

STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Friday, 25 January 2019

Minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held at Committee Room - 2nd
Floor West Wing, Guildhall on Friday, 25 January 2019 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Oliver Lodge (Chairman)
Ann Holmes (Deputy Chairman)
Caroline Addy
Judith Barnes
Alderman David Graves
Mark Greenburgh
Michael Hudson
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Dan Large
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Professor Michael Mainelli

In Attendance:

David Bradshaw
Mary Durcan

Officers:

Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Edward Wood	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Tracey Jansen	- Human Resources

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Chris Boden and Jeremy Simons.

Apologies for absence were also received from the Comptroller and City Solicitor - Michael Cogher.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

3.1 5 OCTOBER 2018

The public minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2018 were considered and approved as a correct record.

MATTERS ARISING

Co-opted Members and Declarations of Interests (page 5) – The Chairman reported that this matter had been followed up and that letters to those Co-

opted Members who had still not returned a declarations of interests form and to the Chairmen of the Committees/Sub-Committees on which they sat had been drafted by the Chairman and would be sent out imminently. The Chairman undertook to update the Committee further on this matter at their next meeting.

Dispensations Requests (page 7) – The Town Clerk reported that, in line with the Committee's views on this, the Town Clerk had informed Deborah Oliver (an external member of the Police Committee) that her request for a dispensation had been deferred so that information relating to the criteria met for the granting of a dispensation may be provided. The Town Clerk reported that, to date, Ms Oliver had not resubmitted a request.

In response to a question, the Town Clerk confirmed that a resolution was sent to the Policy and Resources Committee following the last meeting of the Standards Committee, requesting that they look at the issue of interests affecting the ability of an elected member with children at one of the City's schools to serve on that school's governing body with a view to possibly seeking a solution.

The Town Clerk reported that the Policy and Resources Committee concurred that this situation was unfortunate and contrary to practice at other independent schools or with parent governors more generally. The Committee tasked the Town Clerk with exploring a solution and producing a report for their future consideration. The report was expected to be considered by the Policy and Resources Committee in March 2018.

The Committee requested that this paper also be submitted to the next meeting of the Standards Committee for information, alongside the outcome decided upon by the Policy and Resources Committee.

Pastoral Care (page 9) – The Town Clerk reported that the issue of pastoral care/counselling available for those suffering stress as a result of accusations made relating to the work of the Corporation was set to be considered at the next meeting of the Member Privileges Sub Committee.

3.2 15 NOVEMBER 2018

The public minutes of the special, all Member, meeting held on 15 November 2018 were considered and approved as a correct record.

4. MINUTES OF SUB COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The public minutes of the Assessment Sub (Standards) Committee held on 27 November 2018 were received.

5. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk setting out updates on a number of outstanding actions.

Code of Conduct

The Chairman requested that the Town Clerk check what progress had been made around ease of access to the Code of Conduct and related documents on

the City's website with PRED following a resolution from this Committee on the matter back in June 2018. He went on to express concern at the fact that he had not seen any improvement on this to date. He questioned why, for example, the Code was not listed within the CoL website index for ease of access and requested a response from PRED as soon as possible as to when this would be rectified.

Other Members shared this concern, with many stating that the only way they had been able to find the Code of Conduct previously had been via a google search.

Annual reminder to Members on updating registered interests

The Chairman reported that, regrettably, this matter had progressed slower than he had hoped. He reported that, following confirmation from the Comptroller and City Solicitor as to which Committees/Sub Committees were subject to the Code of Conduct, he had recently received and approved draft letters to be sent to all those Co-opted Members with registers of interest still outstanding. These letters would also be sent to the Chairmen of the relevant bodies on which these Co-opted Members currently served within the next few days.

The Chairman went on to clarify that the Comptroller and City Solicitor had confirmed the class of Co-opted Member to whom the criminal sanctions in the Localism Act 2011 applied. None of those who had failed to respond to date would fall within the category where a failure to register a disclosable pecuniary interest constituted a criminal offence. A failure to register applicable interests would still, however, be a breach of the Code of Conduct.

In response to questions, the Chairman stated that there could be several options available in the event of a continued failure to register interests. This might include considering whether their reappointment to their respective body was suitable going forward for example.

Dispensations Guidance for Chairmen

The Chairman reported that a memo to all Committee chairmen had been drafted regarding the importance of timely applications for dispensations which was due to be circulated imminently.

A Member suggested that this memo also be sent to Chairmen of all Sub/Consultative Committees.

The Chairman agreed with the suggestion and asked that the memo also be sent to all Members of the Standards Committee for information.

RECEIVED.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk asking Members to consider their terms of reference and that of their sub committees ahead of

submission of the White Paper to the Court of Common Council on 25 April 2019 as well as the frequency of future meetings.

The Chairman reminded Members that the Committees existing terms of reference had last been approved by the Court of Common Council in July 2018 to reflect the outcome of the review of Standards framework. This involved, in the main, the removal of the complaints appeal function.

The Chairman went on to highlight that one further drafting correction was proposed to paragraph (e) of the Dispensations Sub Committee. This paragraph would now read that each meeting would be chaired “by either the Chairman or *one of the two Deputy Chairmen* elected annually by the Standards Committee...”. It was the intention that the revised terms of reference for this sub committee come into effect from the implementation of the new dispensations policy and guidance.

The Committee went on to discuss their frequency of meetings. The meetings currently took place three times per annum, on a Friday morning with an 11am start time. The Chairman questioned whether there was a desire amongst members of the Committee to meet more frequently in future. The Deputy Chairman suggested a fourth meeting each year referring to the fact that all recent meetings of this Committee had lasted for longer than two hours which was not always productive given that some Members needed to leave the meeting at this point.

A Co-opted Member stated that the number of meetings associated with this Committee had increased significantly in recent years. He added that an additional meeting of the grand Committee each year would therefore be inconvenient, particularly for Co-opted Members, some of whom were in full time employment not necessarily based close to Guildhall.

Another Co-opted Member reflected on the fact that the Committee had had a number of contentious issues to deal with in recent months which had, unavoidably, impacted upon the length and number of meetings required. He agreed that, going forward, three meetings per annum were sufficient.

A Member suggested that a better approach would be for the Chairman to introduce some flexibility in terms of start time should there be a particularly long agenda for any future meeting.

RESOLVED – That:

- a) The terms of reference of the Committee be approved for submission to the Court of Common Council , as set out at Appendix 1;
- b) Members endorse the drafting correction to paragraph (e) of the Dispensations Sub (Standards) Committee terms of reference – the new terms of reference to come in to force at the implementation of the new dispensations policy and guidance;

- c) Members approve the frequency of the Committee's meetings remain at 3 per annum; and
- d) Members note the scheduled meeting dates for the remainder of 2019 and for 2020.

7. APPOINTMENT OF CO-OPTED MEMBER OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk relative to a recommendation of the Selection Panel in respect of appointment to the existing vacancy for a Co-opted Member of the Standards Committee.

The Chairman reported that the advertisement for a new Co-opted Member of the Standards Committee had generated a good deal of interest on this occasion. Three candidates had been shortlisted for interview by the Selection Panel and the Panel hoped that both this Committee and the Court of Common Council would be enthusiastic about their selected candidate.

The Chairman added that, whilst it was recommended that the initial term of office for the new Co-opted Member be for 2 years (in accordance with views put forward by the Standards Committee, in order to better regulate the terms of office of Co-opted Members) this would be renewable.

The Chairman clarified that, should this Committee and the Court of Common Council endorse the appointment, the selected candidate would become a member of the Standards Committee with immediate effect and that an induction with the Comptroller and City Solicitor would also be arranged at the earliest opportunity.

The Committee were unanimous in their endorsement of the appointment of the selected candidate.

A Co-opted Member went on to question whether there was a limit to the term of office for the Committee's three Independent Persons. He added that he felt that an indefinite appointment to this position seemed unwise.

A Member highlighted that the Committee's terms of reference stated that "none of the appointed shall serve on the Committee for more than eight years". He suggested that this would be a good guideline to also follow in terms of Independent Persons too.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor agreed that it would be a sensible suggestion for the Committee to look at this in more detail at a future meeting. The Chairman was content with this approach.

Another Co-opted Member questioned whether the Selection Panel included a Co-opted Member of the Standards Committee. The Chairman responded that the make-up of the Selection Panel was determined by the Court of Common Council and consisted of the Chief Commoner, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Standards Committee and the Chairman of the General

Purposes Committee of Aldermen. It was suggested that it would be beneficial to include a Co-opted Member on the Selection Panel in future. The Committee suggested that the Co-opted Member might be asked to be in attendance as opposed to forming part of the Panel itself as this would require reference back to the Court of Common Council.

RESOLVED – That, Members approve the recommended appointment for a Co-opted Member of the Standards Committee for an initial term of office of 2 years in order to better regulate the terms of office of Co-opted Members, and in accordance with views put forward by members of the Standards Committee.

8. **DISPENSATIONS - DRAFT POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

The Committee considered a late, separately circulated, joint report of the Town Clerk and Comptroller and City Solicitor setting out final details of the Working Party's draft future policy and guidance on dispensations, and revisions to the dispensation request application form.

The Chairman stated that he hoped that this matter could be concluded today following extensive discussion and consultation on the documents to date.

Members noted that the Dispensations Working Party had met early in the new year, following the meeting of the Court of Common Council in December 2018, to consider/note feedback. There had also been a number of Member workshops throughout December 2018 and the views expressed here and, subsequently on email, had also been noted. The latest version of the Policy, before Members today, had been circulated to Members of the Working Party.

The Chairman stressed that, whilst all feedback had been noted, it had not been possible to include suggestions that were incompatible with legislation.

The Committee were informed that, in the new version of the documentation, some material had now been included within the appendices in an attempt to make the documents more user friendly. There was now also a greater distinction between applications for dispensations under delegated authority and others which was highlighted at the beginning of the dispensations application form.

The documentation had undergone some significant redrafting following the steer provided by the December 2018 Court of Common Council meeting and the Committee felt that the final draft was a sufficient and adequate response to this. It was hoped that the Court would appreciate this.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor explained how the Court's request had subsequently been incorporated verbatim into the latest version of the documents; which, together with the new category of Delegated Dispensations, changed the emphasis of the policy.

The Chairman went on to highlight that meetings to determine dispensation applications would, in almost all cases, be heard in public and that any application received would therefore, normally, be published, even if it

contained special category personal data that was relevant to the application. Whilst this had always been the case this had now been made explicit.

The Chairman was commended on the work of the Working Party and there was general acceptance of the need to reach a consensus and compromise in all matters. It was stressed, however, that there had never been any intention to dilute Members' role as community representatives. The Working Party were hopeful that the final, amended document would be more agreeable to the Court of Common Council.

A Co-opted Member, who had also been a member of the Working Party stated that, whilst he found the paragraph relating to Speaking on general housing matters difficult personally, in that it went further than he was comfortable with, he was satisfied that the Working Party had given the matter very careful consideration and was therefore happy to agree this and the amended policy in general today.

A Member questioned the specific examples cited at paragraph 6) of Appendix 1 under the heading "When is a disclosable pecuniary interest engaged?". He argued that air quality may, for example, be a DPI if it was a factor in the consideration of a planning application near to a Members' property which would adversely affect air quality. He suggested that refuse, street cleaning and air quality be clearly categorised as City-wide matters; and that a caveat be included regarding relevant employment and contracts.

The Member went on to state that, whilst the flow-chart featured at Appendix 2 was a helpful guide, the second box re: DPI's should be split into its component parts to make it clear that consideration needed to be given to both registering a DPI and participation. It was also highlighted that the chart might more helpfully be titled 'Participation at Meetings' as opposed to 'Declaring Interests at Meetings'.

A Co-opted Member stated that he felt it was unhelpful to give examples which might be open to interpretation. The Comptroller and City Solicitor clarified that the Working Party/Officers had been pressed to give examples through the consultation process. He agreed, however, that the examples provided could be tightened up. There was a general agreement that examples were helpful, and the Chairman suggested that the final wording around this be delegated to the Comptroller and City Solicitor.

The Deputy Chairman stressed the challenges and tensions in resident members both maintaining selflessness and being able to represent their constituents. The small size of Wards meant a DPI was frequently engaged with resident members. Being elected as Independents meant it was not easy to pass an issue to another Ward member. Given this and other complicating factors, she stated that she felt that the draft presented to the Committee today was as good as compromise as could be achieved. She thanked the Comptroller and City Solicitor for his very substantial input throughout.

A Member commented on the application form and referred to the many objections received from Members of the Court regarding its length. He suggested that if the section titled 'Statutory Grounds' were to be placed directly after section 'A' the form for delegated authority applications would only be 2 pages long.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor reported that the Working Party had given a great deal of thought to the layout of the application form. He added that the section titled 'Statutory Grounds' needed to be completed for applications for both dispensations under delegated authority and from the Standards Committee. This section would therefore need to be repeated after both A. and B. if the layout were to be altered in the way suggested.

The Chairman asked that the instruction not to fill in or submit the remaining sections of the form if only applying for a dispensation that the Town Clerk is able to grant under delegated authority that featured directly after the section titled 'Statutory Grounds' be placed in red text to ensure that it stood out as much as possible. Beyond this, he stated that he was reluctant to redesign the application form further at this stage.

A suggestion of introducing two separate application forms – one for delegated authority dispensations and one for dispensations from the Standards Committee – was not supported by the Committee.

The Committee were informed that the new system would be carefully monitored with a post implementation review taking place after a year.

Given the number of previous refusals on the grounds of inadequate information provided within application forms, a Co-opted Member suggested that it would be helpful to recommend, within the guidance, that 'N/A' be entered in to any box that did not apply. This would make it clear that the applicant had read and considered the form in full. A Member suggested that a computer code could be used for the electronic form, so that boxes could not be skipped until completed.

The Chairman stated that he was keen that the guidance didn't give the impression that a substantive answer was necessarily required for every section given the feedback received to date and some other Members shared the concern that this might be perceived as overly bureaucratic. A Member referred to the serious consequences of non-compliance and therefore stressed that the application form should not be oversimplified and should contain clear warnings and guidance. A Co-opted Member agreed with this point and felt that elected Members should be able to cope with the application form in this format. It should be made explicit that the Comptroller and City Solicitor was available to advise in terms of any specific difficulties encountered.

Discussion continued and the following suggestions were made in respect of specific paragraphs:

- a) Para 3, Appendix 1 – ‘Application’ - it was suggested that there could be more elaboration in respect of ‘all of the City’s functions’ and whether this was a reference to both LA and Non-LA functions or just LA functions;
- b) Para 4, Appendix 1 – ‘Statement of General Policy’ - a Member questioned the interchangeable use of the words ‘authority’ and ‘discretion’ in relation to the Standards Committee;
- c) Para 5, Appendix 1 - ‘Statement of General Policy’ - a Member asked that the guidance make clear that this was the guiding principle which now underpinned the Policy within the final sentence of this paragraph;
- d) Para 6, Appendix 1 – ‘ Disclosable Pecuniary Interests’ - a Member suggested that the ‘other guidance’ referred to here be set out in terms of what this was and where it could be found;
- e) Para 15, Appendix 1 – ‘Comments on the Statutory Grounds’ – a Member asked that the wording be amended to eliminate the double negative to read ‘*The committee will consider whether granting a dispensation would be to the advantage of that group*’ which would be more in keeping with the statutory language around this;
- f) Para 16 (b), Appendix 1 – ‘Speaking on Planning and Licensing Applications’ – a Member referred to the fact that the Licensing and Planning regimes were totally different and questioned the intermingling of the two within the guidance. A Ward Member could speak against a Licensing applications, for example, regardless of whether or not they had submitted a representation in writing. This appeared to confuse the matter with Members speaking as members of the public. It was clarified that the rights of a Member to speak regarding planning/licensing applications were overridden if they had a DPI that was engaged. The Comptroller and City Solicitor clarified that the wording at paragraph 16(b) was a matter of policy and that the Working Party felt that this was a reasonable balance.

In response to a question as to whether general dispensations could be granted for the balance of a Members existing tenure, the Chairman stated that, depending on the application, this was possible. It was also within the Town Clerk’s delegated discretion. The Comptroller and City Solicitor explained that the maximum length of a dispensation was for four years, so Aldermen might have to reapply during their term of office. For delegated dispensations the period had been linked to the four yearly Ward elections for Common Councilmen, for reasons of administrative expediency.

A Member requested that, for transparency, a paragraph be included within the guidance detailing where members of this Committee/the Dispensations Sub Committee should go in terms of applying for their own dispensations. The Chairman stated that he believed that this was covered within the terms of reference of the Dispensations Sub Committee but that it may be helpful to cross reference here.

There was general agreement that the guidance should clearly state that any change of circumstances or acquisition of any further DPI would require a further application for dispensation even if a dispensation had previously been granted for the whole tenure of an elected Member's four-year term of office. The Comptroller and City Solicitor agreed to incorporate this.

In concluding, the Chairman thanked Officers and Members for their work on a very challenging project. There was general agreement that further consideration of the points raised today be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and the Comptroller and City Solicitor, to consider whether it would be both possible and practical to include them. Members agreed that the document did not require further deliberation thereafter as it had already been subject to extensive debate.

Members went on to discuss how best to launch the new policy and guidance. It was agreed that it should be reported to the Court of Common Council, for information, on 7 March 2019, following implementation on 1st March 2019. The report would make clear that the policy and guidance had been reconsidered in light of the feedback received and that substantial changes/concessions had been made as a result of this.

Members agreed that it should also be shared with the Chairman of Policy and Resources beforehand to seek her support for the documentation, in that it reflected the requests of the Court of Common Council adequately.

RESOLVED – That:

1. Authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Standards Committee, and the Comptroller and City Solicitor to approve the final text of the policy and guidance and the dispensation request application form, having considered the suggestions made at today's meeting;
2. The new Policy be implemented with effect from 1 March 2019.
3. A report be presented, for information, to the Court of Common Council on 7 March 2019 with the new policy and guidance and dispensation request application form appended.
4. The Policy and guidance and dispensation request application form be subject to a post implementation Review by the Standards Committee in March 2020.

9. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF DISPENSATIONS SUB COMMITTEE

The Committee proceeded to elect a Chairman of the Dispensations Sub Committee.

The Town Clerk clarified that all members of the Committee were eligible to stand and were informed that one expression of interest, from Caroline Addy, had been received to date. A statement in support of her candidature had been

submitted and circulated electronically to all prior to the meeting. This was also tabled.

RESOLVED – Being the only Member expressing a willingness to serve, Caroline Addy be appointed as Chairman of the Dispensations Sub Committee for the ensuing year.

10. **ELECTION OF DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF DISPENSATIONS SUB COMMITTEE**

The Committee proceeded to elect the Deputy Chairmen of the Dispensations Sub Committee.

The Town Clerk clarified that all members of the Committee were eligible to stand and that there were two positions to appoint to. The Committee were informed that one expression of interest, from Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark, had been received to date. A statement in support of his candidature had been submitted and circulated electronically to all prior to the meeting. This was also tabled.

Mark Greenburgh also expressed a willingness to serve.

RESOLVED – That, being the only Members expressing a willingness to serve, Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark and Mark Greenburgh be appointed as Deputy Chairmen of the Dispensations Sub Committee for the ensuing year.

11. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROTOCOL ON MEMBER/OFFICER RELATIONS**

The Committee considered a joint report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor and the Director of Corporate HR.

A Co-opted Member stated that he had had the benefit of looking at Codes of Conduct for employees for other Local Authorities, particularly around the matter of conflict of interests. He went on to question paragraph 11 of the Code and asked whether it was implying that, if an individual's interest were to be aligned with that of the City Corporation they would not be conflicted. He suggested that it should be made explicit that, if an Officer were to have a personal, pecuniary interest in any matter, they should not be able to exercise delegated authority in this matter. The Director of Corporate HR undertook to adjust the wording of the Code to adequately reflect this point and to highlight this to the Establishment Committee in their subsequent consideration of the document.

Another Co-opted Member questioned whether, under paragraph 23 of the Code, employees would be barred from lobbying Members on local issues should they also happen to be resident in the City. The Director of HR confirmed that this was not the intention. The Committee asked that it therefore be made clear that this was not an absolute prohibition.

The Chairman stated that both the Employee Code of Conduct and the Protocol of Officer/Member Relations were documents that were property of the Establishment Committee, however, this Committee also reviewed them

annually and made recommendations to the Establishment Committee as necessary on their content. The Establishment Committee then took forward to the Court of Common Council if any amendments were necessary.

The Director of HR undertook to highlight the changes requested by this Committee to the Establishment Committee as part of their consideration of the document.

RESOLVED – That Members:

- (a) Note the report;
- (b) Approve the Protocol on Member/Officer Relations, as modified by this Committee in May 2018, for endorsement by the Establishment Committee and onward approval by the Court of Common Council where necessary;
- (c) Subject to the inclusion of the points made above, approve the Employee Code of Conduct for endorsement by the Establishment Committee.

12. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT
Requests for Dispensation under the Localism Act 2011

At the Chairman's agreement, a late report of the Town Clerk regarding a Member requesting a dispensation to speak, and vote was tabled.

The Chairman gave Members a ten-minute recess to read the report and accompanying application.

The Deputy Chairman withdrew from the meeting for the consideration of this item.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Member had previously been granted a dispensation by the Dispensations Sub Committee to speak only on planning application 17/00770/FULL (former Richard Cloudesley School) at Planning and Transportation Committee on 26 March 2018 or subsequent meetings where the planning application is discussed. The Chairman clarified that the application was now being brought back to the Planning and Transportation Committee in relation to the discharge of a condition. The application before Members was to both speak and vote on this matter at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting on 29 January 2019 or subsequent meetings where this was to be discussed. He questioned whether the dispensation already granted to the Member in March 2018 was sufficient to cover this new request.

The Comptroller and City Solicitor stated that, he would have had some sympathy with this argument if it had been advanced by Ms Pearson. However, she had chosen to submit a fresh application and was presumably making a distinction between discussions around the original grant of planning permission and the discharge of conditions. The Standards Committee should generally assume that any dispensation sought was required in order to facilitate participation and determine the application on its merits.

The Chairman stated that he did, however, feel that the previous decision in March 2018 set a significant precedent. He also queried the status of the new dispensations policy and guidance. The Comptroller and City Solicitor explained that although this was not yet in force, it had been approved in principle by the Standards Committee and therefore it would be reasonable to take the contents of that document into account when reaching a decision.

The Committee went on to discuss the proximity of the Members' residence to the site in question. It was the view of the Committee that this would mean that Ms Pearson would be disproportionately affected versus a number of other residents on the same estate.

Members were content to follow the precedent set here and grant a dispensation for Ms Pearson to, again, speak only on the discharge of the condition at the 29 January meeting and any subsequent meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee at which that matter was discussed. It was generally accepted that it was important to allow her to do so in order to represent resident's views. The Committee were not, however, able to identify that there was sufficient justification for granting a dispensation for her to vote on this matter.

RESOLVED – That, Susan Pearson be granted a dispensation to speak only on the discharge of condition 5 of planning permission dated 19th July 2018 (planning reference 17/00770/FULL) for the redevelopment of the former site of Richard Cloudesley School for the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting on 29th January 2019 or subsequent meeting when the Planning Application is discussed.

14. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No.	Paragraph No(s).
15	3
16	2 & 5

15. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES OF SUB COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

The Deputy Chairman re-joined the meeting at this point.

The non-public minutes of the Assessment Sub (Standards) Committee held on 27 November 2018 were received.

16. **ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk providing Members with the details of decisions taken by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Standards Committee, since the Committee's last meeting in October 2018.

17. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions raised in the non-public session.

18. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There were no additional, urgent items of business for consideration in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 1.20 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
tel.no.: 020 7332 3414
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk