

# Pecyn Dogfennau



Wendy Walters  
Prif Weithredwr,  
Chief Executive,  
Neuadd y Sir, Caerfyrddin. SA31 1JP  
County Hall, Carmarthen. SA31 1JP

DYDD IAU, 28 TACHWEDD 2019

## AT: HOLL AELODAU'R PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

YR WYF DRWY HYN YN EICH GALW I FNYNCHU CYFARFOD O'R **PWYLLGOR SAFONAU** A GYNHELIR YN Y **SIAMBR, NEUADD Y SIR, CAERFYRDDIN, SA31 1JP. AM 10.00 YB, DYDD GWENER, 6<sup>ED</sup> RHAGFYR, 2019** ER MWYN CYFLAWNI'R MATERION A AMLINELLIR AR YR AGENDA ATODEDIG.

*Wendy Walters*

**PRIF WEITHREDWR**



**AILGYLCHWCH OS GWELWCH YN DDA**

Swyddog Democrataidd:	Janine Owen
Ffôn (llinell uniongyrchol):	01267 224030
E-bost:	JanineOwen@sirgar.gov.uk
Cyf:	AD016-001



**EICH CYNGOR arleinamdani**

[www.sirgar.llyw.cymru](http://www.sirgar.llyw.cymru)

**YOUR COUNCIL doitonline**

[www.carmarthenshire.gov.wales](http://www.carmarthenshire.gov.wales)

# PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

## AELODAETH: 9 AELOD

### Aelodau Annibynnol (5)

1. Mrs Mary Dodd Is-Cadeirydd y Pwyllgor
2. Mrs Daphne Evans
3. Mrs Julie James
4. Mr M. Andre Morgan Cadeirydd y Pwyllgor
5. Mr Alun Williams

### Aelod Pwyllgor Cymunedol (1)

1. Cynghorydd Tref Philip Rogers

### Aelodau Etholedig y Cyngor Sir (3)

1. Y Cynghorydd Jeanette Gilasbey
2. Y Cynghorydd Rob James
3. Y Cynghorydd Gareth Thomas

# AGENDA

1. YMDDIHEURIADAU AM ABSENOLDEB
2. DATGAN BUDDIANNAU PERSONOL
3. LOFNODI YN GOFNOD CYWIR COFNODION CYFARFODYDD Y PWYLLGOR A GYNHALIWYD AR 18 TACHWEDD 2019 5 - 6
4. CAIS AM OLLYNGIAD GAN Y CYNGHORYDD CAROL DYER 7 - 16
5. ADRODDIAD BLYNYDDOL Y PWYLLGOR SAFONAU 2018/2019 17 - 26
6. E-DDYSGU YNGHYLCH DATGELU CAMARFER 27 - 50
7. CYDYMFFURFIO Â'R CÔD YMDDYGIAD GAN GYNGHORWYR TREF A CHYNGHORWYR CYMUNED 51 - 62
8. UNRHYW FATER ARALL Y GALL Y CADEIRYDD OHERWYDD AMGYLCHIADAU ARBENNIG, BENDERFYNU EI YSTYRIED YN FATER BRYD YN UNOL AG ADRAN 100B(4)(B) DEDDF LLYWODRAETH LEOL 1972

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

## PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

Dydd Llun, 18 Tachwedd 2019

**YN BRESENNOL:** Y Cyngorydd M. Dodd (Cadeirydd)

**Aelodau Annibynnol:**

D. Evans, J. James ac A. Williams

**Aelod Cymunedol:**

Y Cyngorydd Tref P. Rogers

**Y Cynghorwyr:**

S.J.G. Gilasbey, R. James and G.B. Thomas

**Yr oedd y swyddogion canlynol yn gwasanaethu yn y cyfarfod:**

L.R. Jones, Pennaeth Gweinyddiaeth a'r Gyfraith

E. Bryer, Swyddog Gwasanaethau Democrataidd

**Siambr, Neuadd y Sir, Caerfyrddin. SA31 1JP. - 2.00 yp - 2.35 yp**

**1. YMDDIHEURIADAU AM ABSENOLDEB.**

Cafwyd ymddiheuriad am absenoldeb gan Mr Andre Morgan (Cadeirydd).

**2. DATGAN BUDDIANNAU PERSONOL.**

Ni chafwyd dim datganiadau o fuddiant personol.

**3. LOFNODI YN GOFNOD CYWIR COFNODION CYFARFODYDD Y PWYLLGOR A GYNHALIWDYD AR:**

**3.1. 13EG MEDI, 2019**

**PENDERFYNWYD YN UNFRYDOL** lofnodi cofnodion y cyfarfod a gynhaliwyd ar 13 Medi 2019 i nodi eu bod yn gywir.

**3.2. 26AIN MEDI, 2019**

**PENDERFYNWYD YN UNFRYDOL** lofnodi cofnodion y cyfarfod a gynhaliwyd ar 26 Medi 2019, gan eu bod yn gywir, yn amodol ar ddileu teitl Cyngorydd o enw M. Dodd (Cadeirydd).

**4. CAIS AM OLLYNGIAD GAN Y CYNGHORYDD MICHAEL THEODOULOU**

Bu'r Pwyllgor yn ystyried cais a gyflwynwyd gan y Cyngorydd Michael Theodoulou o Gyngor Tref Pen-bre a Phorth Tywyn, am ollyngiad o dan ddarpariaethau'r Reoliadau Pwyllgorau Safonau (Caniatáu Gollyngiadau) (Cymru) i siarad yn unig am ei waith gyda CBSA Ltd a phartneriaeth bosibl rhwng y cyngor a'r cwmni hwn i geisio am gyllid grant gan y Gronfa Newid yn yr Hinsawdd.

Dywedwyd bod y cais am ollyngiad wedi'i gyflwyno oherwydd bod gan y Cynghorydd Theodoulou fuddiant personol yn rhinwedd paragraff 10(2)(a) (i) o'r Côt Ymddygiad gan fod y mater yn ymwneud â busnes a gynhelir gan y Cynghorydd, neu'n debygol o effeithio ar y busnes hwnnw.

Roedd buddiant y Cynghorydd Theodoulou hefyd yn rhagfarnol, gan y byddai aelod o'r cyhoedd, o wybod y ffeithiau perthnasol, yn ystyried yn rhesymol fod y buddiant hwn mor sylweddol fel ei fod yn debygol o amharu ar farn y Cynghorydd ynghylch budd y cyhoedd.

Gan hynny, roedd y Cynghorydd Theodoulou wedi gofyn am ollyngiad o dan Reoliadau Pwyllgorau Safonau (Caniatáu Gollyngiadau) (Cymru) 2011.

Dywedodd y Pennaeth Gweinyddiaeth a'r Gyfraith wrth y Pwyllgor y dylai, wrth ystyried y cais, nodi mai paragraffau 2 (d) a 2 (f) oedd y rhesymau mwyaf priodol pe byddai'r Pwyllgor am gymeradwyo'r cais i siarad yn unig.

Yn dilyn trafodaeth fanwl

**PENDERFYNWYD gwrthod y cais a gyflwynwyd gan y Cynghorydd Michael Theodoulou am ollyngiad i siarad yng nghyfarfodydd Cyngor Tref Pen-bre a Phorth Tywyn o ran materion mewn perthynas â phartneriaeth bosibl rhwng CBSA Ltd a'r Cyngor.**

**5. UNRHYW FATER ARALL Y GALL Y CADEIRYDD OHERWYDD AMGYLCHIADAU ARBENNIG, BENDERFYNU EI YSTYRIED YN FATER BRYD YN UNOL AG ADRAN 100B(4)(B) DEDDF LLYWODRAETH LEOL 1972**

Nid oedd dim materion brys i'w trafod.

---

**CADEIRYDD**

---

**DYDDIAD**

## Y PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

6 RHAGFYR 2019

**CAIS AM OLLYNGIAD GAN Y  
CYNGHORYDD CAROL DYER**

**Yr argymhellion / penderfyniadau allweddol sydd eu hangen:**

Ystyried a phenderfynu ar y cais

**Y rhesymau:**

Mae cynnwys yr adroddiad hwn yn rhan o faes gorchwyl y Pwyllgor.

Argymhellion / Sylwadau'r Pwyllgor Craffu:

Amherthnasol

Angen i'r Bwrdd Gweithredol wneud penderfyniad NAC OES

Angen i'r Cyngor wneud penderfyniad NAC OES

**YR AELOD O'R BWRDD GWEITHREDOL SY'N GYFRIFOL AM Y PORTFFOLIO:-  
Y Cyngorydd E Dole (Arweinydd)**

Y Gyfarwyddiaeth

Y Prif Weithredwr

Enw Pennaeth y Gwasanaeth:

Linda Rees-Jones

Awdur yr Adroddiad:

Robert Edgecombe

Swyddi:

Pennaeth Gweinyddiaeth a'r  
Gyfraith

Rheolwr Dros Dro y  
Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol

Rhifau ffôn:

01267 224018

Cyfeiriadau E-bost:

rjedgeco@sirgar.gov.uk.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**STANDARDS COMMITTEE**  
**6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2019**

**APPLICATION FOR DISPENSATION BY**  
**COUNCILLOR CAROL DYER**

An application has been received from Community Councillor Carol Dyer of Myddfai Community Council for a further dispensation to speak and vote in respect of Menter Bro Dinefwr (MBD) and Y Llofwr newspaper.

Cllr Dyer was previously granted a dispensation to speak only in respect of these interests on the 7th December 2018. Cllr Dyer has made use of this dispensation to participate in council business relating to MBD and the newspaper on one occasion in the last 12 months.

Councillor Dyer would have a personal interest in any council business relating to or likely to affect MBD or the newspaper by virtue of paragraph 10(2)(a)(ix)(ee) of the members code of conduct as she is a voluntary director of the organisation.

This personal interest would also be prejudicial as a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard the interest as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Councillor's judgement of the public interest.

Councillor Dyer has submitted his application on the basis of two grounds set out in the Standards Committees (Grant of Dispensations)(Wales) regulations 2011 (as amended) namely;

1. That the nature of the member's interest is such that the member's participation in the business to which the interest relates would not damage public confidence in the conduct of the relevant authority's business.
2. That the business in question relates to the finances of a voluntary organisation of whose management committee the councillor is a member AND that he has no other interest.(A dispensation granted under this ground cannot extend to allowing the member to vote)

If the committee is minded to grant Councillor Dyer a dispensation in respect of this interest it has absolute discretion as to the duration of that dispensation.

**ATTACHMENTS?**

**COUNCILLOR CAROL DYERS APPLICATION FOR DISPENSATION**



## IMPLICATIONS

I confirm that other than those implications which have been agreed with the appropriate Directors / Heads of Service and are referred to in detail below, there are no other implications associated with this report :

Signed: Linda Rees-Jones

Head of Administration and Law

Policy, Crime & Disorder and Equalities	Legal	Finance	ICT	Risk Management Issues	Staffing Implications	Physical Assets
<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>

## CONSULTATIONS

I confirm that the appropriate consultations have taken in place and the outcomes are as detailed below

Signed: Linda Rees-Jones

Head of Administration and Law

1. **Scrutiny Committee**- Not applicable
2. **Local Member(s)** - Not applicable
3. **Community / Town Council** - Not applicable
4. **Relevant Partners** - Not applicable
5. **Staff Side Representatives and other Organisations** - *Not applicable*

### Section 100D Local Government Act, 1972 – Access to Information

List of Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

**THESE ARE DETAILED BELOW**

Title of Document	File Ref No.	Locations that the papers are available for public inspection
Legal file	DPSC-173	Legal Services, County Hall

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

**CAIS I'R PWYLLGOR SAFONAU  
AM OLLYNGIAD**

Nodwch fod yn RHAID llenwi pob adran. Cyfeiriwch at y Nodiadau Cyfarwyddyd atodedig wrth lenwi'r ffurflen hon.

**1. EICH MANYLION**

Eich enw llawn: Carol Williams Dyer

Enw eich Cyngor: Cyngor Cymuned Myddfai

Eich cyfeiriad a'ch côd post: Penroc, Heol Llangadog, Llanymddyfri, SA20 0DZ

Rhif(au) ffôn: 01550720956/ 07969684418

Cyfeiriad e-bost: carol.dyer@outlook.com

**2. MANYLION AM EICH BUDDIANT**

Beth yw'r mater o dan ystyriaeth?

Materion yn ymwneud â Menter Bro Dinefwr gan gynnwys materion ynglyn a'r Lloffwr

Beth yw eich buddiant yn y mater uchod?

Cyfarwyddwr - gwirfoddol

Pryd fydd y mater uchod yn cael ei ystyried?

Ta pryd fydd rhywbeth yn ymwneud a MBD yn codi o flaen y cyngor

A ydych yn gwneud cais am ollyngiad i:

Siarad yn unig:

Siarad a phleidleisio:

Gwneud sylwadau  
Ysgrifenedig

Arfer Pwerau  
Gweithrediaeth

### 3. RHESYMAU DROS OLLYNGIAD

Mae rheoliadau a wnaed gan Gynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru yn pennu'r amgylchiadau lle gall y Pwyllgor Safonau ganiatáu gollyngiad. Ceir crynodeb o'r rhesymau dros ganiatáu gollyngiad isod ac maent wedi'u nodi'n llawn yn y nodiadau cyfarwyddyd atodedig. Am ba un o'r rhesymau canlynol ydych chi'n credu y dylid caniatáu gollyngiad yn yr achos hwn? Ticiwch y blwch/blychau priodol.

• mae buddiant gan o leiaf hanner yr aelodau sy'n ystyried y busnes	<input type="checkbox"/>
• byddai fy anallu i gymryd rhan yn newid cydbwysedd gwleidyddol y cyfarfod i raddau a fyddai'n debygol o effeithio ar y canlyniad;	<input type="checkbox"/>
• ni fyddai'r ffaith fy mod yn cymryd rhan yn niweidio hyder y cyhoedd	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• mae'r buddiant yn gyffredin i mi ac i gyfran arwyddocaol o'r cyhoedd;	<input type="checkbox"/>
• mae cyfiawnhad i mi gymryd rhan yn y busnes oherwydd fy rôl neu arbenigedd penodol;	<input type="checkbox"/>
• bydd y busnes yn cael ei ystyried gan bwyllgor trosolygu a chraffu ac nid yw fy muddiant yn fuddiant ariannol;	<input type="checkbox"/>
• mae'r busnes yn ymwneud â materion ariannol neu eiddo corff gwirfoddol yr wyf yn aelod o'i bwyllgor neu ei fwrdd rheoli ac nid oes gennyf unrhyw fuddiant arall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• mae'n briodol gwneud hynny yn yr holl amgylchiadau lle nad yw'n bosibl fel arall gwneud addasiadau rhesymol i ddarparu ar gyfer anabledd person	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 4. GWYBODAETH I GEFNOGI EICH CAIS

Nodwch isod y rhesymau pam rydych yn credu y dylai'r Pwyllgor Safonau ganiatáu gollyngiad yn yr achos hwn:

**(Sylwch, os na fyddwch yn llenwi'r adran hon bydd y ffurflen gais yn cael ei dychwelyd atoch)**

Mae Menter Bro Dinefwr yn un o dair Menter iaith yn Sir Gar. Dyma fraslun wedi ei lunio gen i o ddyletswyddau a phwrpas cyfarwyddwr.

Sefydlwyd Menter Bro Dinefwr yn 1999 gydag un aelod o staff a throsiant o tua £30k, erbyn heddiw mae'r Fenter yn cyflogi saith aelod o staff ac mae'r trosiant wedi cynyddu i bron i £700k. Mae arian craidd y Fenter yn cael ei ddarparu gan Lywodraeth Cymru a Chyngor Sir Gâr. Unodd y Fenter gyda Menter Dyffryn Aman yn 2007 yn sgil ail-strwythuro'r Mentrau yn y sir.

Nod Menter Bro Dinefwr yw cefnogi datblygiad yr iaith Gymraeg a chyfrannu at adfywiad cymunedol ac economaidd i greu cymunedau cynaliadwy, naturiol ddwyieithog a llewyrchus. Slogan y Fenter yw 'Cymuned • Iaith • Economi' ac mae'n cydblethu drwy holl waith y Fenter. Rydym bellach yn canolbwyntio ar chwe maes penodol fel a ganlyn:

- Teuluoedd
- Plant a Phobl Ifanc
- Ysgol ac Addysg
- Y Gymuned
- Gwaith, Iaith a'r Economi
- Hyrwyddo a Marchnata

Mae'r pwyntiau isod ymhlith dyletswyddau cyffredinol statudol Cyfarwyddwyr:

1. Sicrhau bod y sefydliad yn cydymffurfio â'i ddogfen llywodraethu, cyfraith cwmnïau ac unrhyw ddeddfwriaeth neu reoliadau perthnasol eraill.
2. Sicrhau bod y sefydliad yn dilyn ei amcanion fel y'u diffinnir yn ei ddogfen lywodraethu.
3. Sicrhau bod y sefydliad yn defnyddio ei adnoddau i ddilyn ei amcanion yn unig.
4. Cyfrannu'n weithgar i rôl bwrdd y Cyfarwyddwyr wrth roi cyfeiriad strategol cadarn i'r sefydliad, gosod polisi cyffredinol, diffinio nodau a gosod targedau a gwerthuso perfformiad yn unol â'r targedau y cytunir arnynt.
5. Diogelu enw da a gwerthoedd y sefydliad.
6. Sicrhau y gweinyddir y sefydliad yn effeithiol ac yn effeithlon.
7. Sicrhau sefydlogrwydd ariannol y sefydliad.
8. Gwarchod a rheoli eiddo'r sefydliad a sicrhau y buddsoddir yr arian yn briodol.
9. Penodi'r prif swyddog gweithredol a monitro ei berfformiad.
10. Rôl wirfoddol, ddi-dâl yw hon.

*(Os bydd angen gallwch ddefnyddio dalen ar wahân)*

Cadarnhaf fod y wybodaeth a roddir ar y ffurflen hon yn wir hyd eithaf fy ngwybodaeth. Rwy'n cytuno y gall y cais hwn a'r holl wybodaeth a gynhwysir ynddo ffurfio rhan o adroddiad cyhoeddus i'r Pwyllgor Safonau. Rwy'n gwneud cais am ollyngiad mewn perthynas â'r mater uchod.

Llofnod: C W Dyer

Dyddiad: 21/11/2019

Dylech ddychwelyd y ffurflen hon at y Swyddog Monitro, Adran y Prif Weithredwr, Cyngor Sir Caerfyrddin, Neuadd y Sir, Caerfyrddin, SA31 1JP.

## Nodiadau Cyfarwyddyd

- (1) Dylech ddarllen y Côd Ymddygiad a phenderfynu pa un o'r paragraffau sydd fwyaf priodol yn eich achos chi. Ceir manylion cryno am y paragraffau perthnasol yn y tabl isod. Os nad ydych yn sicr, cysylltwch â'r Swyddog Monitro i gael cyngor.

Para.	Y math o fuddiant personol	
10(2)(a)	<p>Busnes y Cyngor sy'n ymwneud â'r canlynol, neu'n debygol o effeithio ar y canlynol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eich cyflogaeth neu'ch busnes</li> <li>• eich cyflogwr, busnes neu'ch cwmni</li> <li>• contract a wnaed rhwng y Cyngor a chi</li> <li>• unrhyw dir, prydles neu drwydded y mae gennych fuddiant ynddynt</li> <li>• corff cyhoeddus neu gymdeithas arall yr ydych yn aelod ohonynt neu lle'r ydych yn dal swydd reolaeth gyffredinol</li> </ul>	
10(2)(c)	<p>Busnes y Cyngor sy'n effeithio eich lles neu'ch sefyllfa ariannol, neu les, sefyllfa ariannol neu fuddiannau eraill person yr ydych yn cyd-fyw ag ef/hi neu y mae gennych gysylltiad personol agos ag ef/hi</p>	
13	<p>Busnes y Cyngor sy'n cael ei ystyried gan Bwyllgor Trosolygu a Chraffu ac sy'n ymwneud â phenderfyniad y Cabinet neu Bwyllgor arall yr oeddech yn aelod ohono ar y pryd [Cyngor Sir yn unig]</p>	

- (2) Mae Rheoliadau Pwyllgorau Safonau (Caniatáu Gollyngiadau) (Cymru) 2001 (fel y'u diwygiwyd) yn nodi y gall Pwyllgor Safonau ganiatáu gollyngiadau yn y sefyllfaoedd canlynol:

- (a) os oes gan ddim llai na hanner aelodau'r awdurdod perthnasol neu hanner aelodau un o bwyllgorau'r awdurdod (yn ôl fel y digwydd) y mae'r busnes i gael ei ystyried ganddo fuddiant sy'n berthnasol i'r busnes hwnnw
- (b) os oes gan ddim llai na hanner aelodau gweithrediaeth arweinydd a chabinet yr awdurdod perthnasol y mae'r busnes i gael ei ystyried ganddo fuddiant sy'n berthnasol i'r busnes hwnnw a bod naill ai paragraff (ch) neu baragraff (d) hefyd yn gymwys;
- (c) yn achos cyngor sir neu gyngor bwrdeistref sirol, byddai anallu'r aelod i gymryd rhan yn newid cydbwysedd gwleidyddol yr awdurdod perthnasol neu bwyllgor yr awdurdod a fydd yn ystyried y busnes i raddau a fyddai'n debygol o effeithio ar y canlyniad;
- (d) os yw natur buddiant yr aelod yn gyfryw fel na fyddai cyfranogiad yr aelod yn y busnes y mae'r buddiant yn berthnasol iddo yn niweidio hyder y cyhoedd yn y modd y mae busnes yr awdurdod perthnasol yn cael ei gynnal;
- (e) os yw'r buddiant yn gyffredin i'r aelod ac i gyfran arwyddocaol o'r cyhoedd;
- (f) os oes cyfiawnhad i'r aelod gymryd rhan yn y busnes y mae'r buddiant yn berthnasol iddo oherwydd rôl neu arbenigedd penodol yr aelod;
- (g) os yw'r busnes y mae'r buddiant yn berthnasol iddo i'w ystyried gan bwyllgor trosolygu a chraffu'r awdurdod perthnasol ac nad yw buddiant yr aelod yn fuddiant ariannol;

- (h) os yw'r busnes sydd i'w ystyried yn berthnasol i faterion ariannol neu eiddo corff gwirfoddol y mae'r aelod yn aelod o'i bwyllgor neu ei fwrdd rheoli heblaw fel cynrychiolydd yr awdurdod perthnasol ac nad oes gan yr aelod unrhyw fuddiant arall yn y busnes hwnnw ar yr amod na fydd unrhyw ollyngiad yn ymestyn i gymryd rhan mewn unrhyw bleidlais mewn perthynas â'r busnes hwnnw; neu
- (i) os yw'n ymddangos i'r pwyllgor ei bod o les i drigolion ardal yr awdurdod perthnasol i'r anallu gael ei godi, ar yr amod bod hysbysiad ysgrifenedig bod y gollyngiad yn cael ei ganiatáu yn cael ei roi i Gynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru o fewn saith diwrnod a hynny mewn unrhyw fodd y gall ei bennu.
- (j) os ystyrir ei bod yn briodol gwneud hynny yn yr holl amgylchiadau lle nad yw'n bosibl fel arall gwneud addasiadau rhesymol i ddarparu ar gyfer anabledd person



## Y PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

6 RHAGFYR 2019

<b>ADRODDIAD BLYNYDDOL Y PWYLLGOR SAFONAU – 2018/2019</b>		
Yr argymhellion / penderfyniadau allweddol sydd eu hangen: Ystyried yr adroddiad		
<b>Y rhesymau:</b> Mae'r testun dan sylw yn yr adroddiad yn rhan o gylch gorchwyl y Pwyllgor		
Argymhellion / Sylwadau'r Pwyllgor Craffu: Ddim yn berthnasol		
Angen i'r Bwrdd Gweithredol wneud penderfyniad NAC OES Angen i'r Cyngor wneud penderfyniad NAC OES		
<b>YR AELOD O'R BWRDD GWEITHREDOL SY'N GYFRIFOL AM Y PORTFFOLIO:-</b> Y Cynghorydd E Dole (Arweinydd y Cyngor)		
Y Gyfarwyddiaeth: Y Prif Weithredwr Enw Pennaeth y Gwasanaeth: Linda Rees-Jones Awdur yr Adroddiad: Robert Edgecombe	Swyddi: Pennaeth Gweinyddiaeth a'r Gyfraith Rheolwr Dros Dro y Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol	Rhifau ffôn: 01267 224018 Cyfeiriadau E-bost: RJEdgeco@sirgar.gov.uk

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**STANDARDS COMMITTEE**  
**6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2019**

**STANDARDS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2018/2019**

The Standards Committee is required to produce an annual report of its activities during the preceding municipal year for presentation to Full Council,

Following discussions between officers and the Chair of the Committee, the attached draft report has been prepared.

The committee is requested to consider the draft report and make such changes as it considers appropriate, prior to the presentation of the report at full council in January 2020.

**DETAILED REPORT ATTACHED?**

**YES**

## IMPLICATIONS

I confirm that other than those implications which have been agreed with the appropriate Directors / Heads of Service and are referred to in detail below, there are no other implications associated with this report :

Signed: Linda Rees Jones

Head of Administration and Law

Policy, Crime & Disorder and Equalities	Legal	Finance	ICT	Risk Management Issues	Staffing Implications	Physical Assets
<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>

## CONSULTATIONS

I confirm that the appropriate consultations have taken in place and the outcomes are as detailed below

Signed: Linda Rees-Jones

Head of Administration and Law

1. **Scrutiny Committee** - Not applicable
2. **Local Member(s)** - Not applicable
3. **Community / Town Council** - Not applicable
4. **Relevant Partners** - Not applicable
5. **Staff Side Representatives and other Organisations** - *Not applicable*

### Section 100D Local Government Act, 1972 – Access to Information

List of Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

**THESE ARE DETAILED BELOW**

Title of Document	File Ref No.	Locations that the papers are available for public inspection
Legal file	DPSC-173	Legal Services, County Hall

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

# STANDARDS COMMITTEE

---

## ANNUAL REPORT 2018/2019

### Introduction

1. Period Covered by the Report
2. Terms of Reference
3. Code of Conduct Complaints
4. Applications for Dispensation
5. Code of Conduct Training
6. Whistleblowing Policy
7. Code Compliance by Town and Community Councils
8. Other Activities
9. Conclusion

## **INTRODUCTION**

The law requires each and every County and County Borough Council in Wales to establish and maintain a Standards Committee. Such committees are responsible for overseeing standards of conduct for elected members of both the principal council and the constituent community and town councils within the principal council's area.

The Committee receives and determines applications for dispensation from elected members in relation to the Code of Conduct and adjudicates upon code complaints referred to the Council by the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales. However it should be noted that only rarely has the Committee been requested to undertake this latter function.

The Committee also receives reports in relation to the operation of the Council's whistle-blowing policy.

### **1. PERIOD COVERED BY THE REPORT**

This report covers the activities of the Standards Committee during the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019

### **2. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The role and functions of the committee as set out in the constitution of the Council are:

- To promote and maintain high standards of conduct by councillors and co-opted members
- To assist councillors and co-opted members to observe the Members' Code of conduct
- To advise the Council on the adoption or revision of the Members' Code of Conduct
- To monitor operation of the Members' Code of Conduct
- To advise, or arrange training for councillors and co-opted members on matters relating to the Members' Code of Conduct
- To grant dispensations to councillors and co-opted members where they have a personal and prejudicial interest under the Members' Code of Conduct
- To deal with reports from the Adjudication Panel for Wales and reports from the Monitoring Officer or the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales
- The exercise of the above functions in relation to Town and Community Councils in the county
- To receive annual reports on the operation of the Council's Whistleblowing Policy

### **3. CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS**

The Committee was not required to adjudicate upon any Code of Conduct complaints during the period of this report.

Formal complaints about councillors who are suspected of breaching the Code of Conduct are referred directly to the Public Service Ombudsman for Wales without involving the Standards Committee. Most complaints are resolved by the Ombudsman but occasionally the Ombudsman may require the Committee to investigate and adjudicate on a complaint.

In 2018-19 however, the Ombudsman did not refer any complaints to the Committee, nor were any matters referred to the Adjudication Panel for Wales in respect of Councillors from Carmarthenshire.

The Committee is kept informed by the Monitoring Officer about the number of complaints relating to Carmarthenshire councillors notified to her by the Ombudsman.

During the period covered by this report the Ombudsman dealt with a total of 35 code complaints in respect of councillors and co-opted members of councils in Carmarthenshire. Unfortunately this represents a further increase from the number of complaints dealt with during the previous year. Of these 35 complaints, 9 related to County Councillors (6 of which were carried over from 2016/2017) and 26 to Town and Community Councillors (15 of which related to just 1 Town Council).

It should be noted however that in all of these cases the Ombudsman either closed his investigation after initial consideration or found no action was necessary.

Therefore despite the increase in the number of code complaints the committee is satisfied that the vast majority of councillors do comply with the code and that where allegations of breach are made they are either unfounded or are not considered by the Ombudsman to be sufficiently serious to warrant enforcement action.

### **4. APPLICATIONS FOR DISPENSATION**

The Committee considered 55 applications for dispensation from County and Community and Town Councillors during the year, all but 3 of which were either granted or partly granted.

The grounds upon which the Committee may grant a dispensation are set out in the Standards Committees (Grant of Dispensations) (Wales) Regulations 2001.

The Committee continues to approach each application with a presumption in favour of granting a dispensation wherever practicable, particularly in relation to granting a dispensation to speak. The Committee may also delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer to grant similar dispensations in relation to that business. However no such delegation was given during the period of this report.

Details of the applications that have been dealt with can be viewed as part of the minutes of the meetings of the Committee which are accessible on Carmarthenshire County Council's website [www.carmarthenshire.gov.uk](http://www.carmarthenshire.gov.uk).

A comparison between the numbers of dispensation applications received since 2014/15 shows the following:

YEAR	TOTAL	CCC	T/CC	GRANTED*	REFUSED	OTHER
2014/15	17	1	16	17	0	N/A
2015/16	65	5	60	62	3	N/A
2016/17	21	4	17	18	3	N/A
2017/18	31	7	24	31	0	N/A
2018/19	55	42	13	52	3	N/A

\* either granted or partly granted

## 5. CODE OF CONDUCT TRAINING

Following a review of the code of conduct training provided to Town and Community Councillors in previous years, a decision was again taken to invite each Town and Community Council to send representatives to two training sessions that were held on separate evenings during June 2018. The sessions were well attended, with a total of 80 delegates present representing a large number of different Councils.

## 6. WHISTLEBLOWING POLICY

The Committee has oversight of the authority's Whistleblowing Policy. The process is regulated by the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, which protects against dismissal and other detriment for workers who disclose information in the public interest in prescribed circumstances to prescribed persons.

Details of the complaints dealt with during the period of this report are set out below.

New Complaints	Complaints carried over from 2017/18	Cases Concluded	Cases Continuing
6	3	1	8



The number of complaints continues to be consistent with those received by other local authorities.

When considering the number of complaints made under the policy, it is necessary to keep in mind that there is often some overlap with matters relating to grievance, disciplinary matters and dignity at work. This can significantly impact upon the time it takes to bring these matters to conclusion.

The Committee reviewed the Whistleblowing Policy during the period covered by this report and made changes which reflected the experience of its operation during the year.

## **7. CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLIANCE BY TOWN AND COMMUNITY COUNCILS**

The committee again received a report regarding the extent to which Town and Community Councils within the County are complying with the Code of Conduct. The report contained data relating to:

- Code complaints
- Dispensation applications
- Declarations of interest
- Code training

No particular trends or patterns could be discerned from the data and there is no obvious correlation between whether a particular Council provides Code training to its members and the number of Code complaints being made.

## **8. OTHER ACTIVITIES**

In addition to the above activities the Committee also:

- Received and considered the Annual Report of the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales
- Received and considered case decisions of the Adjudication Panel for Wales
- Received and considered case decisions made by other Standards Committees in Wales
- Received and considered the Code of Conduct casebook published by the Ombudsman

Where appropriate the Committee has identified points of learning and best practice and has taken them into account in their own decision making and included them in the training referred to in paragraph 5 above.

## 9. CONCLUSION

The committee had a busy year and we are grateful for the help and support given to us by the council's legal department. We have been much encouraged by the generally good levels of compliance with the Code of Conduct exhibited by Councillors across the County and very much hope this will continue.

## Y PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

## 6 RHAGFYR 2019

<b>COFLYFR CÔD YMDDYGIAD</b>		
<b>Yr argymhellion / penderfyniadau allweddol sydd eu hangen:</b> Ystyried yr adroddiad		
<b>Y rhesymau:</b> Mae cynnwys yr adroddiad hwn yn rhan o faes gorchwyl y Pwyllgor.		
Argymhellion / Sylwadau'r Pwyllgor Craffu: Amherthnasol		
Angen i'r Bwrdd Gweithredol wneud penderfyniad		NAC OES
Angen i'r Cyngor wneud penderfyniad		NAC OES
<b>YR AELOD O'R BWRDD GWEITHREDOL SY'N GYFRIFOL AM Y PORTFFOLIO:-</b> Y Cynghorydd E Dole (Arweinydd)		
Y Gyfarwyddiaeth Y Prif Weithredwr Enw Pennaeth y Gwasanaeth: Linda Rees-Jones Awdur yr Adroddiad: Robert Edgecombe	Swyddi: Pennaeth Gweinyddiaeth a'r Gyfraith  Rheolwr y Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol	Rhifau ffôn: 01267 224018  Cyfeiriadau E-bost: RJEdgeco@sirgar.gov.uk.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**STANDARDS COMMITTEE**  
**6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2019**

**CODE OF CONDUCT CASEBOOK**

The Public Services Ombudsman for Wales (PSOW) publishes a Code of conduct casebook at intervals during the year, giving details of concluded code cases which the PSOW would be of interest.

The attached Casebook covers cases concluded between July and September 2019.

Committee members will note that the Casebook highlights two cases referred to local Standards Committees for determination and one case referred to the Adjudication Panel for Wales

Copies of the decision notices issued by the two standards committees are also attached to this report.

**ATTACHMENTS:-**

**Ombudsman's Code of Conduct Casebook – July – Sept 2019**

**Appendix 1 – Notice of Determination by  
Denbighshire County Council's Standards Committee**

**Appendix 2 – Decision of Neath Port Talbot Standards Committee**

## IMPLICATIONS

I confirm that other than those implications which have been agreed with the appropriate Directors / Heads of Service and are referred to in detail below, there are no other implications associated with this report :

Signed: Linda Rees Jones

Head of Administration and Law

Policy, Crime & Disorder and Equalities	Legal	Finance	ICT	Risk Management Issues	Staffing Implications	Physical Assets
<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>

## CONSULTATIONS

I confirm that the appropriate consultations have taken in place and the outcomes are as detailed below

Signed: Linda Rees-Jones

Head of Administration and Law

1. **Scrutiny Committee** - Not applicable
2. **Local Member(s)** - Not applicable
3. **Community / Town Council** - Not applicable
4. **Relevant Partners** - Not applicable
5. **Staff Side Representatives and other Organisations** - *Not applicable*

### Section 100D Local Government Act, 1972 – Access to Information

List of Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

**THESE ARE DETAILED BELOW**

Title of Document	File Ref No.	Locations that the papers are available for public inspection
Legal file	DPSC-173	Legal Services, County Hall

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

# The Code of Conduct Casebook

Issue 22 October 2019

## Introduction

The Public Services Ombudsman for Wales considers complaints that members of local authorities in Wales have broken the Code of Conduct. The Ombudsman investigates such complaints under the provisions of Part III of the Local Government Act 2000 and the relevant Orders made by the National Assembly for Wales under that Act.

Where the Ombudsman decides that a complaint should be investigated, there are four findings, set out under section 69 of the Local Government Act 2000, which the Ombudsman can arrive at:

- a) that there is no evidence that there has been a breach of the authority's code of conduct;
- b) that no action needs to be taken in respect of the matters that were subject to the investigation;
- c) that the matter be referred to the authority's monitoring officer for consideration by the standards committee;
- d) that the matter be referred to the President of the Adjudication Panel for Wales for adjudication by a tribunal (this generally happens in more serious cases).

In the circumstances of (c) and (d) above, the Ombudsman is required to submit the investigation report to the standards committee or a tribunal of the Adjudication Panel for Wales and it is for them to consider the evidence found by the Ombudsman, together with any defense put forward by the member concerned. It is also for them to determine whether a breach has occurred and, if so, what penalty (if any) should be imposed.

The Code of Conduct Casebook contains summaries of reports issued by this office for which the findings were one of the four set out above. However, in reference to (c) and (d) findings, The Code of Conduct Casebook only contains the summaries of those cases for which the hearings by the standards committee or Adjudication Panel for Wales have been concluded and the outcome of the hearing is known. This edition covers July to September 2019.

# The Code of Conduct Casebook

Issue 22 October 2019

## Contents

No evidence of breach .....	3
No action necessary .....	4
Referred to Standards Committee .....	5
Referred to Adjudication Panel for Wales.....	6



# Case summaries

## No evidence of breach

### Caia Park Community Council - Disclosure and registration of interests

Case number: 201805133 - Report issued in July 2019

The Ombudsman received a complaint that a Member ("the Member") of Caia Park Community Council ("the Council") had breached the Code of Conduct for members, in October 2018, when they submitted an application for funding for a community project, in which they had an interest, which was above the Council's agreed limit, against the advice of the Clerk. It was alleged that the Member's behaviour could bring the Council into disrepute.

The investigation established that the Clerk had advised that the Council could consider an application for funding above the agreed limit. The Member declared an interest and there was no evidence that they sought to influence the decision making. Therefore, the Ombudsman found that there was no evidence that the Member had breached the Code of Conduct.

### Powys County Council - Accountability and openness

Case Number: 201803272 – Report issued in August 2019

The Ombudsman received a complaint that a Member ("the Member") of Powys County Council ("the Council") had breached the Code of Conduct ("the Code") in relation to the connection of water supplies to two of his properties and in respect of his actions in relation to his caravan site.

An investigation was commenced to consider whether the Member had breached the part of the Code relating to disrepute. Copies of relevant documents were obtained. The evidence found by the investigation was shared with the Member before he was formally interviewed.

The Ombudsman determined there was no evidence to suggest that the Member had breached the Code.

### Denbighshire County Council - Promotion of equality and respect

Case Number: 201900044 – Report issued in August 2019

The Ombudsman received a complaint about a Member ("the Member") of Denbighshire County Council ("the Council"). It was alleged that the Member's behaviour had been inappropriate and disrespectful and breached the Code of Conduct.

During the course of the investigation, information was provided by relevant parties including the complainant, and the Monitoring Officer.

The Ombudsman found that there was no evidence to support the concerns raised and found that there was no breach of the Code of Conduct.

### Prestatyn Town Council - Promotion of equality and respect

Case Number: 201900045 – Report issued in August 2019

The Ombudsman received a complaint about a Member ("the Member") of Prestatyn Town Council ("the Council"). It was alleged that the Member's behaviour had been inappropriate and disrespectful and breached the Code of Conduct.

During the course of the investigation, information was provided by relevant parties including the complainant, the Clerk to the Council and the Monitoring Officer.

The Ombudsman found that there was no evidence to support the concerns raised and found that there was no breach of the Code of Conduct.

there was no breach of the Code of Conduct.

### [Sully and Lavernock Community Council - Duty to uphold the law](#)

[Case number: 201900025 - Report issued in September 2019](#)

The Ombudsman received a complaint that a Member ("the Member") of Sully and Lavernock Community Council ("the Council") had breached the Code of Conduct when he allegedly physically attacked someone.

The Ombudsman's investigation was suspended pending the outcome of a criminal prosecution made against the Member in relation to the incident. The case was heard by the Magistrates Court; there was no direct witness evidence to the alleged incident and the Member was found not guilty. Therefore, the Ombudsman did not consider that the evidence suggested that the Member had breached the Code of Conduct in this case. The Ombudsman's finding under s69(4)(a) of the Local Government Act 2000 was therefore that there was no evidence that the Member had failed to comply with the Code.

## **No action necessary**

### [Llandrindod Wells Town Council - Promotion of equality and respect](#)

[Case number: 201803394 - Report issued in July 2019](#)

The Ombudsman received a complaint that a Member ("the Member") of Llandrindod Wells Town Council ("the Council") had inappropriately accessed the Council's computer, withheld information gathered from it from the Council and failed to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in matters the Council was considering. It also alleged that the Member had engaged in bullying behaviour towards the Clerk at two meetings, in particular.

The investigation considered whether the Member might have breached paragraphs 4(b) and (c), 5(b), 7(a), 11 and 14 of the Code of Conduct. Copies of relevant documents, including the approved minutes of the two meetings, were obtained and telephone interviews were conducted with relevant witnesses. The evidence found by the investigation was shared with the Member before he was formally interviewed.

The investigation found that the evidence did not suggest the Member had acted in a bullying manner, prevented the Council from obtaining access to information to which it was entitled or used his position improperly. The Member was entitled to comment on matters to do with the Council and had legitimate grounds for his actions.

The investigation found evidence that the Member had failed to show due respect and consideration to the Clerk at one meeting, and that he had failed to take appropriate action in respect of a personal and prejudicial interest. However, the Member had been acting in good faith and in the best interests of the Council. In addition, he demonstrated a reasonable level of personal reflection since the time of the events. The Ombudsman found that, therefore, no action needed to be taken in respect of the matters investigated

### [Bridgend Town Council - Disclosure and registration of interests](#)

[Case number: 201707582 - Report issued in September 2019](#)

The Ombudsman received a complaint about a Member ("the Member") of Bridgend Town Council ("the Council"). It was alleged that the Member had failed to disclose a personal and prejudicial interest during a meeting of the Council and proceeded to participate in discussions relating to that matter. Additionally, it was alleged that the Member failed to show respect and consideration during the meeting and behaved in a bullying manner towards the Clerk to the Council.

During the course of the investigation, information was provided by relevant parties including the complainant, and the Council.

The Ombudsman found that the evidence gathered was suggestive that the Member had failed to appropriately declare a personal and prejudicial interest at the meeting of the Council. In addition, the Member's actions in failing to leave the room and making representations were also suggestive of a failure to comply with the relevant provisions of the Code. Further, the Ombudsman determined that the evidence was suggestive that the Member failed to show respect and consideration to the Clerk during that meeting.

In deciding what action to take the Ombudsman considered the custom and practice of declaring interests within the Council at the relevant time, the mitigation provided by the Member and recent evidence confirming a significant improvement in working relationships within the Council. The Ombudsman concluded that it would not be in the public interest to take matters further and that no action should be taken in respect of the matters investigated.

#### [Bridgend Town Council - Disclosure and registration of interests](#) [Case number: 201707583 - Report issued in September 2019](#)

The Ombudsman received a complaint about a Member ("the Member") of Bridgend Town Council ("the Council"). It was alleged that the Member had failed to disclose a personal and prejudicial interest during a meeting of the Council and proceeded to participate in discussions relating to that matter. Additionally, it was alleged that the Member had used his position improperly in an attempt to gain an advantage for himself or his close personal associates.

During the course of the investigation, information was provided by relevant parties including the complainant, and the Council.

The Ombudsman found that the evidence gathered was suggestive that the Member had failed to appropriately declare a personal and prejudicial interest at the meeting of the Council. In addition, the Member's actions in failing to leave the room and making representations are also suggestive of a failure to comply with the relevant provisions of the Code. However, the Ombudsman was not persuaded that the evidence was suggestive that the Member used his position in an attempt to gain an advantage as suggested.

In deciding what action to take the Ombudsman considered the custom and practice of declaring interests within the Council at the relevant time and the mitigation provided by the Member. The Ombudsman concluded that it would not be in the public interest to take matters further and that no action should be taken in respect of the matters investigated.

#### [Trefeurig Community Council - Disclosure and registration of interests](#) [Case number: 201806748 - Report issued in September 2019](#)

The Ombudsman received a complaint that a Member ("the Member") of Trefeurig Community Council ("the Council") had breached the Code of Conduct. It was alleged that, during a discussion about a planning application for a local development, the Member failed to declare an interest in the matter.

During the course of the investigation, information was provided by relevant parties including the complainant, and the Clerk to the Council.

The Ombudsman found that no action needed to be taken in respect of the matters investigated.

## **Referred to Standards Committee**

#### [Prestatyn Town Council - Promotion of equality and respect](#) [Case number: 201700947 – Report issued in July 2019](#)

The Ombudsman received a complaint that a Member ("the Member") of Prestatyn Town Council

("the Council") may have used threatening and abusive behaviour towards a fellow member of the Council and behaved in an aggressive and confrontational manner at two Council meetings in November 2016 and May 2017.

The Ombudsman obtained relevant information about the matter from the Council and interviewed a number of witnesses. The Member was interviewed and provided his response to the complaint. Having considered the evidence the Ombudsman found that there was evidence to suggest that the Member may have breached the Code of Conduct and referred the matter for consideration by the Council's Standards Committee.

The Standards Committee determined that the Member failed to show respect and consideration to Police Officers who were in attendance at the meeting in November 2016 and towards his fellow member in the meeting in May 2017. In addition, the Standards Committee found that the Members behaviour at both meetings was capable of bringing the Council into disrepute.

The Standards Committee decided that on the basis of the findings reached that the Member should be suspended from office of member of the Council for a period of four months.

#### [Neath Town Council - Promotion of equality and respect](#)

[Case number: 201707990 – Report issued in July 2019](#)

On 21 March 2018, I received a complaint that a member of the Council ("the Member") failed to observe the code of conduct for members of Neath Town Council ("the Council"). It was alleged that the Member had commented that a Neath resident had deserved to be murdered.

The investigation found that the Member's unsolicited comments about the victim were both disrespectful and distasteful and, whilst it may have been the member's private opinion, there was no reason for it to have been expressed publicly. In view of the effect of the Member's comments on the citizens of Neath Town Council, many of whom believe that the Member is no longer a suitable representative, and the effect on the reputation of the Town Council itself, the Ombudsman concluded that the Member may have breached paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct.

The Ombudsman determined that the matter should be referred to the Monitoring Officer of Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council for consideration by that Council's Standards Committee. The Standards Committee found that the Member had breached the Code of Conduct and she was suspended for four months.

## **Referred to Adjudication Panel for Wales**

#### [Mathern Community Council - Promotion of equality and respect](#)

[Case number: 201802799 – Report issued in July 2019](#)

During a public hearing of the Adjudication Panel For Wales held on 19 July 2018, a member of Mathern Community Council ("the Member") made a statement which he followed up with a letter to the Adjudication Panel. Both the statement and the letter contained language either the same as or similar to language which the Adjudication Panel had advised him would amount to a breach of the Code of Conduct.

The Ombudsman decided to investigate whether the Member's actions amounted to a breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct on the basis that the matter had come to his attention as a result of the investigation which was being heard by the Adjudication Panel for Wales on 19 July.

The Ombudsman considered that a reasonable person would conclude that the Member actions affected the reputation of both the Office of Member and the Authority of which he is a member and that they may amount to a breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct. The Ombudsman also considered that any restriction of the Member's right to freedom of expression under article 10 of the Human Rights Act, would be necessary for the protection of the rights and interests of others.

The Ombudsman referred the matter to the Adjudication Panel for Wales. However, on 17 July 2019 the Adjudication Panel determined that the matter did not come to the Ombudsman's attention as a result of the investigation heard on 19 July 2018 as that investigation concluded on 20 December 2017 (when the matter was referred to the Adjudication Panel for Wales) and determined it would therefore not consider the case. No further action was taken.

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

## Notice of Determination by the Standards Committee

Member	Cllr Peter Duffy
Relevant Authority	Prestatyn Town Council
Date and place of Standards Committee Hearing	24 <sup>th</sup> and 25 <sup>th</sup> July, County Hall, Ruthin, Denbighshire
Complainant	Cllr Paul Penlington
Public Services Ombudsman for Wales reference number	201700947

1. The Standards Committee of Denbighshire County Council considered a report by the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales (the Ombudsman) regarding alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct for members of Prestatyn Town Council by Councillor Peter Duffy, which was referred to the Standards Committee by the Ombudsman for determination.
2. On 18<sup>th</sup> May 2017 the Ombudsman received a complaint from Councillor Paul Penlington that Councillor Peter Duffy had failed to observe the Code of Conduct for members of Prestatyn Town Council. It was alleged that Councillor Duffy had used threatening and abusive behaviour towards Councillor Penlington and behaved in an aggressive and confrontational manner towards him personally at several Town Council meetings dating back to January 2015. On 26<sup>th</sup> September 2018 Councillor Penlington complained of further inappropriate behaviour by Councillor Duffy during a Town Council meeting which had taken place that day. The Ombudsman's investigation focused on two meetings which took place on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 and 11<sup>th</sup> May 2017 respectively.
3. The Ombudsman's office forwarded to the Monitoring Officer of Denbighshire County Council a concluded Investigation Report dated 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018 which concluded that Cllr Duffy's actions were suggestive of breaches of Paragraphs 4(b) and 6(1)(a) of the Model Code of Conduct.
4. On 24 January 2019 the Standards Committee considered the Ombudsman's investigation report and made an initial determination that Councillor Duffy should be given an opportunity to make representations either orally or in writing in respect of the findings of the investigation and any allegation that he failed or may have failed to comply with the Code of Conduct.
5. At the hearing the Ombudsman was represented by Mrs. Annie Ginwalla. Councillor Duffy was represented by Mr. John Owens, Solicitor.

### Stage 1 – Preliminary procedural issues

6. The Committee had been provided with a bundle of documents incorporating the Ombudsman's Investigation Report together with the witness statements obtained during the investigation. The bundle also included skeleton arguments provided by the respective advocates.
7. The Ombudsman's investigation report referred at page 17 of the bundle to the

following disputed facts:

- Did Councillor Duffy demonstrate aggressive and threatening behaviour towards Councillor Penlington when he arrived at the meeting of 2 November 2016?
  - Did Councillor Duffy demonstrate respect and consideration towards the Police Officers at the meeting of 2 November 2016?
  - Did Councillor Duffy refer to Councillor Penlington as a “f\*\*\*ing prick” before the meeting of 11 May 2017 started?
  - Did Councillor Duffy refer to Councillor Penlington as a “fool” during the meeting of 11 May 2017?
8. The parties agreed that the Committee should focus its consideration of the evidence on the relevant meetings that took place on 2 November 2016 and 11 May 2017.
9. It was agreed that the witness statements could be taken as having been read by the Committee, that Mrs Ginwalla would ask each witness to confirm their statements, asking questions only in respect of particular issues that she wished to highlight, and that Mr. Owens would then have the opportunity to cross examine. Mrs Ginwalla would be given the opportunity to re-examine witnesses in respect of matters that had arisen from cross- examination.

#### Stage 2 – Making findings of fact

10. The Committee invited both advocates to make opening remarks.
11. Mrs Ginwalla referred to the complaint received by the Ombudsman and the fact that the Ombudsman had determined to conduct an investigation focussing on alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct at two meetings.
12. The Ombudsman had concluded that the evidence suggested a breach of the Code of Conduct.
13. Mr. Owens informed the Committee that Councillor Duffy had considered his position in respect of the allegations and considered them to be factually incorrect. Mr. Owens submitted that the evidence was contradictory and that it was right that the evidence be tested through a hearing in order that there be a process of fairness and transparency.
14. The Committee then heard evidence from a number of witnesses, each of whom confirmed the contents of their statements as being true and answered questions from both advocates.
15. The Committee also heard evidence from Councillor Duffy.
16. The Committee heard closing statements from both advocates.



17. The Committee retired to consider the evidence presented to it and found the following facts:

Councillor Duffy did demonstrate disrespect and a lack of consideration to both police officers at the meeting on 2 November 2016.

Councillor Duffy referred to Councillor Penlington as a “prick” before the meeting of 11 May 2017 started.

Councillor Duffy referred to Councillor Penlington as a “fool” or an “idiot” during the meeting of 11 May 2017.

### Stage 3 – Deciding whether the member has failed to comply with the Code

18. The Committee invited representations from the parties as to whether, on the basis of the facts found, Councillor Duffy had failed to comply with the Code of Conduct.

19. It was established that the paragraph numbers of the Prestatyn Town Council Code of Conduct did not coincide with those of the Model Code of Conduct. The relevant paragraphs of the Model Code of Conduct were:

4(b) You must show respect and consideration for others

6(1)(a) You must not conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or authority into disrepute

These paragraphs were reflected in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Prestatyn Code of Conduct.

20. The parties made submissions as to the capacity in which Councillor Duffy was acting at the first meeting and whether the Code of Conduct applied to his conduct at that meeting. The Committee was referred to the case of Livingstone v The Adjudication Panel for England [2006] H.R.L.R. 45
21. The Committee retired to consider whether or not Councillor Duffy had failed to comply with the Code of Conduct.
22. The Committee first considered whether the Code of Conduct applied to Councillor Duffy at the meetings held on 2 November 2016 and 11 May 2017. The Committee considered the case of Livingstone to which they had been referred.
31. The Committee concluded that Councillor Duffy had at the meeting on 2 November 2016 been acting or giving the impression that he was acting as a councillor. The meeting was not one that was open to the public and the evidence presented to the Committee by several witnesses was that those present were acting in their professional capacity. Councillor Duffy himself had stated that he was annoyed at not

having been invited given that the anti-social behaviour complained of affected his ward. Councillor Duffy had indicated in his initial written response and in interview that he should have been invited as Deputy Mayor of Prestatyn and because the matters to be discussed affected his ward.

32. The meeting on 11 May 2017 was a meeting for councillors to get to know each other and to make informal decisions as to certain appointments such as school governors and chairs of Committees. It was accepted by both parties that the Code of Conduct applied at this meeting. The Committee also concluded that at this meeting Councillor Duffy was acting in his capacity as a councillor.
33. The Committee determined that Councillor Duffy had failed to comply with paragraph 5 of the Prestatyn Town Council Code of Conduct at the meeting on 2 November 2016 in that he failed to show respect and consideration towards the police officers in attendance. Further, his behaviour towards invited guests at a meeting attended by other partner agencies was such that it brought the Town Council and the office of councillor into disrepute. In reaching these determinations the Committee has had regard to Article 10 European Convention on Human Rights. The Committee considered that the behaviour demonstrated towards the officers went beyond that which would be considered legitimate challenge or scrutiny.
34. The Committee determined that Councillor Duffy's conduct at the meeting on 11 May 2017 in respect of the use of the words "prick", "idiot" or "fool" was a failure to show respect and consideration for Councillor Penlington and the meeting in general. Councillor Duffy's use of these words went beyond the protection of Article 10 as this was considered to be personal abuse rather than political expression. The Committee further concluded that the use of such terms amongst councillors would if brought to the knowledge of the public erode the public's confidence in the standards of behaviour in local democracy and bring the Town Council and the office of Councillor into disrepute.
35. The Committee unanimously determined therefore that in respect of all three facts that had been found, Councillor Duffy had failed to comply with both paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Prestatyn Town Council Code of Conduct.

#### Stage 4 – Sanction

36. The Committee received representations from both parties as to the form of sanction, if any, that it should consider imposing on Councillor Duffy as a consequence of his failure to comply with the Code of Conduct.
37. The Committee also received copies of two decisions made by Standards Committees in Gwynedd and Rhondda Cynon Taf by way of examples of decisions made in similar cases.
38. The Committee retired to consider its decision as to sanction.
39. The Committee considered very carefully the representations made to it. The Committee considered the aggravating and mitigating factors relating to the conduct

of Councillor Duffy. The Committee also considered the Sanctions Guidance produced by the Adjudication Panel for Wales.

40. The Committee considered Councillor Duffy's long service to the Council and his commitment to his community. This long service should however have meant that Councillor Duffy knew the standards of behaviour expected of an elected member.
41. The incident on 2 November 2016 was one involving aggressive and disrespectful behaviour towards public servants who were seeking to work in partnership with the Council and was akin to behaving in such a manner to officers of the Council.
42. These were not isolated incidents, the Committee having found that Councillor Duffy had failed to comply with the Code of Conduct on three occasions at two separate meetings some months apart.
43. The Committee also considered that Councillor Duffy had not fully learnt the lessons to be learned from these incidents and had not shown any remorse for his actions.
44. The Committee considered whether to take no action, one of the courses open to it. The Committee concluded that these breaches of the Code of Conduct were not inadvertent or isolated and were too serious for this course of action.
45. The Committee considered censure but concluded that the breaches were too serious to be dealt with by this sanction considering that the conduct was considered to have brought the council and office of Councillor into disrepute.
46. The Committee therefore considered that suspension was the most appropriate form of sanction available to it. In determining the length of the suspension the Committee had regard to the decision notices that had been brought to its attention and to the aggravating features of the conduct in this case. Taking into account the seriousness of showing aggressive and disrespectful behaviour towards the police officers and the use of insulting words or language towards an elected member, the fact that there were three breaches of the Code of Conduct and the lack of insight and remorse shown by Councillor Duffy, the Committee determined that a period of suspension of four months was appropriate.
47. The Committee returned to inform Councillor Duffy that he would be suspended from Prestatyn Town Council for a period of four months. The Committee further strongly advised Councillor Duffy that he should at the end of that period of suspension avail himself of the opportunity to undergo training on the Code of Conduct provided by the Monitoring Officer.

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

## Decision of Neath-Port Talbot County Borough Council Standards Committee

### Minutes:

**RESOLVED:** That Councillor S.M. failed to comply with the Authority's Code of Conduct under Paragraph 6(1)(a) (in an official capacity or otherwise, bringing the office of Member or the Authority into disrepute) and should be subject to a four month suspension.

### Decision Notice:

#### Introduction

1. This is the report of the Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council Standards Committee on the outcome of an investigation into the conduct of Town Councillor Sheila Marston, a Town Councillor of Neath Town Council ("Councillor Marston").
2. This report has been produced in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government Investigations (Functions of Monitoring Officers and Standards Committees) (Wales) Regulations 2001. The investigation follows from a referral by the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales ("the Ombudsman") which alleged that Councillor Marston had acted in breach of the Neath Town Council Members Code of Conduct ("the Code of Conduct").

#### Allegations

3. In his referral the Ombudsman indicated that his investigations had found that there was evidence to suggest that Councillor Marston had breached the following provisions of the Code of Conduct–

***Paragraph 6(1)(a)** Members must not conduct themselves in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bring their office or authority into disrepute*

#### Process

4. Both the Ombudsman and Councillor Marston agreed that this matter was capable of being dealt with by way of written representations and consideration into the matter took place on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2019 by virtue of consideration of the papers at Civic Centre Port Talbot before the Standards Committee of Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council.

## Findings of Fact

5. Councillor Marston is a long standing member of Neath Town Council who was last elected in May 2017, having first been elected in 2004.
6. Councillor Marston and her neighbour, the late Ms Jones lived in the same street. There was an acrimonious relationship between both parties which is believed to have stemmed from an argument between Ms Jones and Councillor Marston over a garden hedge.
7. Sadly in January 2018, Ms Jones, a victim of domestic violence was murdered in her home.
8. During the period after the murder, Councillor Marston was reported to have expressed her opinion to members of the public, including a number of taxi drivers that Ms Jones had “deserved to be murdered”. This caused significant distress to Ms Jones’ familiar and friends.
9. During this period, a complaint was made to the Neath Town Council about Councillor Marston’s comments, upon which the Neath Town Council referred the matter to the Ombudsman.
10. In view of the reactions by the public, the Neath Town Council invited Councillor Marston to a meeting to discuss the comments on the 14<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Councillor Marston believed that this meeting was to offer her guidance and support and to ensure she was safe and she believed she attended in good faith. During the meeting, Councillor Marston immediately admitted to make comments to the effect that Ms Jones had “deserved to die”. The members and officer present were surprised and distressed to note that Councillor Marston’s only reaction was to express surprise at the manner of Ms Jones death but Councillor Marston refused to withdraw or apologise for her comments. Councillor Marston later added by way that the comments were made because there was uncertainty as to how Ms Jones had sadly passed away.
11. Councillor Marston was of the view that these comments were not made in any Council related meetings. However, in respect of both matters (the discussions with taxi drivers and at the aforementioned meeting), the principles of the Code of Conduct (namely paragraph 6(1)(a)) will still have applied.<sup>[1]</sup>

## **Article 10**

12. Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (“ECHR”) was fully considered by the Standards Committee during its deliberations both in relation to the breach and sanction. The Standards Committee adopted the three stage approach used by Wilkie J in the case of *Sanders v Kingston No (1)* [2005] EWHC 1145 in its deliberations as follows:
  - (a) Could the Standards Committee as a matter of fact conclude that Councillor Marston’s conduct amounted to a relevant breach of the Code of Conduct?
  - (b) If so, was the finding of a breach and imposition of a sanction prima facie a breach of Article 10?
  - (c) If so, is the restriction involved one which is justified by reason of the requirement of Article 10(2)?
13. The Standards Committee had determined each allegation against part (a) in the first instance. It was then concluded the nature and content of the questions raised by Councillor Marston did not consist of political expression which attracts enhanced protection under Article 10 ECHR. The content was so egregious and caused such significant upset and disruption that Police involvement was necessary and therefore an interference with Article 10 rights is justified.

## **Decision of the Standards Committee**

14. The Standards Committee determined that Councillor Marston did conduct herself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing her office or authority into disrepute.
15. In finding against Councillor Marston, the Standards Committee concluded that in light of the particular circumstances of this case (which should evidence from this Report), that it is justified in interfering with Councillor Marston’s Article 10(1) rights of freedom of expression, by making a finding of breach and by imposing a sanction.

## **Reasons for Decision**

16. The reason for making these conclusions were as follows (adopting the structure set out above):

- (a) Councillor Marston's comments were disrespectful and distasteful and there was no reason for such comments to be made public.
- (b) Councillor Marston made these comments to members of the public outside of the Town Council setting but the principles of the Code of Conduct still applied on this occasion. Paragraph 6(1)(a) must be complied with at all times and the behaviour of Councillor Marston fell short of the appropriate standards required of elected members.
- (c) Although acknowledging Councillor Marston's representations, respectfully it was felt that they did not amount to a defence of any actions but more mitigation and therefore were appropriate for consideration of sanction only.
- (d) The Standards Committee concluded that Neath Town Council was brought into disrepute as a result of the comments made but also concluded that Councillor Marston's comments and her position as Town Councillor brought her office into disrepute. The evidence highlighted that several constituents feel that such comments were not expected from an elected member and therefore Councillor Marston's suitability as an elected member was called into question. The disapproving comments from the general public appear to be directed towards Councillor Marston and not the Neath Town Council but nevertheless given that Neath Town Council came under undue criticism because of their inability to take action directly, Neath Town Council were brought into disrepute as a result of the actions of Councillor Marston.

## **Sanction**

- 17. The Standards Committee were guided by decisions of the Ombudsman in their Code of Conduct Casebook and had due regard to the principles identified in the Adjudication Panel for Wales Sanctions Guidance as part of their determination. The Standards Committee acknowledged that in line with the Local Government Investigations (Functions of Monitoring Officers and Standards Committees) (Wales) Regulations 2001 the maximum sanction they can impose is a six month suspension.
- 18. In considering the determination of any sanction which might be applied the Standards Committee determined that due to the seriousness of the incident and the level of public condemnation associated with the comments made by Town Councillor Sheila Marston, no action or informal action was not feasible.
- 19. The Standards Committee concluded that a public censure would not be appropriate as it would be important to send a message to Councillors that such behaviour is not appropriate for an elected official and it would be necessary to ensure that the public had confidence in local democracy and the only way to achieve this would be via a stronger sanction.



20. The Standards Committee concluded that a suspension of some duration was the appropriate course of action here.
  
21. The Standards Committee, considered that the following were aggravating factors:
  - (a) Town Councillor Marston was a long standing member of Neath Town Council
  - (b) Town Councillor Marston had a lack of acceptance of the misconduct and any consequences and failed to engage with the Ombudsman investigation.
  - (c) The express of views were not worthy in a democratic society and were incompatible with dignity and in conflict with the rights of others
  - (d) The behaviour not only brought herself into disrepute but also the Town Council (as elaborated above).
  
22. The Standards Committee though, considered by way of mitigation the representations put forward by Councillor Marston, those being:
  - (a) Councillor Marston had now admitted the statements made, though it was acknowledged that there was no involvement with the Ombudsman during the course of their investigation.
  - (b) Councillor Marston now acknowledged that her personal reputation had been sullied.
  - (c) The commentary was made at the time when Councillor Marston was recovering from serious personal injuries sustained in a road traffic accident.
  - (d) Councillor Marston acknowledged that she had been in a defensive mode during the aforementioned meetings as she felt she had been under personal attack but is now prepared to apologise to Ms Jones' family and the community. Though the Standards Committee noted though that no apology had appeared to have been made only an indication that an apology would be given. The Standards Committee recognised that this is something that Councillor Marston would have to pursue by herself as the Standards Committee could not legally insist on it.
  - (e) Councillor Marston has undertaken public service for a number of years leading up to this matter and during this period there had been no previous referrals to the Standards Committee.

and accordingly were prepared to reduce the sanction that would be made accordingly in line with the guidance from the Adjudication Panel for Wales.

23. Pursuant to Regulation 9 of the 2001 Regulations, the Standards Committee made a determination that Town Councillor Sheila Marston should be suspended as a Town Councillor for a period of four (4) calendar months from the date that this notice takes effect. This Decision Notice is dated the 26<sup>th</sup> July 2019 and Town Councillor Sheila Marston has 21 calendar days in which to make an appeal. In the event that no appeal is made, the suspension will take effect following 21 day period.

---

[1] Paragraph 2 (1)(d) of the Neath Town Council Member Code of Conduct provides that “save where paragraph 3(a) applies, you [a member] must observe the code of conduct - ... .... (d) at all times and in any capacity, in respect of conduct identified in paragraphs 6(1)(a) and 7”

## Y PWYLLGOR SAFONAU

6 RHAGFYR 2019

<b>CYDYMFFURFIO Â'R CÔD YMDDYGIAD GAN GYNGHORWYR TREF A CHYNGHORWYR CYMUNED</b>		
<b>Yr argymhellion / penderfyniadau allweddol sydd eu hangen:</b> Ystyried yr adroddiad		
<b>Y rhesymau:</b> Mae'r testun dan sylw yn yr adroddiad yn rhan o gylch gorchwyl y Pwyllgor		
Argymhellion / Sylwadau'r Pwyllgor Craffu: Ddim yn berthnasol		
Angen i'r Bwrdd Gweithredol wneud penderfyniad NAC OES Angen i'r Cyngor wneud penderfyniad NAC OES		
<b>YR AELOD O'R BWRDD GWEITHREDOL SY'N GYFRIFOL AM Y PORTFFOLIO:-</b> Y Cynghorydd E Dole (Arweinydd) ac Y Cynghorydd M. Stephens (Dirprwy Arweinydd)		
Y Gyfarwyddiaeth: Y Prif Weithredwr Enw Pennaeth y Gwasanaeth: Linda Rees-Jones Awdur yr Adroddiad: Robert Edgecombe	Swyddi: Pennaeth Gweinyddiaeth a'r Gyfraith Rheolwr Dros Dro y Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol	Rhifau ffôn: 01267 224018 Cyfeiriadau E-bost: RJEdgeco@sirgar.gov.uk

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**STANDARDS COMMITTEE**  
**6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2019**

**CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLIANCE BY  
TOWN AND COMMUNITY COUNCILLORS**

As part of its role in monitoring Code compliance by Town and Community Councillors, the Committee receives reports detailing the levels of code training received, declarations of interest made, dispensation requests granted and Code complaints registered in respect of Town and Community Councils within the County.

A request for this information was submitted to all Town and Community Councils in the County.

The attached spreadsheet sets out the information provided and allows for comparison with previous years.

As can be seen, there continue to be significant variations between councils as to the extent to which declarations of interest are made and/or dispensations sought, although there appears to be no correlation between these factors and the level of code of conduct training provided.

Similarly there appears to be no clear evidence of any correlation between the provision of code training and the number of code complaints nor is there is a consistent pattern of complaints against particular councils.

Unlike in previous years a high proportion of Councils have responded to the request for information. Only 11 councils failed to respond.

Overall however the statistical evidence appears to suggest a generally good level of Code compliance by Town and Community Councillors across the County.

**DETAILED REPORT ATTACHED?**

**YES**

## IMPLICATIONS

I confirm that other than those implications which have been agreed with the appropriate Directors / Heads of Service and are referred to in detail below, there are no other implications associated with this report :

Signed: Linda Rees Jones

Head of Administration and Law

Policy, Crime & Disorder and Equalities	Legal	Finance	ICT	Risk Management Issues	Staffing Implications	Physical Assets
<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>	<b>NONE</b>

## CONSULTATIONS

I confirm that the appropriate consultations have taken in place and the outcomes are as detailed below

Signed: Linda Rees-Jones

Head of Administration and Law

1. **Scrutiny Committee** - Not applicable
2. **Local Member(s)** - Not applicable
3. **Community / Town Council** - Not applicable
4. **Relevant Partners** - Not applicable
5. **Staff Side Representatives and other Organisations** - *Not applicable*

### Section 100D Local Government Act, 1972 – Access to Information

List of Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

**THESE ARE DETAILED BELOW**

Title of Document	File Ref No.	Locations that the papers are available for public inspection
Legal file	DPSC-173	Legal Services, County Hall

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol

Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments (ND=No Data)
Abergwili	Yes	0	0	2	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	1	
Abernant	Yes	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Ammanford Town	Yes	0	0	16	Yes	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Betws	No	0	0	6	ND	0	0	ND	4	0	6	4	
Bronwydd	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Carmarthen Town	Yes	0	0	80	Yes	0	0	76	0	10	0	41	Dispensation applications by 1 Cllr who is also a County Cllr.
Cenarth	Yes	0	0	ND	Yes	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
Cilycwm	No	0	0	1	ND	0	0	ND	3	0	0	12	
Cilymaenllwyd	ND	0	0	ND	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	All Cllrs provided with County Council code training presentation
Cwmamman Town	No	1	1	29	Yes	0	0	22	6	0	0	41	
Cynwyl Elfed	No	0	0	27	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	

## Tudalen 56

Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments
Cynwyl Gaeo	Yes	0	0	1	No	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Dyffryn Cennen	Yes	0	0	16	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	9	
Eglwys Gymyn	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	2	0	0	ND	
Gorslas	Yes	0	0	30	No	18	0	39	0	0	0	40	
Henllan Fallteg	Yes	0	0	5	Yes	0	0	5	1	0	0	2	
Kidwelly Town	Yes	1	1	ND	Yes	0	0	35	4	3	0	29	
Laugharne Town	Yes	0	0	11	Yes	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Llanarthne	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Llanboidy	Yes	7	0	34	Yes	0	0	ND	2	0	0	37	
Llanddarog	Yes	0	0	3	Yes	0	0	16	3	4	0	13	
Llanddeusant	Yes	0	0	4	No	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	



Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments
Llanddowror & Llanmiloe	Yes	0	0	3	ND	0	2	ND	2	0	0	2	
Llandeilo Town	Yes	1	0	ND	YES	0	0	ND	8	1	0	21	
Llandovery Town	No	0	0	16	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	8	
Llandybie	Yes	4	0	21	No	4	0	21	0	0	0	6	
Llandyfaelog	Yes	0	0	19	Yes	0	0	25	9	0	0	20	
Llanedi	Yes	0	0	21	Yes	0	0	13	8	0	3	17	
Llanegwad	Yes	0	0	14	Yes	0	0	14	2	0	0	0	
Llanelli Rural	Yes	0	6	45	Yes	0	1	53	1	0	1	19	
Llanelli Town	Yes	0	1	23	Yes	0	0	44	19	0	0	41	Code training provided by One Voice Wales
Llanfair ar y Bryn	No	0	0	4	No	0	0	8	0	0	0	9	
Llanfihangel Aberbythych	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	
Llanfihangel ar Arth	Yes	0	0	7	Yes	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	

## Tudalen 58

Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments
Llanfihangel Rhos y Corn	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Llanfynydd	Yes	0	0	3	ND	0	0	ND	2	0	0	5	
Llangadog	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	7	
Llangain	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Llangathen	Yes	0	0	6	ND	0	0	ND	3	0	0	5	
Llangeler	No	0	0	20	Yes	0	0	33	3	0	0	38	
Llangennech	No	0	2	9	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	5	All Cllrs have received copies of County Council code training presentation
Llangyndeyrn	No	0	0	38	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	27	
Llangunnor	Yes	0	0	4	YES	0	0	ND	4	0	1	13	
Llangynin	No	0	0	1	Yes	0	0	ND	2	0	0	0	
Llangynog	Yes	0	0	0	No	0	0	4	1	0	0	6	

Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments
Llanllawddog	ND	0	0	ND	No	0	0	3	1	0	0	7	
Llanllwni	Yes	Yes	0	5	ND	0	0	ND	1	0	0	12	
Llannon	Yes	0	0	5	Yes	0	0	23	5	0	0	23	
Llanpumsaint	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Llansadwrn	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	8	
Llansawel	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	7	
Llansteffan & Llanybri	Yes	0	0	ND	YES	1	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Llanwinio	No	0	0	2	No	0	0	9	1	0	0	2	
Llanwrda	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	1	
Llanybydder	No	0	0	11	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	5	
Llanycrwys	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	

Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments
Manordeilo & Salem	No	0	0	12	Yes	0	0	12	5	2	0	24	
Meidrim	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	3	
Myddfai	No	0	0	3	Yes	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	
Newcastle Emlyn Town	No	0	0	18	No	0	0	31	1	0	0	19	
Newchurch & Merthyr	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	1	
Pembrey & Burry Port Town	Yes	0	0	ND	YES	0	14	80	0	0	15	77	
Pencarreg	ND	0	0	ND	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Pendine	Yes	0	0	0	ND	0	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Pontyberem	No	0	0	6	ND	0	0	ND	2	0	0	1	

Council	Code Training 2016/2017	Dispensations 2016/2017	Code Complaints 2016/2017	Declarations 2016/2017	Code Training 2017/2018	Dispensations 2017/2018	Code Complaints 2017/2018	Declarations 2017/2018	Code training 2018/2019	Dispensations 2018/2019	Code Complaints 2018/2019	Declarations 2018/2019	Comments
Quarter Bach	Yes	0	0	43	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	27	
St. Clears Town	Yes	0	0	7	Yes	0	0	7	6	2	0	18	
St. Ishmael	ND	0	0	ND	Yes	1	0	ND	ND	0	0	ND	
Talley	Yes	0	0	ND	Yes	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	
Trelech a'r Betws	No	0	0	0	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	
Trimsaran	Yes	0	0	1	Yes	0	0	9	0	0	0	15	
Whitland Town	Yes	0	0	4	Yes	0	0	3	9	6	0	11	

Mae'r dudalen hon yn wag yn fwriadol