

| CYNGOR SIR YNYS MON / ISLE OF ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL |  |
|---|--|
| <b>COMMITTEE:</b>                                     | <b>Standards Committee</b>   |
| <b>DATE:</b>  | <b>22 January 2026</b>   |
| <b>REPORT TITLE:</b>                                  | <b>Decisions by the Adjudication Panel for Wales</b>   |
| <b>PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:</b>                         | <b>To provide information about the matters considered by the Adjudication Panel for Wales and published between 1 June 2025 and December 2025</b> |
| <b>REPORT BY:</b>                                     | <b>Lisa Lord<br/>Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer (Locum)<br/>lisalord@ynysmon.llyw.cymru</b>                                  |
| <b>LINK OFFICER:</b>                                  | <b>Lynn Ball<br/>Director of Function (Council Business) / Monitoring Officer<br/>lbxcs@ynysmon.llyw.cymru</b>                                     |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Adjudication Panel for Wales (APW) was established by the Local Government Act 2000. It has two statutory functions:

1. To form case tribunals, or interim case tribunals, to consider reports from the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales (PSOW) following investigations by the PSOW into allegations that a member has failed to comply with their authority's code of conduct; and
2. To consider appeals from members against the decisions of their own authority's standards committee that they have breached the code of conduct (as well as deciding if permission will be given to appeal in the first instance).

This report includes decisions published by the APW during the period 1 June 2025 until December 2025. It is intended as a factual summary of the matters decided by the APW. The reported cases for the relevant period are currently available on the APW website and links to the individual cases are provided below.

It is important to note that cases are largely fact specific, however learning has been noted where appropriate.

## **2. SUMMARY OF THE RELEVANT CASES**

A summary of the relevant cases is detailed in **ENCLOSURE 1**.

## **3. RECOMMENDATION**

To note the content of the case summaries.

### **ENCLOSURE:**

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | A summary of the cases published on the <u>Adjudication Panel for Wales (APW)</u> website for the period from 1 June 2025 – December 2025. |
|----|--|

## ENCLOSURE 1

### Summary of Cases before the Adjudication Panel for Wales: June 2025 – December 2025

| Case Details  | Key facts  | Key findings /Outcome  | Learning   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Name:</b> Councillor Ian Perry</p> <p><b>Reference number:</b> APW/002/2024-025/AT</p> <p><b>Relevant authority:</b> St Nicholas &amp; Bonvilston Community Council</p> <p><b>Nature of allegation:</b> Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c) and 6(1)(a).</p> <p><a href="#">apw-decision-cllr-ian-perry.pdf</a></p> | <p>It was determined that the <b>Standards Committee had not explained in its decision letter how it had evaluated evidence and had not set out clear reasons</b> to support its decisions and as such the appeal was allowed to proceed on specific grounds.</p> <p>The Standards Committee found</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the Member breached paragraph 4(b) and 4(c) of the Code</li> <li>▪ An e-mail sent on 5 July 2021 was intended to intimidate the Clerk</li> <li>▪ the failure to provide appropriate responses or information and his defensive tone evidenced a lack of transparency in his</li> </ul> | <p>Found no breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c) and 6(1)(a) of the Council's Code of Conduct.</p> <p><b>Overturning the determination of the Standards Committee</b> that the Appellant had breached above paragraphs.</p> <p>The Tribunal found</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ that the wording of the e-mail of 5 July 2025 was <b>consistent with an ongoing conversation</b> between the Appellant and the former Locum Clerk, recounting a difficult experience from the past which involved a former clerk, and an issue in relation to the former Monitoring Officer. It was not consistent with the notion of being a 'shot</li> </ul> | <p>For the avoidance of doubt, <b>the Appeal Tribunal confirmed that Regulation 9(1) of the 2001 Regulations does not include power for a Standards Committee to impose a training requirement upon a member as part of a sanction following a finding of breach of the Code.</b> The Regulation specifies the four determinations available to the Standards Committee, and ordering attendance at training is not amongst the determinations available to the Committee.</p> |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>dealings with requests for information from members, amounting to a breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code.</p>  | <p>across the bows' or a 'veiled threat' against an experienced and valued Clerk or an attempt to threaten, harass, bully or undermine her</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ in all the circumstances Tribunal did not consider that the Member's 'defensive tone' of response, or 'lack of transparency' as identified in the Standards Committee reasons for its decision could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Appellant's office or authority into disrepute in breach of Paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><b>Name:</b> Former Councillor Andrew Edwards</p> <p><b>Reference number:</b> APW/004/2024-025/CT</p> <p><b>Relevant authority:</b> Pembrokeshire County Council</p> <p><b>Nature of allegation:</b> Breach</p> | <p>It was <b>alleged that the Member recorded a racist voice note</b> and sent it to his then partner via the "WhatsApp" messaging application and secondly, had <b>shared information relating to</b></p> | <p>Breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Council's Code of Conduct. The tribunal therefore found by unanimous decision that the Respondent should be <b>disqualified for 4 years</b> from being or becoming a member of</p>   | <p>The tribunal was mindful of the public interest in maintaining standards in public life and the overarching purpose of the Code of Conduct <b>to maintain confidence in local democracy.</b></p> |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Council's Code of Conduct</p> <p><b>Tribunal Decision:</b> Breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Council's Code of Conduct. Disqualified for 4 years.</p> <p><a href="#"><u>APW/004/2024-025/CT: Former Councillor Andrew Edwards   The Adjudication Panel for Wales</u></a></p> | <p><b>Council business alongside disrespectful comments about members of the public</b> to his then partner via WhatsApp.</p> <p>It was alleged that this conduct could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Respondent's office as Member or the Relevant Authority into disrepute and was therefore suggestive of a breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct for Members.</p> | <p>the Relevant Authority or any other relevant authority within the meaning of the Local Government Act 2000</p> | <p>Any period of disqualification must be <b>necessary and proportionate</b>.</p> <p>One purpose of disqualification is to allow a period of <b>reflection</b> to recognise the severe impact of the behaviour and the <b>wider impact upon the role and Council</b> which could reasonably have been foreseen.</p> <p>It was considered a sanction of disqualification was fair, proportionate and in the public interest in this case, in order to underline the <b>importance of the standards regime in Wales, to promote a culture of compliance across the relevant authorities and to foster public confidence in local democracy</b>.</p> <p><b>Article 10</b> of the ECHR was noted to be a fundamental right, however it was a right which could only be claimed where it did not impact on the fundamental rights of others.</p> |
|--|---|---|---|

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   |  |  | <p>and it clearly did so in this case and impacted on the lives of other individuals, proposing as it did that their human right to freedom and equality should be determined by their race.</p> <p>The Case Tribunal concluded that the messages in question were <b>not made in a political context</b>, and in any event, were <b>so extreme and disturbing, that the protections offered to politicians by the ECHR to freely express views would not apply here.</b></p> |
| <p><b>Name:</b> Councillor Attridge</p> <p><b>Reference number:</b><br/>APW/0004/2023-024/CT</p> <p><b>Relevant authority:</b> Flintshire County Council &amp; Connah's Quay Town Council</p> <p><b>Nature of allegation:</b> Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 4(d), 5(a), 6(1)(a), 7(a), 11(2)(a) &amp; 14(1)(d)</p> <p><a href="#"><u>apw-decision-report-bernie-attridge.pdf</u></a></p> | <p>The matter was referred to the APW by the PSOW. It was alleged the Member breached the Code by attempting to develop a relationship with someone who, whilst not in his ward, had wanted help with a family member's housing problem. Once he had indicated that he was attempting to help, his <b>messages to the individual became sexually explicit as</b></p> | <p><b>Tribunal Decision:</b> Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 5(a), 6(1)(a) and 7(a). No breach of paragraphs 4(d), 11(2)(a) and 14(1)(d)</p> <p>Suspended for four months</p> | <p>Fact specific circumstances.</p> <p>The Tribunal considered whether it ought to make a recommendation that the Respondent specifically apologise to the individual and the officers for his conduct but, having considered the Sanctions Guidance (paragraphs 54 and 55), <b>it concluded that such recommendations ought to</b></p>   |

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
|   | <p>he hoped for reciprocation. When he did not get the help and cooperation that he had hoped for from Housing Officers, he became <b>rude and threatening</b> and subsequently adopted a similar approach to the Monitoring Officer when the issues came to light.</p>   |  | <p><b>have been directed to the authorities and/or their Standards Committees.</b></p>  |
| <p><b>Name:</b> Former Councillor Jeff Davies</p> <p><b>Reference number:</b> APW/007/2023-024/CT</p> <p><b>Relevant authority:</b> New Quay Town Council</p> <p><b>Nature of allegation:</b> Breach of paragraph 6(1)(a)</p> <p><a href="#"><u>apw-decision-report-jeff-davies_0.pdf</u></a></p> | <p>It was alleged the Member sent messages of a <b>sexually explicit</b> nature to an individual which amounted to the <b>offence of harassment</b>, culminating in what could be perceived to be an <b>attempt to blackmail</b> the recipient, and which resulted in a <b>conditional caution</b> being issued by the Police.</p> <p>It was alleged that this conduct could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Respondent's office as Member or the Relevant Authority into disrepute and was therefore suggestive of a breach of Paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code of Conduct for Members</p> | <p>The Case Tribunal noted that the Respondent had <b>accepted that he had engaged in criminal behaviour</b> by accepting a conditional caution. The offence which the Respondent had admitted was that of <b>harassment of the victim</b> which he knew or ought to have known amounted to harassment. The Respondent had sent numerous and clearly unwanted messages of a sexual and salacious nature to the victim.</p> <p><b>Tribunal Decision:</b> Breach of paragraph 6(1)(a). Disqualified for 12 months.</p> | <p>The Case Tribunal concluded that the relevant question in this respect was <b>whether the relevant behaviour occurred whilst the Respondent was a Member</b>.</p> <p>Whereas Paragraph 4(a) of the Code refers specifically to the fact that a Member must not harass any person, that part of the Code did not apply when the Member was acting in a private capacity as the PSOW and witnesses had agreed was the case here. Paragraph 6(1)(a) could however apply in such circumstances</p> |

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Name:</b> Former Councillor Steve Davies</p> <p><b>Reference number:</b> APW/006/2023-024/CT</p> <p><b>Relevant authority:</b> Ceredigion County Council &amp; Aberystwyth Town Council</p> <p><b>Nature of allegation:</b> Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 6(1)(a) &amp; 7(a)</p> <p><a href="#"><u>apw-decision-report-fmr-cllr-steve-davies.pdf</u></a></p> | <p>It was alleged that the Member had engaged in behaviour over a number of years and involving different individuals and locations that can broadly be categorised as unwanted, often persistent contact and in some cases harassment. <i>(The full details in respect of each of the 8 incidents considered can be found outlined in the Decision)</i></p> | <p><b>Tribunal Decision:</b> Breach of paragraph 4(b), 4(c) &amp; 6(1)(a). No breach of paragraph 7(a). Disqualified for 3 years.</p> | <p>Paragraphs 4 (b) and (c) of the Code ought to have been considered <i>sui generis</i> with (a) and read in the same context; they covered an <b>individual's conduct when carrying out his duties as a councillor</b>. He therefore had to have been working in that capacity and/or holding himself out as such at the time of any alleged breaches.</p> |
|---|--|---|--|