development company. However, the evidence provided in support of the complaint demonstrated that the Member had shared information about a housing scheme by a property management company. The PSOW did not consider that they demonstrated a close personal association between the Member and the Director as it is not uncommon for elected members to share information that may be of interest to their electorate on their		
2023/03774	County	F	Public	It was alleged that the Member had breached the Code of Conduct ("the Code") because they failed to give adequate advice to the complainant about action they should take regarding damage to his car caused by driving over a large pothole. The complainant also indicated they were unhappy that the Member had failed, as an official, to respond to his enquiries.	PSOW did not investigate. The Member did provide advice, as asked, and while the PSOW noted the complainant did not like the response, his follow up email to the Member contained language that could also be considered discourteous. If the Member decided not to respond further, because he had already shared the advice he was given, that is a matter for him, and he was under no obligation to respond further.		
2023/03046	Town 1	G	Public	It is alleged that the Councillor has failed to disclose matters to the relevant authorities despite that being part of their bail conditions, and that they have also broken their bail conditions by approaching their estranged spouse and their property. It is alleged that the Police are aware, and all incidents are due to be heard in court in August 2023.	Investigation concluded	The member was convicted of various criminal offences and was sentenced to a suspended prison term. As a consequence the members is disqualified from standing for public office for 5 years under election law. The code had been breached but no further action is required	
2023/00532	Community 1	B	Councillor	Breach of the Code relating to declarations of interest and not declaring a personal and prejudicial interest on a planning application.	Investigation concluded	The Councillor was found to have breached paragraphs 4(b) respect and 6(1) a disrepute of the code but no action needed to be taken in light of their acceptance that their behaviour was ill judged & poor, and apparent remorse.	
2023/06712	Community 1	H	Councillor	It was alleged that at a Community Council meeting in November 2023 a member of the Community Council made a statement which was threatening and appeared to be directed at other members and the Member had nodded in agreement. The Complainant also said there appeared to be an association between the Member, a local business which had a retrospective planning application before the Community Council and a private group on social media. The Complainant said the Member had been involved in setting up the Facebook Group which had organised community activities receiving donations for refreshments from the business. The Complainant said that when the retrospective planning application came before the Community Council for discussion in March 2023 no interests were declared, and the Member did not "recurse" [sic] himself despite being a member of Flintshire County Council's Planning Committee.	The PSOW did not investigate because there was no evidence as to the nature of the statement, why the statement appeared to be directed at other councillors nor of the link between the councillor, the FB group and the business. Councillors are able to consider planning applications at both community and county council. This is one of a series of 4 complaints (06712 - 06715) from the same councillor about other members of the community council.		
2023/06713	Community 1	I	Councillor	It was alleged that at a Community Council meeting in November 2023 a member of the Community Council made a statement which was threatening and appeared to be directed at other members and the Member had nodded in agreement. The Complainant also said there appeared to be an association between the Member, a local business which had a retrospective planning application before the Community Council and a private group on social media. The Complainant said the Member had been involved in setting up the Facebook Group which had organised community activities receiving donations for refreshments from the business. The member passed on an invitation from the business to tour its premises. The Complainant said that when the retrospective planning application came before the Community Council for discussion in March 2023 no interests were declared.	The PSOW did not investigate because there was no evidence as to the nature of the statement, why the statement appeared to be directed at other councillors nor of the link between the councillor, the FB group and the business. In addition, The information presented suggested that the business approached the Member with an invitation for the Community Council, which he then shared with the Clerk. That approach is not in itself suggestive of a personal interest but, following advice from the Clerk, and other member's responses, the Member subsequently advised the business that the Community Council would decline the invitation. This is one of a series of 4 complaints (06712 - 06715) from the same councillor about other members of the community council.		
2023/06714	Community 1	J	Councillor	It was alleged that at a Community Council meeting in November 2023 a member of the Community Council made a statement which was threatening and appeared to be directed at other members and the Member had nodded in agreement. The Complainant also said there appeared to be an association between the Member, a local business which had a retrospective planning application before the Community Council and a private group on social media. The Complainant said the Member had been involved in setting up the Facebook Group which had organised community activities receiving donations for refreshments from the business. The Complainant said that when the retrospective planning application came before the Community Council for discussion in March 2023 no interests were declared.	The PSOW did not investigate because there was no evidence as to the nature of the statement, why the statement appeared to be directed at other councillors nor of the link between the councillor, the FB group and the business. This is one of a series of 4 complaints (06712 - 06715) from the same councillor about other members of the community council.		

2023/06715	Community 1	K	Councillor	It was alleged that at a Community Council meeting in November 2023 a member of the Community Council made a statement which was threatening and appeared to be directed at other members and the Member had nodded in agreement. The Complainant also said there appeared to be an association between the Member, a local business which had a retrospective planning application before the Community Council and a private group on social media. The Complainant said the Member had been involved in setting up the Facebook Group which had organised community activities receiving donations for refreshments from the business. The Complainant said that when the retrospective planning application came before the Community Council for discussion in March 2023 no interests were declared. The Complainant also said the business was aware of private discussions within the Council and he alleged that the member had disclosed confidential information. In addition, the Complainant	The PSOW did not investigate because there was no evidence as to the nature of the statement, why the statement appeared to directed at other councillors nor of the link between the councillor, the FB group and the business. In addition, With regard to the exchange on FB there was no evidence to suggest what social media platform or group this was on or what capacity the Member was acting in at the time, and the PSOW did not consider that the information presented suggested a close personal association. In respect of the disclosure of private information, no evidence was presented to support this. This is one of a series of 4 complaints (06712 - 06715) from the same councillor about other members of the community council.		
2023/07069	Community 1	I	Councillor	It was alleged that the Member made a statement at a Community Council meeting in November 2023 which was designed to intimidate, threaten and stifle debate. The Complainant said the statement was aimed at her, and if the Member had a legitimate reason to question the integrity of a Member, they should do this through the appropriate procedure. The Complainant also said the Member had misled her and the Clerk about his reason for not attending a Local Resolution meeting about the matter and his behaviour lacked respect.	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence had not been provided to substantiate the complaint, Whilst the Complainant said the statement appeared to be aimed at her, no evidence was presented to support this or to indicate what the statement was about. The PSOW thought the statement could be reasonably said to fall within the realms of freedom of expression . This is one of a series of four complaints (07069 - 07072) from the same councillor. The complaints relate to the same meeting as complaints 06712 - 06715.		
2023/07070	Community 1	H	Councillor	It was alleged that at a Community Council meeting in November 2023, the Accused Member declared an interest in a Policing item and another Member then made a statement which was designed to intimidate, threaten and stifle debate. The Complainant said the statement was aimed at her, and if the Accused Member had a legitimate reason to question the integrity of a member, they should do this through the appropriate procedure. The Complainant also said she had agreed to seek Local Resolution but had had no communication as to why the Accused Member did not wish to engage in the process, and his behaviour lacked respect.	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence had not been provided to substantiate the complaint, Whilst the Complainant said the statement appeared to be aimed at her, no evidence was presented to support this or to indicate what the statement was about. The PSOW thought the statement could be reasonably said to fall within the realms of freedom of expression . This is one of a series of four complaints (07069 - 07072) from the same councillor. The complaints relate to the same meeting as complaints 06712 - 06715.		
2023/07071	Community 1	K	Councillor	see 2023/07070	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence had not been provided to substantiate the complaint, Whilst the Complainant said the statement appeared to be aimed at her, no evidence was presented to support this or to indicate what the statement was about. The PSOW thought the statement could be reasonably said to fall within the realms of freedom of expression . This is one of a series of four complaints (07069 - 07072) from the same councillor. The complaints relate to the same meeting as complaints 06712 - 06715.		
2023/07072	Community 1	J	Councillor	see 2023/07070	PSOW did not investigate. Evidence had not been provided to substantiate the complaint, Whilst the Complainant said the statement appeared to be aimed at her, no evidence was presented to support this or to indicate what the statement was about. The PSOW thought the statement could be reasonably said to fall within the realms of freedom of expression . This is one of a series of four complaints (07069 - 07072) from the same councillor. The complaints relate to the same meeting as complaints 06712 - 06715.		
2023/07136	Community 1	I	Councillor	It was alleged that at a community council meeting in November 2023, the Member showed bullying and threatening behaviour to members of the Community Council and breached the Code of Conduct ("the Code"). The Complainant said that if the Member had a legitimate complaint about any member of the Community Council, he should have raised it outside of the meeting using the complaints procedure. The Complainant also said that the Member made no attempt to agree to a meeting via the Local Resolution policy.	PSOW did not investigate - whilst the Complainant said the Member had shown bullying and threatening behaviour to members of the Community Council, the context and nature of the behaviour, what was said, to whom and when was not provided. The PSOW considered the available draft minutes of the meeting, and it is recorded that in relation to a policing matter, the Member said comments had been made on social media against himself and he had sought legal advice, however no details or explanation of what he was referring to were given. The PSOW did not consider the nature of the Member's recorded comments to be unreasonable. The comments referred to could be reasonably said to fall within the realms of freedom of expression and whilst they may have caused offence to the Complainant or others, the PSOW did not consider they are extreme or that the Member's conduct could amount to a breach of the Code. The Ombudsman generally regards this sort of behaviour in a council meeting as a matter for the Chair of that meeting to address. This complaint is made by a 3rd councillor and relates to the same meeting as complaints 06712 - 06715.		
2023/07129	County	L	Public	During Storm Babet the councillor is alleged to have abused their power to secure sandbags for their family when no one else was given sandbags.	Under investigation		
2023/07130	Town 3	L	Public	As above - the councillor is dual hatted.	Under investigation		
2023/09254	Town 4	M	Public	It is alleged that the Councillor has breached the code of conduct and abused their position as a councillor.	Under investigation		

## 2024-25 PSOW

PSOW Reference	Type of Council	Councillor	Complainant	Alleged breach	Outcome by stage		
					Gatekeeper	Investigation	Hearing
2023/09367	County	A	Councillor	Alleged breaches of paragraphs 6(1)(a) (disrepute), 7a (securing improper advantage for self or others) and 9(b) (avoid accepting gifts +/- or hospitality that appear to place one under improper obligation)		PSOW found there was a very clear appearance that acceptance of the offer of a donation from a local business person might place councillors under an improper obligation, in other words that the business person may have been expecting something improper in return for a generous financial donation. The offer was rejected so the code was not breached. Member recommended to undertake further training	
2023/07895	County	B	Officer	Alleged breaches of paragraphs 4(b) respect, 6(1)(a) disrepute, 8(a) decision making on the merits and 11 + 14 disclosure of interests	Under Investigation		
2023/10251	County	C	Public	It was alleged that the Member used aggressive and threatening language when corresponding with the Complainant's legal representative about a planning application. It was also alleged that the Member took 8 months to respond to a query, and shared confidential information.	The member's response lacked courtesy but wasn't disrespectful. No evidence was provided by the complainant to support the alleged breach of confidence.		
2023/10322	County	D	Public	The Complainant said the Member: Refused to meet to discuss the application even though they are his constituent. Presented false information to a Community Council meeting about the planning application and used a mocking and condescending tone in discussing it, tried to sway the opinion of the Council's Planning Committee during a site visit about the planning application and spoke against the planning application at a council meeting and claimed he had been unable to view the site.	A member is entitled to choose whether or not to meet a resident. There comments at the Planning Committee were reasonable. No evidence was supplied by the complainant in relation to the other allegations and so they were not considered		
2024/01189	Community 1	E	Public	It was alleged that the Member had breached the Code of Conduct ("the Code") regarding a parking matter. The Complainant said that when they parked their vehicle on a road near the Member's driveway, the Member subsequently parked 2 of his own vehicles so close to the Complainant's vehicle that they were blocked into a tight space and needed help to move their car. The Complainant said the Member's conduct was deliberate, selfish, chauvinistic and malicious and when they got home, they reported the matter to the Police. The Complainant also said that the Member's correspondence with the Council's Monitoring Officer about the incident contained "lies and hubris".	PSOW did not investigate - the cllr's actions appeared to be in a private capacity and of insufficient gravity to amount to bringing the office of councillor into disrepute		
2024/00325	Community 2	F	Public	The member had posted a message on Facebook saying that the President Jo Biden was making a mistake allowing Islam in to the country.	The member's comment was capable of causing offence. It was not sufficiently extreme to justify interfering with the member's freedom of political speech under Article 10 freedom of political expression.		
2024/01984	County	G	Public	Cllr alleged to have revealed complainant's personal data to a neighbour, resulting in abuse.	Under investigation		
2024/01739	Community	H	Public	Cllr alleged to have used abusive language towards the complainant in the pub.	The council was acting in a private capacity and not on council business. The behaviour was "a fleeting outburst" that would not affect confidence in their role as a councillor.		
2024/04339	Community 2	F	Public	It was alleged that the Member had made racist posts on Facebook. The complainant said the Member had assumed that a person of colour was an illegal immigrant and that they incited violence.	PSOW did not investigate		
2024/04339	Community 2	F	Public	Cllr posted comment on FB the Member assuming that a person of colour was an illegal immigrant and that he incited violence	PSOW did not investigate because the offending posts were not supplied. The complaint therefore failed the stage 1 test		
2024/05369	Community 2	F	Public	It was alleged that the Member made inappropriate comments on Facebook, which were "at best misguided and at worst racist and intended to stir hatred."	PSOW did not investigate. The PSOW considered that (given the riots) the Member's comments could be considered to be recklessly made with no knowledge of the immigration status of the person in the article. However, the Member did not appear to encourage any explicit action to be taken against any specific individual, or against immigrants more generally. While he asked people to contact their MP to express negative views about immigration, this was not targeted at anyone in particular, and in itself is not a violent or aggressive act.		
2024/06270	County	I	Public	It was alleged that the member had made unsubstantiated comments about their planning application and used insulting and inappropriate language. The Complainant also alleged that the Member failed to respond to correspondence or meet with them to discuss the application	The members' language at committee did not breach what was permitted under Article 10 freedom of political expression. Whilst the Complainant's disappointment that the Member objected to their application and did not respond to correspondence or seek their views on the application is noted, this is not in itself evidence of a breach of the Code.		
2024/06271	County	J	Public	It was alleged that the member had made unsubstantiated comments about their planning application and used insulting and inappropriate language. The Complainant also alleged that the Member failed to respond to correspondence or meet with them to discuss the application	The members' language at committee did not breach what was permitted under Article 10 freedom of political expression. Whilst the Complainant's disappointment that the Member objected to their application and did not respond to correspondence or seek their views on the application is noted, this is not in itself evidence of a breach of the Code.		
2024/05794	Town 1	k	Public	It was alleged that the member had brought their office into disrepute by leaving 3 sacks of building rubble on the pavement outside a property which they owned thereby preventing the pavement being resurfaced	PSOW had not seen any evidence to suggest a link to political matters or the Member's role or authority, and as such was not persuaded the evidence is suggestive of, or capable of amounting to, a breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) or 7(a) of the Code		