

Appendix A

Standards investigation finds six councillors breached code over ‘Trigger Me Timbers’ WhatsApp group

An independent investigator has said six councillors have breached Tameside Council's code of conduct over their involvement in a controversial group chat which garnered national attention and led to local MP Andrew Gwynne being suspended from the Labour Party. The investigation by Linda Comstive followed a series of complaints to the council about the conduct of councillors who participated in the group chat named ‘Trigger me Timbers’ (TMT).

The leak revealed that almost 40,000 messages were exchanged in the group between January 2019 and April 2022. Participants included six Labour councillors: Brenda Warrington, Allison Gwynne, George Newton, Claire Reid, Jack Naylor and George Jones. The investigator concluded that the councillors were acting in their official capacity by sending messages in the group, as some of the correspondence concerned council business and took place during council meetings.

Comstive also stated that the “fact that the communication is by WhatsApp does not mean it cannot be investigated under the Code”, adding: “The Code applies when a councillor is engaging in media activity including the use of social media.”

In addition, the report said that while some councillors claimed the conversations were private, the councillors were not necessarily acting outside of their capacity as council members.

It continued: “Council proceedings are often carried out in private as exempt business, but there is always the potential for it to get in the public domain, including by leaks.

“TMT was leaked into the public domain in February 2025 and there is public interest in it because of its offensive content and who was involved in it.”

Among the most serious findings, the report said Cllr George Newton made “several remarks” in the group chat “that a reasonable person would find racist” towards Navendu Mishra MP.

It stated that Cllr Newton also “appeared to joke about the MP’s accent or use of English”, and that some messages he sent “could be considered discriminatory on grounds of race against members of the public”.

The investigator concluded that Cllr Newton breached four paragraphs of the code of conduct, relating to a failure to treat councillors and members of the public with respect, bullying, failure to promote equality, and conduct bringing the council into disrepute. When interviewed by the investigator, Newton said: “Looking at it now, I’d admit it was childish behaviour.”

This was in reference to some of the messages he had sent. However, he maintained that the comments were made in a "private conversation on a private messaging platform, that were maliciously leaked to the media".

According to a report from The Guardian, it is understood that Newton intends to apologise for the messages but will dispute the investigator's interpretation of the private texts in a group where there was "obviously a power dynamic at play".

The investigation into Cllr Jack Naylor meanwhile found that he had breached four aspects of the code.

Two of the breaches in Cllr Naylor's case stemmed from what the report described as an "antisemitic" joke shared in the group chat.

The Guardian has reported that Cllr Naylor is set to tell councillors his comment was "ill-judged and inappropriate" but strongly contests any accusation of antisemitism.

In a written statement, he offered a "full and unequivocal" apology and added: "There is no justification for my involvement, irrespective of any inexperience – I take full responsibility for my actions; and for any offence caused, regardless of my intent, I am truly sorry."

The report found that Cllr Claire Reid breached three paragraphs of the code, having "bullied a member of the Labour Party", failed to "show respect to various members of the public", and behaved in a way that could reasonably be regarded as bringing the council into disrepute.

Cllr Reid, who created the group chat, responded to the investigator's questions by email. When asked about the derogatory chats, she stated that the "vast majority" of her contributions to the group involved "organising for meetings, ensuring we have the numbers for votes and making sure the rules are correctly applied".

The investigator highlighted some messages sent by Reid, which included swear words and insults aimed at individuals.

Reid told the investigator that some of the messages were in response to "the hideous abuse I received at the hands of these members", adding that she "offloaded in a private forum".

All six councillors under investigation were found to have breached provisions of the code relating to bringing the council into disrepute and treating other councillors and members of the public with respect.

The report also found that Cllr Brenda Warrington breached the code by misusing council resources after using a council-owned mobile phone, paid for with public funds, to participate in the group chat.

"TMT included chats on Council business and for political purposes; the latter is misuse of council resources," the report said.

Cllr Warrington told the investigation that it "was never my intention to offend anyone, and I apologise for any comments I may have made in the chat that has resulted in upset".

However, she said that the "responsibility for the offence lies with those persons who, for malicious reasons chose to leak the chat to the press".

In a statement given to the Local Democracy Reporting Service, Cllr Warrington said she would like to "offer apology to anyone who genuinely feels offended, hurt or upset by any comment that I have made in the private chat.

"It was never the intention that people be offended, hurt or upset. I do have a range of questions that I will be seeking to raise at the hearing of the Standards Sub Committee which will include the scope of the investigation, the process and also the cost, and so at this stage I do not wish to comment further until the hearing."

The investigator concluded that Cllr Allison Gwynne - in addition to breaching the requirements to treat other councillors and members of the public with respect, and not conduct herself in a manner, which could reasonably be regarded as bringing her office or the council into disrepute - failed to cooperate with the code of conduct investigation.

Cllr Gwynne did not respond to the investigation, but has been approached for comment. Cllr Jones, who was 18 years old when he first joined the chat, told the investigator that "in hindsight I wish I had not been involved and sincerely apologise".

He added: "I put it down to my youth and lack of experience. I am truly sorry and genuinely mean all that I have said about how it makes me feel. It has been a terrible few months. I am very sorry for everything, and I have more experience now and like to think I would now behave totally differently."

The investigator said: "In my opinion, Cllr GJ is genuinely sorry for his chats and participation in the TMT and the upset it has caused."

Adam Carey – Local Government Lawyer

Councillor who “made up his mind” ahead of planning vote breached code of conduct

A councillor who voiced opposition to a planning application in a consultation response ahead of voting on it breached Wokingham Borough Council's code of conduct, a standards panel has concluded.

Cllr Stuart Munro voiced "strong objections" to the 81-home application in a consultation response, claiming the development constituted inappropriate development, would put pressure on existing infrastructure, and lead to traffic problems.

He then took part in a discussion and voted against the planning application in January 2024.

The complaint alleged that Cllr Munro should have declared an interest in one of the items on the agenda of a planning committee meeting held in January 2024.

It argued that Cllr Munro had "made up his mind" in advance to oppose the planning application and "that he was provided advice, which shows that he knew there was a risk he had fettered his discretion, and then ignored that advice by voting".

This left the council open to a finding of maladministration or other challenges and constituted a breach of the members code of conduct, the complaint added.

According to a report by the BBC, Cllr Munro said he felt the decision was "nonsense". He said he submitted his comments about the application a year before they were included in the committee's papers and that he did not participate in its discussion about it.

The BBC report said Cllr Munro added that the application was amended after he had submitted his comments and before the committee rejected it.

A decision notice said that the panel agreed with the conclusions reached by an investigating officer that Cllr Munro should have declared an interest relating to the planning item and not participated in the debate or voted on the application.

"This would have been in accordance with the legal advice Councillor Munro received prior to the meeting," it said.

The panel instructed Wokingham's monitoring officer to arrange appropriate training for Cllr Munro on declaration of interests.

It also "noted the investigating officer's conclusion that this is a complex area of law, and the concept of predetermination is not straightforward".

Adam Carey – Local Government Lawyer

City council rebukes parish for "unprecedented volume" of standards complaints

A parish council responsible for an "unprecedented volume" of standards complaints has been asked to contribute to the costs of standards investigations.

In a letter sent to Kents Hill and Monkston Parish Council, the chair of Milton Keynes City Council's Standards Committee, Cllr Mandy Legg, said the circumstances had resulted in a "disproportionate pull on the City Council's resources".

According to the correspondence, the parish is responsible for 64% of all parish council complaints received during this financial year, despite the number of electors registered in the parish comprising less than 3% of those in the local authority area.

The complaints have thus far resulted in two investigations commissioned by the monitoring officer, incurring costs to the city council of over £10,000.

Cllr Legg also predicted that the associated cost of consulting Independent Persons was likely to be in excess of £3,000.

The letter said that Milton Keynes has previously resolved to ask whether the Parish Council would consider contributing towards the investigation costs currently borne by the city council.

It also recommended that the parish council promote "preventative and holistic measures such as mediation, training, and governance reviews as opposed to relying only on the complaints process".

"In our experience, this is a better way of addressing the issues being presented and a more comprehensive approach may result in individual councillors reflecting on the benefits of progressing live complaints," Cllr Legg added.

The letter was highlighted in a report on standards complaints, which is set to be discussed by members of the Standards Committee on Wednesday (14 January).

The report stated that the parish council undertook to discuss the letter at a future meeting, and the Standards Committee will be updated when a response has been received.

Adam Carey – Local Government Lawyer

Auditors tell council to address abusive behaviour in meetings for second year in row

The external auditors for Teignbridge District Council have retained a statutory recommendation calling on the council to address "swearing" and abusive behaviour towards officers and members during meetings.

Grant Thornton issued the statutory recommendation alongside three key recommendations in 2023/24 after finding significant weakness in arrangements for standards, behaviour and decision-making at the council.

The statutory recommendation called on the council to adopt a zero-tolerance approach to any swearing, lack of respect for other people attending meetings, or other abusive behaviour towards other members or officers in meetings.

"This should be done by making full use of the procedural rules set out in the Council's constitution by: Immediately adjourning the meeting; moving a motion that the member concerned be not heard; or moving a motion that the member concerned should leave the meeting," it added.

It also recommended the council commission an expert to investigate the underlying causes of member behaviours in order to assist in the creation of an action plan.

In a value for money assessment for 2024/25 published on 8 December, auditors said the council is currently in the process of procuring an expert to assist with analysing and addressing causes of bad behaviour.

It also noted that amendments to the constitution concerning meetings and motions had been approved in May 2025, a member conduct review had been commenced, and new members had been appointed to the Governance Committee.

A governance action plan is also in place, according to the report.

Commenting on the changes, the auditors said: "Our prior year statutory recommendation remains in place, but we recognise that progress is being made. Root causes of issues and complaints, and the ability of Group Leaders to take responsibility for their groups, now need to be addressed."

Auditors meanwhile retained a key recommendation on councillor access to information after finding an instance in which members had breached confidentiality.

The 2023/24 recommendation reported that "members do not always understand which aspects of council business they do or do not have access to by law".

Writing in this year's update, auditors noted an instance in which members used council information to stage a protest against the council and a project by the developer Vistry. "This was a breach of confidentiality," it noted.

The second retained key recommendation stated that the council should review its decision-making arrangements at the Executive Committee and Full Council levels.

It said the council should stick to decisions once they are made in order to ensure projects can proceed as required, referencing a £500k write-off which came after abandoning a cinema project.

Commenting on progress against this recommendation, auditors acknowledged the findings of an LGA Peer Review, which said that decision-making arrangements had improved, given the lack of significant last-minute changes to recommendations in meetings.

"However, they also reported that there were still concerns around one meeting not being as easy as expected; and the way officer advice is given and challenged on the planning committee," auditors added.

Grant Thornton meanwhile closed its third key recommendation, which concerned declarations of interest and investigations.

It said a 'declarations of interest audit' has now taken place, and the report and recommendations were received in October 2025, in line with the recommendation issued last year.

Adam Carey – Local Government Lawyer

Councillor behind anonymous 'poison pen' letters sentenced

Magistrates have handed a former Liverpool City Council member who sent anonymous 'poison pen' letters to a colleague a restraining order and community order.

Merseyside Police charged Gerrard Woodhouse with harassment without violence in September after allegations emerged that he had sent up to 100 abusive letters between 2023 and 2025 to a fellow Labour Party member, Christine Banks.

At a hearing last month, Liverpool Magistrates' Court heard that the pair had fallen out while serving on the city council's licensing committee, according to a BBC report.

Woodhouse's letters contained foul language and abuse directed at Banks. His solicitor said he had severe mental health problems at the time of the offences.

His involvement was uncovered after forensic evidence linked the councillor to the letters. The judiciary confirmed that he was sentenced yesterday.

His community order is to last 18 months and includes 30 'Rehabilitation Activity Requirement Days'.

He was also fined £300 and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £114 alongside prosecution costs of £85.

In addition, a total of £499 is to be deducted from his benefits.

The restraining order was issued under section 360 of the Sentencing Act 2020 and is to last until further order.

He must not contact, approach or make reference to Banks, directly or indirectly and via electronic means, including all social media.

Adam Carey – Local Government Lawyer



7 October 2025

MEDIA RELEASE

ARGYLL & BUTE COUNCILLOR CRITICISED FOR BEING DISRESPECTFUL BUT CLEARED OF BREACH OF CODE OF CONDUCT

At a Hearing held online on 7 October 2025, Argyll & Bute Councillor Tommy Macpherson was found by the Standards Commission, on the face of it, to have breached the provision in the Councillors' Code of Conduct that requires elected members to treat others with courtesy and respect, in a Facebook post published in September 2024. The Standards Commission's Hearing Panel found, however, that a restriction on Cllr Macpherson's right to freedom of expression could not be justified in the specific circumstances of the case and, therefore, that a formal finding of breach could not be made.

Ms Helen Donaldson, Standards Commission Member and Chair of the Hearing Panel, said: *"The Panel heard it was not in dispute that in September 2024, Cllr Macpherson shared, on his Facebook page, a post published by a group called by 'Glasgow Friends of Israel', along with a quote taken from it that stated he had landed in trouble as a result of being an outspoken and unashamed supporter of Israel. The Panel noted that the Glasgow Friends of Israel post, shared by the Respondent, included a statement that a "certain Israel hater in Argyll who's a member of an Argyll and Bute Palestinian society", had decided to walk into a council meeting and complain about Cllr Macpherson. The Glasgow Friends of Israel post further stated that Cllr Macpherson then found himself being investigated by the Ethical Standards Commissioner (ESC), whereas the "nasty Israel hater has ties and a strong affiliation to proscribed terrorist organisations".*

The Panel noted that the post concerned Glasgow Friends of Israel's comments on a complaint made to the ESC about Cllr Macpherson. The Panel agreed that it was apparent Cllr Macpherson posted the quote from, and link to, the Glasgow Friends of Israel post in order to draw attention to it and promote its contents. In the circumstances, the Panel agreed Cllr Macpherson's post would be reasonably regarded as endorsing the Glasgow Friends of Israel post in its entirety, even if that had not been his intention.

The Panel noted that the Glasgow Friends of Israel post did not name the individual it had accused of being a "nasty Israel hater" who had "ties and a strong affiliation to proscribed terrorist organisations". The Panel noted, however, that the post referred to the individual as having complained about Cllr Macpherson in a council meeting. The Panel noted that council meetings are held in public and, further, that there had been press coverage of the complaint the individual made. The Panel further noted that Cllr Macpherson had advised the ESC's office, during its investigation, that the individual had "long relinquished" their right to anonymity. The Panel was satisfied, therefore, that it was accepted the individual was readily identifiable.

The Panel was further satisfied that it was objectively disrespectful to endorse a post where a readily identifiable member of the public was accused of having ties and a strong affiliation to terrorist organisations, when there was no evidence the individual in question had been investigated, charged or convicted with any related offence. The Panel therefore concluded that Cllr Macpherson had, on the face of it, breached the respect and courtesy provisions in the Code in respect of the post.

The Panel accepted nevertheless that, as a politician posting about a matter of public concern, being the fact that a complaint had been made about him in his capacity as an elected member, Cllr Macpherson was entitled to enhanced protection in respect of his right to freedom of expression, under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In assessing whether a restriction on this right could be justified, the Panel noted that the Courts have found that, in such a context, a degree of the shocking, non-rational and even aggressive, that would not be acceptable outside that context, should be tolerated.

In this case, the Panel accepted that the accusation about the member of the public having ties and a strong affiliation to terrorist organisations could be taken as being a value judgement or opinion. The Panel was satisfied that it had not been presented with any evidence whatsoever the individual in question had been investigated, charged or convicted with any related offence or anything that could reasonably be regarded as being a sufficient basis in fact for an accusation of such a serious nature.

The Panel nevertheless noted that, by appearing at a Council meeting where a motion on the conflict in the Middle East was being considered, the member of the public had essentially already put herself and her views into the public domain. The Panel agreed that given the contentious nature and strength of views on both sides of the conflict, it would be reasonable for her to expect that, in doing so, she might be the subject of some negative commentary (albeit not necessarily from an elected representative).

The Panel acknowledged, however, that while Cllr Macpherson shared the Glasgow Friends of Israel post containing the statement about the individual in question, he had neither authored it himself nor specifically named them. The Panel further noted that the Respondent had edited his post to remove the link to the Glasgow Friends of Israel post, when advised that the ESC was investigating the matter.

Having taken into account the context and factors outlined above, the Panel determined, on balance, that Cllr Macpherson's conduct was not so excessive as to justify, as proportionate, a restriction on his enhanced right to freedom of expression. The Panel concluded, therefore, that a formal finding of a breach of the Code could not be made.

Ms Donaldson stated: *"the Panel wishes to emphasise, nonetheless, that the Standards Commission and, indeed the public, expect councillors, to lead by example and be courteous and respectful at all times, including when publishing content on social media. The Panel noted a failure to do so can have a detrimental impact on the standards of public debate and can erode public confidence in both elected members and the local authorities they represent."*

A full written decision of the Hearing will be issued and published on the Standards Commission's website within 14 days.

ENDS

NOTES FOR EDITORS

1. Complaints about councillors are made to the Ethical Standards Commissioner (ESC). The Standards Commission and ESC are separate and independent, each with distinct functions. The ESC is responsible for investigating complaints. Following investigation, the ESC will refer its report to the Standards Commission for Scotland for adjudication. Email: info@ethicalstandards.org.uk, <https://www.ethicalstandards.org.uk/>
Tel: 0300 011 0550
2. The [Standards Commission for Scotland](#) is an independent public body, responsible for encouraging high standards of behaviour by councillors and those appointed to boards of devolved public bodies including in education, environment, health, culture, transport, and justice. The role of the Standards Commission is to encourage high ethical standards in public life; promote and enforce the Codes of Conduct; issue guidance to councils and devolved public bodies and adjudicate on alleged breaches of the Codes of Conduct, applying sanctions where a breach is found.
3. The [Codes of Conduct](#) outline the standards of conduct expected of councillors and members of devolved public bodies. In local authorities, there is one Code of Conduct, approved by Scottish Parliament, which applies to all 1227 councillors elected to Scotland's 32 Local Authorities.



4 November 2025

MEDIA RELEASE

HIGHLAND COUNCILLOR SUSPENDED FOR A BREACH OF THE CODE OF CONDUCT

At a Hearing held online on 4 November 2025, Highland Councillor, Michael Baird, was found to have breached the Councillors' Code of Conduct. The Standards Commission suspended his entitlement to attend full Council meetings for two months. This was for failing to declare an interest at a meeting of the Sutherland County Committee on 23 January 2024.

Suzanne Vestri, Standards Commission Convener and Chair of the Hearing Panel, said: "The Panel found that Cllr Baird failed to declare a non-financial interest in relation to a grant application by made by a community interest company for funds from the Council's Community Regeneration Fund and, instead, took part in the discussion and decision-making. This was despite him having a friendship and a client / legal representative relationship with the company's sole director, and despite him having written a letter supporting the development of her property, that had been included in the papers submitted in support of the application".

The Panel acknowledged that Cllr Baird did not vote in favour of the application at the meeting. It further accepted there was no evidence of any benefit to the community interest company or its director from Cllr Baird's failure to declare an interest. The Panel nevertheless considered that, having applied the objective test as required by the Code, Cllr Baird should have reached the view that his connection to the director of the applicant company would reasonably be regarded as being so significant to the application to be considered, as to be likely to affect his potential discussion and decision-making at the meeting.

In support of this conclusion, the Panel noted it was evident from the fact that the Chair of the Committee had questioned, at the meeting, whether the Respondent should declare an interest, that he, the Chair, had such a perception. Indeed, the Panel noted that the Respondent appeared to have advised during the investigation process that he would have declared an interest had he been aware before the meeting that the letter was included in the paperwork submitted in support of the application.

The Panel agreed, therefore, that Cllr Baird should have declared an interest, withdrawn from the meetings and taken no part in the discussion and decision-making on the specific matter in question. The Panel found that his failure to do so amounted to a breach of the Code.

In reaching its decision on sanction, the Hearing Panel noted that Cllr Baird had co-operated with the investigative and Hearing processes. The Panel also noted the Respondent's commitment to his constituency and constituents.

The Panel agreed, nevertheless, that Cllr Baird should have been aware that the objective test was one of perception and that he should have considered how members of the public might reasonably view his connection to the director of the applicant company and whether this was likely to influence his discussion and decision-making at the meeting. The Panel agreed this was particularly the case given he was reminded, at the meeting, about the need to declare any interest.

In the circumstances, the Panel agreed that it was necessary to impose a suspension in order to reflect the nature of the breach, to promote adherence to the Code and to maintain and improve the public's confidence that councillors will comply with the Codes and will be held accountable if they fail to do so. The Panel determined that a suspension of two months was appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances.

Ms Vestri noted: "The Panel emphasised that the requirement for councillors to declare interests is a fundamental requirement of the Code as it gives the public confidence that decisions are being made in the public interest, and not the personal interest of any councillor or their friends, family or close associates. A failure to comply with the Code's requirements in this regard can erode confidence in the Council and leave its decisions open to legal challenge."

A full written decision of the Hearing will be issued and published on the Standards Commission's website within 14 days.

ENDS

NOTES FOR EDITORS

1. Complaints about councillors are made to the Ethical Standards Commissioner (ESC). The Standards Commission and ESC are separate and independent, each with distinct functions. The ESC is responsible for investigating complaints. Following investigation, the ESC will refer its report to the Standards Commission for Scotland for adjudication. Email: info@ethicalstandards.org.uk, <https://www.ethicalstandards.org.uk/> Tel: 0300 011 0550
2. The [Standards Commission for Scotland](#) is an independent public body, responsible for encouraging high standards of behaviour by councillors and those appointed to boards of devolved public bodies including in education, environment, health, culture, transport, and justice. The role of the Standards Commission is to encourage high ethical standards in public life; promote and enforce the Codes of Conduct; issue guidance to councils and devolved public bodies and adjudicate on alleged breaches of the Codes of Conduct, applying sanctions where a breach is found.
3. The [Codes of Conduct](#) outline the standards of conduct expected of councillors and members of devolved public bodies. In local authorities, there is one Code of Conduct, approved by Scottish Parliament, which applies to all 1227 councillors elected to Scotland's 32 Local Authorities.



23 October 2025

MEDIA RELEASE

ARGYLL & BUTE COUNCILLOR SUSPENDED FOR BREACH OF CODE OF CONDUCT

At a Hearing held online on 23 October 2025, the Standards Commission suspended, for one month, an elected member of Argyll & Bute Council, Cllr Liz McCabe. This was after she was found to have breached the Councillors' Code of Conduct.

Morag Ferguson, Standards Commission Member and Chair of the Hearing Panel, said:

"The Panel found that, in a social media post published in May 2024, Cllr McCabe was disrespectful towards a relatively junior council officer and criticised their performance and capability in public."

The Panel heard that it was not in dispute that when a member of the public posted a comment on Facebook saying "our beautiful flower beds! What is happening to our town?", Cllr McCabe replied, stating "nothing has been done since Joe retired in November. It is absolutely shocking. That's what happens when someone who has no experience gets the job and doesn't have a clue." The Panel further noted it was not in dispute that 'Joe' was Cllr McCabe's husband.

The Panel noted that Cllr McCabe's position was that she had not intended her comments to be disrespectful and that they were directed towards the Council rather than any individual. The Panel noted, however, that Cllr McCabe referred, in her post, to the person who replaced the retired postholder as having "no experience" or "clue". The Panel was satisfied that, given this, it would be reasonable for anyone viewing the post to consider it was directed at the individual postholder who was now in the role, rather than the Council itself.

The Panel noted that Cllr McCabe did not name the individual postholder. The Panel considered, however, that the officer in question was readily identifiable. This was because:

- there was evidence members of the public had been able to identify him;
- the officer's wife's colleague took a screenshot of the post indicating council officers were also able to identify him); and
- Only five Council officers were responsible for the work referenced, with only one based in Bute. Therefore, it would be apparent which one had replaced 'Joe'.

The Panel was of the view that by saying the individual had no experience or clue, Cllr McCabe was inferring they should not have got the job. The Panel considered this was inherently disrespectful to the officer in question. The Panel was further of the view that Cllr McCabe implied, in the post, that the officer was responsible for the "absolutely shocking" state of the flowerbeds and the alleged failure to do anything about this. The Panel was therefore satisfied that it would be reasonable for anyone reading the post to perceive it as amounting to public criticism of both the individual officer's performance and capability.

The Panel concluded, therefore, that Cllr McCabe had breached the provisions in the Code that require councillors to be respectful and to refrain from criticising their performance, conduct or capability in public.

In determining the sanction to be imposed, the Panel noted it had found Cllr McCabe's comments were personal in nature and amounted to an unwarranted, egregious and offensive personal attack on an officer. The Panel considered that it would have been entirely possible for Cllr McCabe to express dissatisfaction with the Council's performance without undermining and demeaning the officer in public. The Panel was disappointed to note Cllr McCabe had not demonstrated insight into how her comment may have affected the officer in question (in terms of his confidence and reputation) and, instead, had indicated at the Hearing that she considered it should have resulted in an improvement in his performance.

The Panel nevertheless acknowledged, in mitigation, that the conduct in question was essentially limited to the one social media post that had been removed quickly and, as such, was limited in duration. The Panel further noted that Cllr McCabe had co-operated with the investigative and Hearing processes and had not been the subject of any previous finding of a previous contravention of the Code. It also acknowledged Cllr McCabe's contribution to her town and public life in general. The Panel was pleased to note Cllr McCabe deleted the post shortly after posting it and accepted it was the result of her being frustrated and angry at the time.

In the circumstances and context, the Panel concluded, on balance, that a full suspension of one month was the appropriate sanction.

Mrs Ferguson stated: *"the requirements for elected members to treat council officers with respect, and to refrain from criticising their performance, conduct or capability in public are key provisions in the Councillors' Code. The Panel noted that a failure to comply with the Code's requirements in this regard can have a detrimental impact on officers and can also erode the mutual bond of trust and confidence, between them and councillors, that allows local government to function effectively."*

A full written decision of the Hearing will be issued and published on the Standards Commission's website within 14 days.

ENDS

NOTES FOR EDITORS

1. Complaints about councillors are made to the Ethical Standards Commissioner (ESC). The Standards Commission and ESC are separate and independent, each with distinct functions. The ESC is responsible for investigating complaints. Following investigation, the ESC will refer its report to the Standards Commission for Scotland for adjudication. Email: info@ethicalstandards.org.uk, <https://www.ethicalstandards.org.uk/> Tel: 0300 011 0550
2. The [Standards Commission for Scotland](https://www.ethicalstandards.org.uk/) is an independent public body, responsible for encouraging high standards of behaviour by councillors and those appointed to boards of devolved public bodies including in education, environment, health, culture, transport, and justice. The role of the Standards Commission is to encourage high ethical standards in public life; promote and enforce the Codes of Conduct; issue guidance to councils and devolved public bodies and adjudicate on alleged breaches of the Codes of Conduct, applying sanctions where a breach is found.
3. The Codes of Conduct outline the standards of conduct expected of councillors and members of devolved public bodies. In local authorities, there is one [Code of Conduct](#), approved by Scottish Parliament, which applies to all 1227 councillors elected to Scotland's 32 Local Authorities.



PANEL DYFARNU CYMRU
ADJUDICATION PANEL FOR WALES

**PANEL DYFARNU CYMRU
ADJUDICATION PANEL FOR WALES**

NOTICE OF DECISION

TRIBUNAL REFERENCE NUMBER: APW/001/2025-026/CT

RESPONDENT: Former Councillor Iwan Huws

RELEVANT AUTHORITY: Gwynedd County Council

1. A Case Tribunal convened by the President of the Adjudication Panel for Wales has considered a reference in respect of the above Respondent.
2. The Adjudication Panel for Wales received a referral from the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales in relation to allegations made against Former Councillor Huws that he had breached the Gwynedd County Council Code of Conduct by accepting a Conditional Caution for the offence of “Fraud by misuse of office” in an attempt to defraud his employer by the misuse of money. It was considered reasonable that a conditional caution and the Member’s misconduct brought his office and his County Council into disrepute.
3. The Case Tribunal determined its adjudication by way of written evidence and representations at a meeting on 17 December 2025 which was held by way of remote video-conferencing. The Case Tribunal unanimously found that the Councillor had acted in breach of the Code as set out in paragraph 2 above.
4. The Case Tribunal concluded by unanimous decision that the former Councillor should be disqualified from acting as a member for any relevant authority, as defined by section 49(6) of the Local Government Act 2000, for a period of 3 years.
5. The Authority and its Standards Committee are notified accordingly.
6. The Respondent has the right to seek the leave of the High Court to appeal the above decision.
7. The Case Tribunal made no recommendations to the Authority.

Signed..... Meleri Tudur Date...17 December 2025.....

Judge Meleri Tudur
President of the Adjudication Panel for Wales and Chair of the Case Tribunal

Dr G Jones
Panel Member

Mrs S McRobie
Panel Member